United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 28, 1995 No. 107

House of Representatives

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

(Continued)

□ 2100

It was reminiscent of the charges against Nelson Mandela as he brought South Africa to democracy. There was no tradition of democracy. This individual was not a perfect personification of democratic policies and institutions. They will never have another election.

Well, what just happened? The country took a step it had virtually never taken before, having free and open elections. And, yes, like every election process, and I can speak for that, having gone through a close one myself, there are always some issues that you can review. But there is no question that Haiti had what it never had before.

And I would ask my friend from Florida [Mr. GOSS] to accept this amendment. This amendment does no harm to what he seeks to do here today. I think the gentleman is honest in his desire to see Haiti move forward in democracy. I think his motives are pure, and I believe in a motion of good faith. I would ask the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] to stand and accept the gentlewoman's amendment, because together we can help this Nation have what it never had before. It can have a democratic government. Let us give it a chance. Let us not try to shackle the President. Let us not try to hobble this government. Let us continue to encourage its moving forward.

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

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

Mr. GOSS. I will not withdraw my amendment because we can get all of that and one additional factor which is very important, and that is accountability to the American taxpayers on how these funds are being used.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, this is astounding debate. We spent tens of millions of dollars on services for Haitains that overloaded the services that are available to Florida. We spend tens of millions of dollars, of Coast Guard dollars, sweeping the Caribbean trying to find Haitians fleeing tyranny in sailboats, in bath tubs, in wooden tubs that they created. And now, suddenly, we think Price Waterhouse will make this democracy flourish.

We are making every effort with the administration to make sure the taxpayer dollars are accounted for. But let us understand what this is all about. This is a nation taking its first steps for democracy. If you pull that rug out now, do not come back to this Congress asking for more dollars to set up blockades for Haitians and their children as they risk their lives to flee the next tyrants.

Let us give this democracy a chance. Let us support the Meek amendment and defeat the Goss amendment. This is the right direction. That is the wrong direction.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to try to defuse this situation and simply suggest that I do not think the Meek amendment is needed, and I do not think the Goss amendment is needed. But neither do I believe any of them do any harm.

The problem with this entire debate so far is that I think it is rooted in, to be kind, a very warped sense of expectation about the present government in Haiti. I must confess I am somewhat amused by political factions in this country who somehow seem to have found a newly discovered concern about democracy and human rights in Haiti, after this government for about 50 years was complicit in the governing of Haiti by one of the most reprehensible regimes in the history of this hemisphere, the Duvalier government.

I think Americans need to learn that other people who have never experienced democracy also need to learn how to experience that form of government. We have seen on that island a series of lurches as the people of that country have tried to reach a different kind of reality in their own society, after 50 years of being absolutely crunched and destroyed by the cynics who ran that island.

When Mr. Carter and General Powell went to Haiti, there was a lot of snipping. But they produced results, and the administration has been able to follow through on those results and produce a situation in Haiti which is far better than virtually anyone on this floor predicted, either supporters or opponents of the President's action in sending the military to Haiti.

It seems to me what we ought to do is to recognize success when we see it. This is one occasion on which American policy has succeeded, through a combination of wisdom and luck, which is what it always takes to succeed. So I am, frankly, mystified, after this Congress for years acquiesced in a vicious, vicious regime in that country, because they happen to support some of the elite business interests in our own country, that all of a sudden we are expecting that the Clinton administration and the Aristide regime and the elections in Haiti should be held to a far higher standard than any party has ever been held on that island before.

So it seems to me if we want to deal substantively and rationally and fairly with this issue, that we will do one of two things: We would either reject both amendments and leave the language as is in the bill, or else we would, in the spirit of comity, accept both amendments, indicating on both sides of the aisle that we are trying to find our way toward some unity on some issue in

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

this place in the midst of all of the turmoil which is going on around us.

So I would again urge the gentleman from Florida to accept the Meek amendment, because it does no harm; and, if that happens, I would urge the acceptance of the Goss amendment, because neither one of them together does any harm. They indicate the Congress' preference for continued progress in democratization, but they do so in a realistic way, which is not conveying either mean-spiritedness or a total lack of unreality on the part of the Congress.

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

Mr. Chairman, I got a notice today, as I think probably everyone did, that at 4 o'clock there would be a briefing on the election in Haiti, and unfortunately, some people did not come. In fact, only four Members made it. But I would like to give an accounting of the briefing. The people there who gave the briefing had been to Haiti to be observers at the election. They were also, many of them, the same people who went to South Africa to be official observers at the election.

Yes, they said, there were some polls that opened late, because it is a very poor country and there really was not the infrastructure there. Some did open late, but they opened.

Yes, some of the polling places did not have enough ballots, because it is a poor country. They did not have the infrastructure. But they got the ballots there.

I do not remember, but I was not in this House, I do not remember when we said we would never give money to Haiti when there were no elections in Haiti. No, they did not bother to have elections in Haiti, because they had a dictator.

There was an election in Haiti, there were some polls that were late. And, as someone who lived many years ago in South Africa, I remember, as my colleague does, that we said, many people said, oh, the South Africans, they will not be able to run a good election.

Well, the same people who went and observed the election in South Africa observed the election in Haiti, and they said that it was done as fairly as possible. And one thing that I would remind my colleagues, an historic thing happened in Haiti in this election: There was virtually no violence. No violence, Mr. Chairman. People fought to vote in Haiti.

Who are we to say that a poor country cannot run an election, that poor people cannot reach for democracy? Who are we to say? We must vote for the Meek amendment. We must stand by the people of Haiti as they reach for democracy, as we reach for democracy.

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

Mr. Chairman, there are many characteristics of this institution and of our country that I admire, and one is our great pride in ourselves. Sometimes we forget, we are not the only people in the only country that have dignity and a sense of pride. Only a year ago, this Chamber was deeply divided, and, like the gentleman from Missouri, I argued strenuously for the United States not to involve itself in the affairs of Haiti. I did not believe that a peaceful election was possible. I was not sure that American forces could accomplish their mission, and I was wrong.

Our forces performed brilliantly, but that was not the only success. As we reached out to the people of Haiti, they reached too. We offered security and our forces. And in spite of all the doubts and all the things that this Member and other Members said, the people of Haiti kept a peaceful regime, within the law, and participated in elections.

There is not a great difference in substance between the language of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], and the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK]. But there is a great difference in the respect for what the Haitian people have done, their nation, their pride, and their dignity.

The American people made a deal with the people of Haiti. They kept it. There is another quality I admire about our people; we do not break deals. They kept their part, they held an election, they have kept the peace. Now let us see the mission through that our military forces began, and that the Haitian people have been true to.

I, too, like the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSEN], that for all the foreign policy divisions, since this is only about tone, that the gentleman from Florida will accept the amendment of the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK] and tonight the people of Haiti will understand, and all of our military forces who risked their lives will understand, that tonight, for all the divisions of the past, we are united and proud of what has happened in Haiti.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for his statement, and simply want to observe one thing: For those who are concerned about the fact that this debate on this issue has taken so long, I would simply like to point out that the Meek amendment would not even be here had the Committee on Rules not made in order an amendment which was not in order under the ordinary rules of the House. The Committee on Rules made in order not a limitation, but an amendment which was legislation on the appropriations bill.

□ 2115

We would not even have had this extended debate on this subject tonight if the Committee on Rules had not gone out of the normal order to make this amendment in order. I think under those circumstances it is perfectly understandable why the gentlewoman from Florida would want to attach a modifying amendment to an amendment which was not normally in order under the normal course of events.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE. asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Chairman, I will not take up all of my time. I simply, in listening to the debate, wanted to understand the debate. I heard something just a few minutes ago that gave me pause for concern. It seems that several of our Members have offered a compromise of withdrawing both amendments or supporting both amendments. Then I heard the gentleman from Florida offer an explanation, if you will, of his amendment that dealt with taxpayers' dollars.

I thought we were talking about a question of human rights. That is what I hear in the comments of the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK] that Haiti is making the steps that need to be made to emphasize life but also to emphasize a better life, that a good life in Haiti, is also a respect for human rights.

I do understand the concern with taxpayer dollars and accountability, but I think when America stood alongside of Haiti, they stood alongside of Haiti to give them the bridge and the support to be able to embrace a better life for their nation. And for Haiti to be able to say, we are proud to stand up for human rights. We are proud to go against tyranny, to go against murder, pillaging, poverty. We want to have fair elections to make a better quality of life for Haitians.

So in listening to the debate, albeit there is certainly maybe some positive points that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] wants to offer, but when it comes down to the question of human rights versus the issue of mere accountability, I want to bolster Haiti's right for elections but also to applaud what occurred, and that is a transition of power through elections that occurred safely and without massive loss of life.

I think that is the real vote for human rights. I think the Meek amendment is a vote for human rights. So in my understanding of it, I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting the Meek amendment which is really a vote for human rights and a vote for Haiti and a vote for the future of their nation and to say to them, thank you, you kept your promise. And America is going to keep its promise.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we would reject the Goss amendment for many of the same reasons that my colleagues have already taken the well to

speak about. Clearly, the path to democracy in Haiti has not been a smooth one. It has been a tragic one. We have all seen, and our constituents have all seen and witnessed in their living rooms and on TV for all too long the murders, the retributions. The denial of human rights, actions by the government, against the government, by the Ton-Tons Macoutes, for and against and by the private police against the citizens.

We have watched when people have tried to exercise free speech, whether it was in the churches or in the town square. They were gunned down in front of others, and others felt frozen to do anything about it because they were afraid that they or their families would be killed.

We watched this as it went on and on and on. We watched as Aristide, President Artistide rose as a Catholic priest who had the ear of the people and won a popular election. That upset a lot of people for a whole host of reasons, very little of which had to do with Haiti, other than the Haitians inside that wanted back that power, did not want to let that transition take place and finally was driven from the country by violence as governmental officials and others were killed openly. Religious leaders were killed openly.

Finally, after a great debate in this country, a great debate in the United Nations, a long and protracted debate around the world, and a debate in this Congress where people were not clear, they were not sure about the use of force, somehow, somehow it happened. Once the troops arrived, nobody was sure whether they had left or not. We had to invoke former President, Members of Senate, Joint Chiefs of Staff to pave the way. But it did happen. And beyond all of our expectations, Aristide has been returned to the country, and he promise was held, and an election was held.

Now we threaten to undermine that election, and to those people who have sacrificed so much, the Haitians, to try to get the flower of democracy to bloom, we start the process of undermining it, questioning it, second guessing it. Let me tell you, this Chamber, this Government and the people who raised questions about this election have accepted far less from the Government of Mexico year after year after year. They have accepted far less from the Government of Honduras year after year after year. They have accepted far less from the Government of El Salvador, the Government of Columbia, year after year after year; all in the name that those were open and free elections, and we know very well they never were.

And yes, we finally have accepted an election in El Salvador that in fact turned out to be open and free. A huge amount of irregularities. Aristide visited the pole sites. Many of our colleagues were with us as we traveled in areas. But El Salvador is not California. It is not Nebraska. It does not have a history of elections. People do not have transportation. People cannot read.

But do you know what they did do? They stood in line, under threats of violence, in hot sun for hours and hours and hours for the right to do this. And people did the same thing in Haiti, under the threats of violence, their own lives in peril. What did they do? When the polling place was not open, they stayed and they waited and they waited.

Last night we saw views of women who walked 6 and 7 miles to deliver the ballots, to make sure that their little village and their polling place was going to be counted in the name of democracy. And now the U.S. Congress rises up and undermines that? Without any showing of that irregularity? No, that is not what we should be about.

We recognize it was not perfect. But we also recognize it is the best they have yet had in Haiti, and that is all we ever asked in El Salvador, and that is all we ever asked in a lot of other countries: that progress continue to be made and that open and free continue to become the watchwords and that transparencies is now we will measure it so that we will know that the fraud is not there. But it is progress, just as we demand of our larger neighbor to the south, of Mexico. Nobody believed that the PRI won the election two elections ago except the PRI.

Well, but the point is this: that we have set down the marker, and we have demanded this progress. And Haiti has met the mark. We should reject this amendment for that reason because it is most important. If we believe that we are going to go and ask people to risk their lives, to face down the violence, to try and participate in democracy and then we say, unless it is perfect, we are going to take it away from you and do it again, we will be doing what the general could not do. We will be doing what the thugs could not do, and we should not do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK] to the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to rule XXIII, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the underlying Goss amendment, if there is no intervening business. This will be a 17-minute vote. The Chair intends to hold it to 17 minutes.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 231, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 436]

AYES—189

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Houghton
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDade
McDermott
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn

NOES—231

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)

Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—14

Bateman
Berman
Chenoweth
Clyburn
Coburn
Gunderson
Harman
Largent
McNulty
Moakley
Reynolds
Rush
Stokes
Yates

□ 2141

Mr. EWING changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment to the amendment, as modified, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, first it is my understanding that we have pending the Goss amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VOLKMER. That is subject to debate under the 5-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

MOTION TO RISE OFFERED BY MR. VOLKMER

Mr. VOLKMER. Before moving to strike the last word, which I will do at a later time, I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a vote in progress. Twenty-five Members stood, a recorded vote was ordered, and the vote is now in progress.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 236, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 437]

AYES—185

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Studds
Stupak
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn

NOES—236

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Beilenson
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—13

Bateman
Berman
Coburn
Fawell
Gunderson
Harman
Largent
Markey
McNulty
Moakley
Reynolds
Stokes
Yates

□ 2200

So the motion to rise was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mr. Chairman, we continue with this debate on this amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], and many have raised the question: Why this amendment? What is he trying to do? The amendment certainly is unnecessary.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] perhaps knows better than anyone else all that we have been through as we have assisted Haiti in its move toward democracy. Even Mr. GOSS agrees that Haiti has done well. Certainly there were some problems in the election.

Mr. Chairman, as we continue, we know that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] knows that those elections

that were just held in Haiti are somewhat of a miracle. This country that has been in such turmoil, this country that for years has been under a dictatorship, finally had an election, an election that we assisted them with.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] perhaps knows better than most that this miracle that just occurred in Haiti is something that we should celebrate. We should embrace the fact that a very poor people struggling, many of them without food, many of them without shelter, participated in this election. They stood in long lines, and, yes, someone said earlier they counted votes by candlelight.

But instead of celebrating the success of the election, we wonder why the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] would insist on bringing an amendment to this floor that basically may tie the hands of Haiti as they move toward the next election.

Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is basically saying in this amendment is that he does not trust all of the work that has been done, he does not trust the representations of the President there.

I said to Mr. GOSS that President Aristide had said to me that he thought Mr. GOSS was a fine man, and Mr. GOSS said to me that he thought President Aristide was a fine man, and he said to me that President Aristide has made a commitment to him that he would not run again, that he would not interfere in the elections, and according to the constitution he cannot run again, and he said that he made a commitment that he would do everything that he could to ensure that there would be fair and free elections.

Given all of that, he comes with this amendment, and this amendment basically says he does not trust any of that. This amendment basically says, if somebody, God knows who, tells the President of the United States that the elections were not in substantial compliance with the 1987 constitution, then we should cease to give any financial assistance to Haiti.

Well, I reiterate, this is quite unnecessary, and it has gotten us into this big debate this evening. The gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK] had to come with an amendment in order to try and modify what was being done. She had to do that because she knew that whether he was serious about this or not or whether he was just being mischievous that they could cause some problems in Haiti.

I tried to get him to explain, what does he mean by substantial compliance. I asked him if, in fact, he thought the recent elections were in substantial compliance, and he said yes, and I said, ''Are you asking for a higher standard? Do you know the work that went into getting an agreement from everybody that they would move in the direction that they did to oversee and conduct these elections?'' And he said yes. So, he does not know why he is doing this.

This does not encourage, this discourages, the people of Haiti. They know that, given everything that they have done, everything that they have agreed to, when we continue to have these kinds of motions on the floor of Congress, something is wrong.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] has expired.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent the gentlewoman from California be given 2 additional minutes.

The Chairman. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Colorado?

Mr. LINDER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I would like to question the gentlewoman as to how much longer she thinks this debate is going to go on. There has been about 2 hours' debate on both the underlying amendment and the Meek amendment which failed. I would like to ask the gentlewoman how much longer this might go on.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDER. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. It was my preference that we not have this debate. As a matter of fact, given my negotiations with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], I asked him if he would withdraw his amendment. Someone else asked if they would simply agree to the Meek amendment.

POINT OF ORDER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, we have been on this amendment for 6 hours and 55 minutes, and I think I have been extremely fair to everybody in this House on both sides of the aisle by making absolutely certain that all of my colleagues have the opportunity to speak. The gentlewoman from California had been recognized for 5 minutes——

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a point of order. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] is not stating a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Would the gentleman state his point of order?

Mr. CRANE. Object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection heard.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto end with 10 minutes.

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

Mr. OBEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, could I under my reservation suggest to the Chair, to the subcommittee chairman, that, as we know, there are a pair of discussions going on between out two leadership, and I think, if we are going to get through this night in a civilized way, that we ought to recognize the fact that those discussions are probably going to determine what happens in this debate tonight. I do not especially like that any more than——

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield under his reservation?

Mr. OBEY. I will be happy to after I complete the sentence, but I really do believe that we can keep the emotional pressure at a lower level if we allow people to continue to make their points for a few minutes to see what is happening in the other room.

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

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

Mr. LINDER. Would the gentleman agree that the discussions between the respective leaders has less to do with the Goss amendment than it has to do with the Committee on Ways and Means, and that we can still conduct the business of this amendment and get it out of the way while they are discussing the question as to what has been interrupting the House for the last 6 hours?

Mr. OBEY. I would simply observe that that is one part of, or that is partially true, but I think it is also true that this debate would not be taking place at all had the committee on which the gentleman serves not approved an amendment which would not be in order under the regular rules of the House.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman further yield on that?

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

Mr. LINDER. Would the gentleman also agree that several other amendments were made in order with waivers in the same vein?

Mr. OBEY. Yes, I would, and I objected to all of them at the time, and I think we would have been better off if none of them had been made in order.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection has been heard.

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

Mr. Chairman and colleagues. As some of my colleagues in the Chamber know, I lived in and worked in Haiti for 3½ years. I speak the language, the official language and the everyday language of the people, both French and Creole, and Haiti for me has been a passion of over 35 years.

Mr. Chairman, I have followed with great excitement what has happened in the last 5 years: that a real election has taken place, an honest election, the results of which were disrupted by the army, and then, through diplomacy and forceful action, the rightful President was restored.

Mr. Chairman, just this past weekend we witnessed another election in Haiti that was about as fair and as free as any election in the history of the country ever has been with the possible exception of the election of President Aristide.

I was on the presidential observer team with our colleague from Florida. We observed election precincts in the mountains above Petionville, in the waysides, in the center city, in Cité Soleil, in Marché Salomon. The gentleman was with me when a similar occurrence in 1990 happened as happened over this past weekend. People waited in line for 7 hours to vote but could not vote because there were no ballot boxes, and the gentleman helped me make ballot boxes out of cartons.

Mr. Chairman, mistakes were made in that election, mistakes, but not actions of ill will; and mistakes were made in this past weekend's election, but not purposefully, not actions of ill will.

I think the gentleman's amendment is well intentioned. I think he wants to see a good result come out of the December election or whenever it occurs in accordance with the constitution.

□ 2215

But I suggest to you that this is the wrong time and the wrong place for this amendment. We have in the past used forcing mechanisms against violent regimes, against regimes that were oppressive and dictatorial and would not hold elections, to force elections to happen.

In this case we have a government that wants elections, a President who is committed not to succeeding himself, who said that the second election is the one that counts in this country, the second election is the one that determines whether we will have a democracy. He wants an election to happen.

It is the other side that does not want an election to happen. It is the remnants of the Ton-Tons Macoutes, the remnants of the Force de FRAPH. It is the remnants of Duvalierism who do not want elections to happen in Haiti. They would rather disrupt. And this language now, at this time, six months or more before an election even happens, feeds the forces of retreat and repression and regression.

It will give them all the encouragement in the world to disrupt elections, to cause evil things to happen, if today we are imposing conditions on this country.

You know, it is a modern miracle that Haiti even wrote a Constitution, wrote an election law. This is a country whose law school was closed for 30 years, whose university was closed for 30 years; where people left the country, the best and brightest minds left the country to go elsewhere to work, for the United Nations, in Africa, elsewhere around the world. And yet when Baby Doc was ousted from Haiti, there were people of good will and of bright minds who could write a Constitution, a model Constitution, and write an election law, and supervise elections and have a real election happen.

My fear is that if this amendment is adopted, the Haitian proverb will come true, ''We washed our hands and dried them off in the dirt.'' The end will be the reversal of the beginning.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] has expired.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out to the House that the gentleman has had experiences in Haiti, and this is the only time that the gentleman has spoken on the floor on this amendment, is that correct?

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, to simply conclude, the Haitians say it so well in their own words. ''Behind the mountains are more mountains.'' Today I say, behind the problems of Haiti are more problems. We are trying, I think well, to deal with the problems of Haiti. But the gentleman's amendment will feed into the hands of the forces of repression. And to simply restate that very simple but eloquent Haitian proverb, it is washing your hands and drying them off in the dirt. That is the effect of the amendment. It will be to undo the good that we intend and the good that we have accomplished.

Please, do not adopt this amendment. If elections go badly, we can always come afterward and cut off aid. But we do not impose on any country in the world, any industrialized country, any third world country, any developing country, preconditions, preconditions to democracy. Do not do it now, not for struggling Haiti. Please, defeat the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, we are confronted with an odd principle here, which is that a nation which has been deprived of democracy for many, many years, will be worse off for trying to become democratic than if they just are content to remain repressive.

The Haitians are trying in extraordinarily difficult circumstances. They are doing far better than anyone had predicted. But they are being held to a standard that is much too high.

Had they not tried at all, it is clear that for many in this body that would not be a problem. We have given aid and continue to give aid to countries which are not even trying to be democratic.

I think the Middle East peace process is one of the most important things going on in the world right now, so I am for foreign assistance for, among other places, Egypt. I do not think anyone would look at the electoral process of Egypt and award it any prizes. I think we have in Haiti today more democracy in fact than we have in Egypt.

We continue, as I understand it, to provide some forms of assistance to Indonesia. As I understand it, the only elections they have in Indonesia are when the family of the President gets together and votes on who gets what, and they may do that by majority rule.

Indonesia is right now in the process of oppressing East Timor. By what logic and moral principle do the people of Haiti get punished, as they would under this amendment, for trying to be democratic, when you do not get punished for succeeding in being repressive?

If you were going to make a list of recipients of American foreign assistance on a scale of the will to have democracy, Haiti would come very high. I have to say I think part of the problem here is not just the Haitian's fault. They are guilty of having benefited from President Clinton's foreign policy. I know when the President makes a mistake, as he does sometimes, because all Presidents do, people on the other side are unhappy. But when he succeeds, they are furious.

The problem here is not President Aristide, it is President Clinton. He presumed not to listen to this body. I was in the minority, and this time I was glad I was. The President went ahead under his constitutional authority and moved in the right direction in Haiti. People warned of disaster.

There is nothing more frustrating than to be walking around with a sign that says the world is going to end Friday, and all of a sudden it is Monday morning and the sun is shining.

Now, the sun is not shining yet in Haiti, but it is coming out, the clouds are receding. And what we have in Haiti is a successful presidential foreign policy that has gone further towards restoring democracy to one of the most oppressed and maligned places in the world.

If you had a measurement of progress, Haiti would be at the very top. What we are in danger of doing is punishing people for trying something difficult and not succeeding fully.

If the standards of this amendment governed Olympic judging, all the diving events would be head first straight into the pool, and all the gymnasts would just jump up and back and up and back, because you do not take into account degree of difficulty. In the real world, when you are judging people, the degree of difficulty that they have volunteered to undertake has to count for something.

Aristide and Clinton and, even more, the brave common citizens of Haiti are guilty of having shown some people to be excessively pessimistic. The Haitian people are proving more interested in democracy. We have some people who tended to argue that the desire to be

democratic was kind of an European instinct, not shared by others. The people of Haiti have disproved that as eloquently as anyone in history, because against the greatest of odds, at the peril of people's lives, they have insisted on their right to govern themselves and they have come a very long way toward that goal. And they are to be rewarded by an amendment that says because you did not have a very, very good election, we are going to throw this one away.

Now, I have to say, perhaps we should have been warned about that by the standards people on the other side use, because I have to admit they are not entirely inconsistent. If you look at their views regarding the election in North Carolina and California, they are being consistent, but they are wrong on all counts.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am trying to understand exactly what the motivation of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is and what the attitude of our country is towards the poor Haitian people. The United States is the richest and most powerful democracy in the world. Yet we put on the floor of this House an amendment designed to once again create a paternalistic attitude by the United States towards a poor, vulnerable, black, democratically elected regime.

We say to this poor nation, where people have stood in line for hours and hours, where people have been killed and gunned down on the street to fight a military junta led by General Cedras, where time and time again families have been disrupted and torn apart, individuals absolutely pulled out of churches and gunned down, and we have the right to say to these people that somehow their struggle for democracy is not up to our standards? Our standards, where only 25 percent of the American people currently participate in the electoral process, and a party comes in here thinking they have got some mandate from the American people?

The fact of the matter is that if the people of this country ever participated in an election the way the Haitian people did this last weekend, we would have a very different government here in the United States of America. What we need in this country is a little sensitivity towards a struggling democracy, and a sensitivity that suggests that an individual in this Congress who offered an amendment just a few months ago to send the Aristide government to an island off of Haiti in exile rather than have the guts that President Clinton did to put President Aristide back into power.

President Aristide, a quiet, stately human being, who has committed himself and his country toward the path of democracy, who opened up free and fair elections, with 11,000 people running for office over a weekend. Yes, there were problems. But as I have heard many people say to me today, not as many problems as we sometimes have in Boston, not as many problems as MAJOR OWENS has in New York, not as many problems as some of the major cities here in the United States in terms of getting polls.

I was reading about some of the problems the Republicans were having, some of the problems Democrats are having in getting votes in this country today. But all of a sudden, if there is a problem in a poor black country in the Caribbean, we are going to condemn them. We are going to put an amendment out on the House floor that says if they do not shape up, we are going to ship them out.

Well, maybe it is time that we look in the mirror of our democracy and ask ourselves the same questions we are asking the Haitian people, and challenge ourselves to reach the same standards that we asked the Haitian people to meet. And maybe if we met those standards, we would have the right to ask people throughout the world to reach those same standards.

You look at the level of democracy and participation in so many other countries throughout the world, Third World nations, that struggle each and every day, that have individuals and corporations and so many special interests, that have the capability of going in and struggling and stifling off any hope of individuals rising to their full potential, not because of their brain power, not because of their desire for democracy, but simply because they are stifled by the systems that are in place.

Haiti, more than any other nation, has struggled against that system for 200 years. Finally, after 200 years, after millions of dollars of American taxpayers' money has gone to stifle democracy in Haiti and so many other countries throughout Latin America, they finally have a democratically elected regime, and we sit here in the Congress of the United States and basically tell them that they are not good enough.

Well, Mr. Chairman, it is time for us to stand up for Haitian democracy, be proud of President Aristide, be proud of the democracy that President Clinton has allowed to take place in the Third World, in Haiti, and stand up and be counted the way the American people did when George Washington led our revolution.

□ 2230

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that I had the privilege to travel to Haiti, as I indicated before, and was certified by their election board to be a person that could observe these elections. I was a member of the Interorganizational Observers Mission Group. It was made up of people who were scholars and educators, lawyers. And we visited many of the election sites. I flew up to Cap Haitien, and we went to the area that was supposed to be the most in distress. There were 10,000 polling places, 10 million election pieces had to be printed. There were 177 Senates running, 859 deputies, 885 mayors with 3 names with each mayor because they have several persons in, so you can multiply that by 3 and you get close to 2,500.

You had 2,688 counselors and in those you had also 3 persons, so you are talking about 7,500, over 11,000 persons being elected.

In that country, 3.5 million people were registered, 92 percent of the persons registered to vote, and a member of the International Republican Institute said, ''Well, that sounds fairly good.''

In the election people voted from all parts of that country. We had turnouts that were outstanding throughout the country. We had numbers of people, close to 50 percent in some areas. We had election returns of up to 40 percent in some of the other suburbs. We had the fact that many of the people there, 30 to 40 percent in Port-au-Prince, 60 to 65 percent in the rural suburbs of Port-au-Prince, 35 percent in the north, 50 percent in the northeast, 30 to 40 percent in the south. In our last election in this country, only 39 percent of the registered persons voted. In our country, only about 75 percent of the people in this country, eligible to register, are registered.

During the 1987 election, 100 people were killed leading up to election day in Haiti. In 1987, 34 people were killed on election day alone. This time there were none killed. There was a shooting of someone in the arm, and no one knows whether that was about an election on whether it was some longstanding problem.

I say that this election was fair and free. I say that the people who voted voted their conscience. Yes, there were some problems, but the thing that was interesting was that all parties complained about the fact that they did not feel the election was as good as they wanted it to be. I commend President Aristide for the criticism that he took from his own Lavalas Party so that he created a new party, a new party with a new symbol, a symbol of people sitting around a table, four people, where they are at the table negotiating for peace. And his right wing radical persons from his party disagreed with him. They said, Let us get revenge; let us not have reconciliation. He said, There is reconciliation and not revenge. And so they split off from him because he was not going after revenge.

This was a very outstanding election. We talked to people after the election. They stood in line peacefully waiting hours and hours, polls opened at 6:00 in the morning. People had to walk for hours and hours to get there to open them up. Yes, a few got there a little bit late, but I have seen polls open late all over the country, in my own State

of New Jersey, where you do not have to walk far to get to a polling place.

So I think it is totally unfair. If we want to see people once again leaving a place because people like a Cedras or a Michel Francois or a Biamby will come back into power as they did before, using the gun barrel.They have a police department. For the first time Aristide wanted to do away totally with their military, with their army and wants a police department like they have in other countries.

Why do you not give the man credit? I know the CIA was upset when they miscalculated the fact that Aristide was going to win the election, because the CIA told everyone it was going to be a guy named Bazin who they said had it in the bag, they were totally wrong. They have been trying to clean their act up ever since they miscalculated that election in 1990. With the hundreds of millions of dollars they had there to monitor the election, they blew it.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. PELOSI TO THE AMENDMENT, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. GOSS

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment, as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. PELOSI to the amendment, as modified, offered by Mr. GOSS: In the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment, strike ''when it is made known'' and all that follows and insert the following: ''except when it is made known to the President that the democratic process is being strengthened in Haiti.''

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Ms. PELOSI. I do not yield to the gentleman from Georgia for that purpose.

Mr. Chairman, I frankly do not believe that we need any amendments to the foreign operations bill in relationship to Haiti. I do not think we should condition our assistance to Haiti, but I do understand the concern expressed by my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS]. In the spirit of that understanding, I am suggesting that perhaps an appropriate amendment to his amendment would be as the Clerk reported, except when it is made known to the President that the democratic process is being strengthened in Haiti. That is as opposed to the gentleman's amendment which just addresses the elections.

There is more to a democracy than elections, Mr. Chairman. Many times, people in this body, indeed in our country, have looked away from countries once they have had a democratic election and said: Okay, they have had a democratic election, now we can move on before those countries have even had a chance to develop democratic institutions, develop systems of independent judiciary, a court system, which is fundamental to a democracy.

So I think that instead of just using the elections as a guide, we should determine a standard that is realistic and that strengthens democracy in Haiti.

When I was listening to the debate, it was interesting to me to hear about this conditionality which, as I said, if I had my druthers, I do not think we need any conditionality for our aid. But in the spirit of compromise, I was thinking that we do not even condition aid to countries that do not even have elections, much less elections that do not meet our complete standards.

But I was recalling a speech that was very familiar to every American, particularly to Americans of a generation of many of us who serve in this Congress, indeed, inspired many of us to a life of public service. That was President Kennedy's acceptance speech.

Everybody, whoever follows government and politics, can quote the President's very famous: And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you but what you can do for your country. But what I want to address is the sentence that comes next in that speech. The sentence that comes next, Mr. Chairman, is, the President went on to say: My fellow citizens of the world, ask not what America will do for you but what together we can do for the freedom of man.

I think that the issue that is before this body this evening is about what we can all do working together for the freedom of man.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] says in his amendment that we spend so much money and we have limited resources right now; and, indeed, I know that. Our chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] worked very hard to craft a bipartisan agreement in our foreign operations bill. Every time I have risen to address an amendment on this floor, our colleague, in a Dear Colleague letter to us, Mr. GOSS says that recognizes the budgetary, the tight budgetary times, and indeed they are. As I was saying, every time I have risen to speak on this bill, I have commented on the excellent job that our chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] has done to make the most of the resources that were available to him and to comment on also the hard work of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] in trying to get us the best allocation he could. But the tight budgetary times did not give us enough money to go around.

I think that for the money that we have and the investment that we have in Haiti, we want to protect that investment, not only by sending money but by sending our respect for the people of Haiti. We are not going to say to them: We do not think you can do this, so right from the outset we are going to put a condition on your receiving the funds or the continuation of your receiving the funds.

The people of Haiti went to the polls this weekend to vote. Let us give them our vote of confidence by saying we believe that they can become a more democratic country. They have been through a very tough time.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I also want to quote from President Kennedy's speech because I think it is appropriate to the debate this evening. In addition to asking the citizens of the world what together we can do for the freedom of man, he talked about a clarion call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out, rejoicing in hope, a patient in tribulation, a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself.

Surely, Haiti, a small neighbor of ours, has suffered to through all of those afflictions. Let us help them become a strong democracy. Let us please, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to the Goss amendment.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WISE

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WISE moves that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 179, noes 236, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 438]

AYES—179

Abercrombie	Doggett	Johnston
Ackerman	Dooley	Kanjorski
Andrews	Doyle	Kaptur
Baldacci	Durbin	Kennedy (MA)
Barcia	Edwards	Kennedy (RI)
Barrett (WI)	Engel	Kennelly
Becerra	Eshoo	Kildee
Bentsen	Evans	Kleczka
Bevill	Farr	Klink
Bishop	Fattah	LaFalce
Bonior	Fazio	Lantos
Borski	Fields (LA)	Levin
Boucher	Filner	Lewis (GA)
Brewster	Flake	Lincoln
Browder	Foglietta	Lipinski
Brown (CA)	Ford	Lofgren
Brown (FL)	Frank (MA)	Lowey
Brown (OH)	Frost	Luther
Bryant (TX)	Furse	Maloney
Cardin	Gejdenson	Manton
Clay	Gephardt	Markey
Clayton	Geren	Mascara
Clement	Gibbons	Matsui
Clyburn	Gonzalez	McCarthy
Collins (IL)	Gordon	McDermott
Collins (MI)	Green	McHale
Condit	Gutierrez	McKinney
Conyers	Hall (OH)	Meehan
Costello	Hamilton	Meek
Coyne	Hastings (FL)	Mfume
Cramer	Hefley	Miller (CA)
Danner	Hefner	Mineta
de la Garza	Hinchey	Minge
DeFazio	Holden	Mink
DeLauro	Hoyer	Mollohan
Dellums	Jackson-Lee	Montgomery
Deutsch	Jefferson	Moran
Dingell	Johnson (SD)	Murtha
Dixon	Johnson, E. B.	Nadler

Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Studds
Stupak
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn

NOES—236

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Beilenson
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Heineman
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—19

Berman
Chapman
Coleman
Dicks
Forbes
Gunderson
Harman
Herger
Hilliard
Largent
Martinez
McNulty
Moakley
Rangel
Reynolds
Rose
Stokes
Waxman
Yates

☐ 2259

So the preferential motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

☐ 2300

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlemen will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, our records show that debate started at 6.55, more than 4 hours ago. Do the Chair's records comply with that?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. GOSS

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the Goss amendment and all amendments thereto close immediately.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. VOLKMER

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I have a preferential motion at the desk

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the preferential motion.

Mr. VOLKMER moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, the attempt by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] to limit debate on this very important amendment of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] to the gentleman's amendment I do not think is appropriate at this time.

We have yet to start real debate on the amendment of the gentlewoman from California, and I think it is inappropriate at this time, very inappropriate at this time, to move or to even request a limitation on time on this amendment.

This amendment, most of the Members I am sure do not even know what the consequences are. I think it is appropriate that we permit unlimited debate on these amendments so that they can be thoroughly discussed and then at the appropriate time we will vote on those amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the appropriate thing to do under the circumstances is to proceed and, therefore, for the committee to rise and to report the bill back and that the enacting clause be stricken, so that the committee can then start all over with this piece of legislation.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLKMER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I think that perhaps there is a misunderstanding here. I think perhaps that the people in this room do not know how long it takes to get a democracy. Maybe it takes more than a few minutes. Perhaps it takes a little longer.

It has taken the people of Haiti a long time. I am going to ask the people in this room just to imagine what it might be like to all your life long for a vote, to vote in an election in your country. I am going to ask you to imagine what it is like when finally you get to vote and you find that that great democracy, the United States of America, does not think that your vote is really worthy.

That the United States of America, to which you have looked to as a great democracy, as a model for that vote you are going to make, they say, Well, we do not know if that vote is right. We do not know what it is like to be a democracy.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask my colleagues to imagine what it must be like tonight in Haiti, having finally voted in a free election, to hear that the country that they looked toward does not think that this is worth a few more hours of debate, a few more days of debate.

This country took a long while to become a democracy. Let us respect the people of Haiti. Let us give them the time to talk about democracy and their vote.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I know that there are some Members of this House who really do not want to take the time to debate the situation in Haiti and the freedom that those people now receive that they have not had for many years.

They have had now the opportunity to vote freely for one time and yet they want to now, by the amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], they, the majority, are willing to take that away from them again.

And, therefore, I really think that this House needs to spend at least another hour to 2 hours on the situation in Haiti. Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that I have attempted to interrupt any speaker during my 19 years, or 18½ years, in this House. I would hope that we have mature people as Members of Congress. And not people who act like spoiled children.

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

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am relatively new here as a freshman of the new Congress. There was a lot of clapping going on when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] spoke about working through the night. Since his speech, we have been asked to rise by your side of the aisle over three times. Are we going to work or are we going to keep having these types of tactics to rise and have Members come to the floor and vote and waste time?

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion. I think that what we have got here, if

anybody ever wondered what a dilatory tactic was, across the country they are seeing it in evidence.

We have been more than 4 hours on this amendment. Granted, we have got better than $2 billion of American taxpayers' money riding in Haiti which does need appropriate oversight and that does justify some time. I think 4 hours is enough.

This is an appropriations bill. We are talking about appropriations. We are talking about oversight of appropriations. There has been sort of an attempt to obfuscate that by going back into a lot of other very important matters, but they are not particularly important to this bill.

The amendment that we are out there talking about, the Goss amendment, basically says, ''No democracy, no money.'' That is a fair proposition. Most everybody understands it. We all hope for the democracy, and therefore the money will flow.

One of the speakers on the other side, one of our colleagues said they long for a vote. Well, Mr. Chairman, we long for a vote too. And I think it is about time we got down to that vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 166, noes 255, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 439]

AYES—166

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Collins (IL)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Studds
Stupak
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Tucker
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn

NOES—255

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Beilenson
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Luther
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—13

Berman
Coleman
Collins (MI)
Gunderson
Harman
Martinez
McNulty
Moakley
Reynolds
Rose
Sisisky
Stokes
Yates

□ 2326

Mr. SKELTON changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the preferential motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to explain where I think we are at this point, on this bill anyway.

As my colleagues know, we have had considerable concern about another matter before this House, and I understand that we will see that concern continue to manifest itself. But I think there is general agreement on both sides of the aisle that it would be good if we could reach agreement on this item and then move on to whatever is going to happen because we have debated it for a good long time.

So what I would like to do is just to take a brief moment or two to make certain people understand what it is we are going to vote on on the Pelosi amendment. Then I would hope after that vote, we can move right to a vote on the Goss amendment. Then I do not have any idea what is going to happen, but at least we will have moved on to something else.

□ 2330

So let me simply explain that the Pelosi amendment simply reads as follows:

In the matter proposed to be inserted in the Goss amendment, strike ''when it is made known'' and all that follows, and simply insert the following: Except when it is made known to the President that the democratic process is being strengthened in Haiti.

The point that the gentlewoman from California made when she offered the amendment was that we feel on this side of the aisles that there was no need for any amendment of this section, but if there is going to be one, it at least ought to reflect the fact that in evaluating whether a country really has democracy or anything close to it, that there are other factors to consider besides elections; not instead of elections, but in addition to elections. You want to know that they have an improving state of the judiciary. You want to know that the police force is not running wild. You want to know that democratic institutions are being strengthened.

So it was in the spirit of trying to get an agreement on Haiti which is, after all, one of our neighbors, and which is, after all, an island which has seen a good less than democracy for a long, long time, it was simply her effort to

try to reach agreement in a very contentious evening by trying to offer language that would be a reasonable compromise.

So I would simply, in urging that we vote on this amendment, and then the Goss amendment, I would urge Members to support the Pelosi amendment. I think it is a constructive effort to continue the bipartisanship which we tried to maintain on this bill, even though we have a lot of other problems plaguing the House at this point.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge a yes vote on the Pelosi amendment.

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

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, let me understand. The gentleman is saying we will immediately vote at the end of this conversation assuming that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] will withdraw his motion, on the Pelosi amendment, and then immediately vote up or down on the Goss amendment?

Mr. OBEY. That would certainly be my hope.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, with that understanding, I withdraw my motion at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] to the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to rule XXIII, the Chair may reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the underlying Goss amendment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 233, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 440]

AYES—186

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Collins (IL)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn

NOES—233

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bass
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Zeliff
Zimmer

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Bateman

NOT VOTING—14

Berman
Coleman
Collins (MI)
Gunderson
Harman
Martinez
McDade
McNulty
Moakley
Reynolds
Stokes
Towns
Yates
Young (FL)

□ 2350

So the amendment to the amendment, as modified, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 252, noes 164, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 441]

AYES—252

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Browder
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
Deal
DeFazio
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden

Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Luther
Manzullo
Martini
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Wyden
Young (AK)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—164

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baldacci
Barcia
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Collins (IL)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
de la Garza
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McDermott
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Mollohan
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Spratt
Stark
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Bateman

NOT VOTING—17

Berman
Coleman
Collins (MI)
Gunderson
Harman
Hoyer
LaFalce
Martinez
McDade
McNulty
Moakley
Parker
Reynolds
Stokes
Towns
Yates
Young (FL)

☐ 2358

Mr. LIPINSKI changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title V?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VISCLOSKY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VISCLOSKY:

H.R. 1868

AMENDMENT NO. 52: In Title V Section 507 strike ''Provided further,'' and all that follows in Section 507.

☐ 0000

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would stress at the outset on a personal note, having been present and listening to the debate of the last 5 hours, that the amendment before us is bipartisan. There will be Members on the majority side who are supportive of the amendment. There will be Members on the majority side who will be opposed to the amendment. There will be Members on the minority side who will be supportive of the amendment. There will be Members on the minority side who will oppose the amendment.

It is a bipartisan issue that I would hope can be considered by all of the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle in that vein.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to strike language in the bill lifting the current ban on direct United States assistance to the Government of Azerbaijan. This ban, Section 907 of the Freedom Support Act, was passed in the 102d Congress and signed into law by President George Bush in 1992. It was in response to Azerbaijan's decision to impose a complete blockade on all goods and services into Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh. Section 907 is not vague.

Section 907 states:

United States assistance under this or any other act may not be provided to the government of Azerbaijan until the President determines and so reports to Congress that the government of Azerbaijan is taking demonstrable steps to cease all blockades and other offensive uses of force against Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh.

To date, the President has failed to report to the Congress that the blockade is being lifted.

This bill would gut that section. I want to be clear about this. Section 907 does not prohibit direct government aid. It does not deny United States humanitarian assistance to Azerbaijan as the bill language would lead one to believe. As a matter of fact, as of March 31 of this year, Azerbaijan has received $61.8 million in United States foreign aid money provided through non-governmental organizations and private volunteer organizations. The United States money went to such notable organizations working in Azerbaijan as Save the Children, the International Red Cross, UNICEF and the World Food Program. Do not give credibility to arguments that Azerbaijan does not receive United States humanitarian aid. The U.S. taxpayers have already spent over $60 million in humanitarian aid.

Let me return to the issue of the blockade. The President's own administration, instead of reporting that the blockade is being lifted, detailed through the Agency for International Development in its 1995 annual report the devastating effects caused by the Azerbaijani blockade of Armenia. The administration's report describes how Azerbaijan continues to enforce a complete railroad and fuel blockade of Armenia throughout its territory, cutting off all fuel and humanitarian supplies.

Aides described the situation in Armenia as desperate with key industries completely shut down by the blockade, public transportation crippled, and over 50 percent of the work force unemployed or underemployed.

Any attempt to remove Section 907 must be viewed as support for Azerbaijan's blockade of Armenia, as a weapon of war, and as an obstructionist position in the ongoing peace negotiations.

I am also particularly disturbed by the fact that this position is intellectually inconsistent with the entire thrust of this bill. The bill includes very clear instructions regarding the use of U.S. foreign aid. The Committee on Appropriations inserted a new provision, Section 562, the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act, strictly prohibiting assistance, and this is in the bill, to any country whose government prohibits or restricts the transport or delivery of U.S. humanitarian aid.

Therefore, the provision of Section 907 gutting the current law regarding Azerbaijan is clearly inconsistent with another section of this bill as well as the policies of the authorization committees. Lifting the ban on U.S. assistance to the Azerbaijani government would contradict requirements outlined in the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act which has already been overwhelmingly approved by the House Committee on International Relations as well as the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. Chairman, if the Azerbaijani government wants to drink from the cup of United States generosity, they

should wash their hands of this blockade and come to the table of conciliation in peace.

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

The CHAIRMAN. I know the sponsor has worked long and hard to work something out that would protect aid to the refugees in Azerbaijan and the interests of Armenia. I regret that he was unable to get agreement, and I commend him for his effort.

I don't know any Member of this House who wants to deny help for women and children who have been driven from their homes by the wars that are sweeping across the old communist empire. I don't think many of us care whether these victims are Christian or Moslem, believers or atheists.

Some of the opposition to this amendment appears motivated by revenge for past wrongs against Armenia. All of us have Armenian friends who have told us of the events of 1915, but most Americans of Armenian descent look to the future, and to a time when today's Armenia can live in peace with its neighbors. This amendment could set back the day when Armenia can live in peace with its neighbors.

Mr. Chairman, while I support the gentleman's concern as do many Americans, I reluctantly oppose his amendment.

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Visclosky amendment. The provisions of the bill lifting the ban on United States aid to the government of Azerbaijan is intellectually inconsistent with other provisions included in the foreign aid appropriations bill. Specifically, section 562 of the bill, the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act, strictly prohibits assistance to any country whose government prohibits or restricts the transport of U.S. humanitarian aid. Azerbaijan is doing just that to Armenia, restricting the transport of United States humanitarian aid to Armenia and Nagorono-Karabakh.

Current United States law prohibits direct United States government assistance to the Government of Azerbaijan until it ceases its aggression against and lifts its blockade of Armenia and Nagorono-Karabakh. In the 3 years since Congress enacted that law (section 907 of the Freedom Support Act), the blockade has driven 94 percent of Armenia's population below a poverty level of $1 a day. As many as one-third of Armenia's 3.6 million people have fled the country because the winters are unbearable.

Removing Section 907 should only happen when Azerbaijan lifts its blockade. Azerbaijan has the power to do this right now if they wanted, but the Government of Azerbaijan would rather flaunt their refusal to abide by international norms of conduct.

The Government of Azerbaijan has done absolutely nothing to lift their 5-year-long total blockade of Armenia and have blatantly disregarded the very clear conditions that Congress attached to our foreign aid.

Therefore, lifting the ban now would only encourage Azerbaijan to resist a peaceful solution to the conflict in Nagorono-Karabakh and thus keep their blockades in place.

For 5 consecutive years the Government of Azerbaijan has maintained a complete blockade of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh. This blockade has cut off the transport of food, fuel, medicine, and other commodities.

Mr. Chairman, I urge this committee to support the Visclosky amendment. I vote to maintain the ban on direct United States assistance to the Government of Azerbaijan until it lifts the vicious blockade of Armenia.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, however well-intentioned the amendment by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY] may be, the fact of the matter is, it does indeed deny innocent people humanitarian assistance and assistance for democracy-building purposes, because in effect it repeals a provision in the bill that says very simply, ''Azerbaijan shall be eligible to receive funds provided under title II of this act to be used solely for humanitarian assistance and for democracy-building purposes.''

The gentleman says that that provision will not apply, that his amendment will apply instead. He interprets it as not denying people humanitarian assistance. But in fact, in the conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan, only those refugees in Azerbaijan who are totally unassisted by the Azerbaijani Government will receive assistance. All of those others will not get assistance.

Here are the facts: 10 percent of the refugees in Azerbaijan the people who really need help, the people who are starving, the people who are malnourished, 10 percent of those people are currently living in organized camps and would be eligible for the assistance alleged by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY]. The rest are either living with host families in public buildings, government-provided shelters, hostels provided for the government, or unused railway wagons or crude earth pits, all of which are government-related facilities.

The hepatitis cases in Azerbaijan among the IDP's and refugees have increased by 144 percent since January 1993.

Water-borne diseases among children are up 18 percent.

Salmonellosis is up 70 percent in the first 8 months of 1994 compared with all of 1993.

The leading cause of infant mortality and their main reason for hospitalization in Azerbaijan is acute respiratory infections.

Drugs previously supplied by the former Soviet central system have decreased from 75 percent of the country's needs to 5 percent.

Of the total IDP/refugee population, those most in need, those who have few or no alternative sources of income are estimated to number some 430,000. The families hosting the displaced, pensioners, orphans, handicapped and disabled people bring the total vulnerable population in need of assistance to 450,000 people.

Of those, the gentleman's amendment would say all but 10 percent just have to ''hit the road, Jack. Don't get any help; forget it; because you're living in public-assisted housing or you're in a railroad house or a government provided hovel or someplace like that.''

Look, if the gentleman gets his way, in effect he will be repealing a provision that is very straightforward and very clear, and says we will only give funds under this act to people in Azerbaijan for the sole purposes of humanitarian assistance and democracy-building.

The point is that the United States does not have a dog in this hunt. We should be in favor of helping people in Azerbaijan who need help, as well as for helping people in Armenia who need help. We should not be injecting ourselves in their dispute. What is done is done. If these people cannot live together in peace, that is too bad. It is unfortunate. But our policy should not be one of taking sides.

We have people here that need assistance. This gentleman's amendment would deny 90 percent of them any assistance whatsoever. It is a bad amendment. I urge this body to reject it, outright and totally. Just get rid of it. Vote ''no.''

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise reluctantly in opposition to the amendment. Let me just say at the outset, I do not agree, having read the article, who the Azerbaijani government has hired to represent them, and I want to put that on the record before I speak.

Second, I have been there, I have been to Armenia, I have been to Nagorno-Karabakh for 4 days, and we went into Baku. I felt an obligation to go.

□ 0015

I am pro-Armenian. Let the word go forth not because there are many Armenians in my district. There really are not. But I am pro-Armenian. They are the oldest Christian Nation and the ones abused by the Turks.

If you want to do something tonight, support the Porter amendment. Because it is the Turks that have the blockade, not the Azeris.

Secondly, I went into the refugee camps and I met with World Vision and all the different ICRC. The people in those camps, as Mr. Livingston said, they are suffering. And what this part of the world needs is reconciliation. It does not need ''I am going to take yours away and you are not going to get.'' We ought to aid the people in the camps. They are good, decent people. They are of the Muslim faith, but they are hurting badly.

Thirdly, the Azeris have prohibited, if your want to talk about national security, they have prohibited the Russians from entering their country. They have said no, they will not allow them in. And that is important for us.

Lastly, they have expelled Iran. They have expelled Iran from the oil basin, which is very, very important. So I say as an act of reconciliation to bring these parties together, I reluctantly urge my colleagues to defeat the Visclosky amendment. It is well-meaning, but it will, as the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] said, it will hurt a lot of people there.

If you want to do more good for the people in Nagorno-Karabakh and the people in Azerbaijan and the people in Armenia, the opportunity will come soon after this and that is to support the Porter amendment, because when we were in Nagorno-Karabakh, we saw Turkish tanks when we were in Nagorno-Karabakh. We saw weapons whereby there were American weapons given to the Turkish Government and then given to torpedo and kill innocent Armenians.

As somebody who is pro-Armenian because I agree with them, and let me tell you, millions of Armenians were slaughtered by the Turks in what was genocide and that is something that is a fact. But we do not want to hold it against the poor people in Baku that have no part about this.

In fairness and in reconciliation, a no vote on the Visclosky amendment is the right vote. And I want to go on record again, and I want the Azeri government to know, I do not, having read that article in the Wall Street Journal the other day, I find some of the people representing the Azeri government reprehensible, but I cannot hold that against the poor people in the camps.

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

Mr. Chairman, I know that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] mentioned the article in the Wall Street Journal, and I would like to just spend some of my time now reading from that article. It gives some indication of what he was talking about.

This was in the Wall Street Journal, Friday, June 23, of this year. It says:

Azerbaijan Pays Lobbyists $2.5 million to Plug Its Image and Oil Potential.

And I quote,

Azerbaijan was once an obscure part of the Soviet empire. Now, to burnish its image, this potentially oil-rich nation is paying $2.5 million to a group that includes an international oil trader and several former Congressmen, one an ex-convict.

They have lavish plans to spend $700,000 to set up a Washington operation to promote ''the Republic of Azarbaijan and its people in all governmental bodies in the U.S.A. and in the eyes of the American people.'' according to the contract signed in 1994 by Azerbaijan and Arco-Globus International, Inc.

But their first real test is at hand.

That is this vote tonight.

To push through a measure being considered by the House that would soften a 3-year-old ban on U.S. aid to Azerbaijan.

Azerbaijan's trump card is oil, possibly billions of barrels of it, that attracts U.S. oil giants. So Azerbaijan hired 2 Americans to solve its problem. One is Abe Citron, a Russian-born American citizen and self-described international oil trader; the other is John Murphy, a former Congressman from New York who was convicted in a sting operation in 1981 for accepting bribes from FBI agents disguised as wealthy Arabs. He was sentenced to 3 years in jail and fined $20,000.

According to their contract, they plan to spend up to $300,000 annually for public relations, $250,000 for rent on a Washington office, and $1.5 million on staff salaries. Citron and Murphy each will receive salaries of $125,000.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to put all of this in the record. But I mention what this is about; I have to mention that the oil lobby is clearly behind this effort to gut section 907. The language currently in the foreign operations bill would rewrite U.S. law by weakening section 907 of the Freedom Support Act.

The bottom line is that U.S. humanitarian aid is going to Azerbaijan. More than $60 million in such assistance has been provided to meet humanitarian needs in Azerbaijan. What is going on here is that the Azeris, Azerbaijan, is blockading Armenia. They are blockading Armenia.

Here is a country that is trying to move towards a market economy and trying to trade with the United States and other countries and it is being blockaded by Azerbaijan. And we are here going to say that is okay. Even though the Azeris continue the blockade, we are going to say throw out section 907, let them receive aid, direct governmental assistance from the United States, even though they continue this blockade.

Who are we talking about? Armenian citizens are suffering directly, not only because of the blockade by Turkey, but also because of the blockade by Azerbaijan. And it simply does not make sense for us now to say that that is okay.

Until the time comes when we have certified, and the President certifies, that Azerbaijan has lifted that blockade, they have dirty hands. They cannot expect us to provide them with any kind of aid other than the humanitarian assistance they already have as long as they keep up this stranglehold blockade on Armenia.

It is not fair. I think that those who are advocating the other point of view are simply ignoring that the blockade continues to exist. Azerbaijan does not have clean hands. They are causing the suffering in Armenia. They shouldn't be rewarded the way this committee accomplishes that goal.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to put this in the right perspective. This provision of the Freedom Support Act was originally put in the language of the bill and has been carried for 3 years because Azerbaijan is preventing all aid, humanitarian and otherwise, crossing its borders to go to Armenia.

And the gentlemen who have spoken previously have talked very eloquently about the suffering going on in Azerbaijan, but the suffering going on in Armenia is just as bad or much worse. And it is the result directly of the failure of Azerbaijan to allow the passage mainly of energy supplies, but also of others, into Armenia.

Mr. Chairman, the people of Armenia last winter had 2 hours of electricity a day in a country that has a freezing cold climate. People had no heat. People had no hot water. People had no energy supplies to cook their meals. Talk about suffering going on, it is going on in the entire population of Armenia as a direct result of the blockade of Azerbaijan. Can we get aid to Azerbaijan in there? Certainly. If they lift the blockade on Armenia, they will have it tomorrow.

And what has happened in this bill is that slipped into the bill is a provision to repeal section 907 of the Freedom Support Act that is a perfectly logical policy on behalf of the United States saying: You have to lift the blockade before you get our aid.

You have in Azerbaijan a government that is not a democratically-elected government. The Azeri President is a former communist party boss and politburo member who overthrew the democratically-elected President of Azerbaijan and his police and military are responsible for ongoing widespread human rights abuses in that country. And if we do not adopt the Visclosky amendment, we will allow aid to go directly to this corrupt government. There is no guarantee whatsoever that the aid would help the poor people of Azerbaijan.

In fact, we have now today under the current law a provision where aid can go directly through private voluntary organizations. We have already sent, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY] said, $60 million since 1991 through that source. We should not now change the U.S. policy.

Mr. Chairman, we should insist that the Azeris lift the blockage, stop the suffering in Armenia, and then we will stop the suffering in Azerbaijan. It is in their hands that the policy lies for change. The Visclosky amendment should be supported.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise this evening to urge Members to support amendments to the Foreign Aid Appropriations Act which will end the brutal blockade on the people of Armenia by Turkey and Azerbaijan.

I rise, of course, in strong support of the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. VISCLOSKY's, amendment and thank him for his leadership on this. I would like to also salute my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] for the work that he has done in particular in this amendment, which strikes the section of the bill which undermines the 1992 Freedom Support Act.

The Freedom Support Act prohibits government-to-government assistance between the United States and Azerbaijan until Azerbaijan lifts its blockade of Armenia.

As the only Member of Congress of Armenia descent, I find that the bill passed by the Appropriations Committee contains both good news and bad news for the people of Armenia.

On one hand, the committee included the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act which bars U.S. assistance to countries that prevent the delivery of U.S. assistance to a third country. This would directly affect Turkey and encourage Turkey to lift its blockade against Armenians.

Yet the bill also changes section 907 of the 1992 Freedom Support Act by permitting government-to-government assistance to Armenia's neighbor to the east, Azerbaijan, which is currently imposing its own blockade against the people of Armenia.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] I think, speaks more eloquently to this. The United States of America cannot rejoice in the suffering of any people. And If there is an identity of suffering on the part of the Azerbaijanis, then they would lift what they are doing to the Armenian people. And I hope all of my colleagues will listen to and embrace that point.

Mr. Chairman, I know how Armenia is suffering under a two-sided blockade supported to the west by Turkey and to the east by Azerbaijan. Turkish forces during the Ottoman Empire helped write one of the darkest chapters in human history when they systematically executed a million and a half Armenians at the beginning of this century.

So. Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to remember that Armenians were persecuted throughout the Ottoman Empire because they were a vulnerable people with no nation of their own in which they could seek sanctuary, no borders behind which they could seek protection. Isolated and abandoned, they were attacked and killed.

Now that we have an independent nation, true peace in the Caucuses will only be achieved when the political and economic isolation of Armenia ceases and regional leaders recognize the inherent rights of Armenia, including its land and its history.

Mr. Chairman, now is not the time to send a signal to Turkey or Azerbaijan that their blockade of Armenia is permissible and reward their governments with our precious aid.

I urge my colleagues to support the Visclosky amendment and I thank people from both sides of the aisle in this bipartisan effort to accomplish what the amendment states.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY]. I believe what we are trying to do here is to retain the current ban, simply the status quo. We want to maintain the current ban on direct United States assistance to the Government of Azerbaijan as long as Azerbaijan continues to blockade Armenia.

People have talked about the geography. The geography, of course, puts Turkey and Armenia and Azerbaijan in close proximity. One look at the map would tell you that there is bound to be some problems.

H.R. 1868 includes the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act which prohibits assistance to any country whose government prohibits or restricts the transport or delivery of U.S. humanitarian aid.

Azerbaijan is simply restricting the transport of United States humanitarian aid to Armenia. It has been talked about, it has been discussed, it has been made clear, that the United States law regarding Azerbaijan is based on section 907 of the Freedom Support Act of 1992.

Now I know we quoted that verse and scripture, but I want to do it again because I think it must be clear that we all understand exactly what 907 says. It says: ''United States assistance under this or any other act may not be provided to the Government of Azerbaijan until the President determines, and so reports to Congress, that the Government of Azerbaijan is taking demonstrable steps to cease all blockades and other offensive uses of forces against Armenia and Nagorno Karabagh.''

This amendment, unlike what I have head tonight, does not mean we end all assistance to the people of Azerbaijan. We simply keep the current ban on getting American tax dollars to the Government of Azerbaijan. The amendment maintains the current law. It seems we do not like to maintain the status quo; that is, what we are doing, but that is in fact what we want to do and what we should do.

The United States Government has provided over $40 million to Azerbaijan, and it has been reported by the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Illinois that this money does go from the United States Government to nongovernmental organizations working in Azerbaijan such as, as my colleague shave heard, Save the Children, the International Red Cross, UNICEG, and the World Food Program.

This amendment, and I think this ought to be made very clear, this amendment does not prohibit United States humanitarian aid to Azerbaijan refugees. Removing section 507 and maintaining section 907 simply maintains the ban against direct United States funding to the Government of Azerbaijan.

For that reason I believe we should support this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Visclosky amendment. and I commend the gentleman from Indiana for his hard work on this issue, as well as Mr. PORTER's.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues, ''If you want taxpayer money to go down a foreign rathole, send it to Azerbaijan. The Committee's move to lift the ban on direct aid to Azerbaijan is in total conflict with reasonable human rights standards, and it does nothing to meet our foreign policy goals.''

The Armenian people are suffering greatly at the hands of the Government of Azerbaijan. Over the past few winters, people have been left without food; heat; and shelter as a result of the armed conflict.

In 1992, Mr. Chairman, Congress acted against this aggression by restricting aid until the government makes legitimate progress toward peace in the region by lifting its blockades and shifting its focus from a military to a diplomatic solution. Almost 3 years later, Azerbaijan has done virtually nothing to change its posture. They have taken absolutely no steps to meet the conditions set forth in the Freedom Support Act.

Any attempt to lift the ban puts a barrier to real political solution. If we lift the ban, we will weaken the position of the Armenian people. In fact, we will be abandoning them.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking bout lifting sanctions on a country that has systematically violated the human rights of their neighbors, the Armenian people. There is no vital U.S. interest in doing this. It is a violation of the standards of human decency and compassion which our country's foreign aid program should represent.

I urge my colleagues to support the Visclosky amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, section 907 makes a farce of a statute called the Freedom Support Act. If the Freedom Support Act was a Freedom Support Act, it would be fair to all sides. Truth of the matter is it is not. I say to my colleagues, when you talk about blockade of a country, you have it encircled, and what the proponents of the Visclosky amendment, with every good intention, are suggesting is that Azerbaijan is totally, totally encircled, and it is not. Certainly Turkey is to the south, Azerbaijan is to the east, and Georgia, a country occupied by Russian troops, just as Armenia is occupied by Russian troops, the Republic of Georgia is to the north.

Now let us talk about this war. I too, have been to Azerbaijan several times, and I have been to Yerevan, the capital of Armenia, several times. In fact, I have been in both capitals this year, and to everyone in the sound of my voice:

The conditions are deplorable in both countries, and it is a hard contest to say they worse in one country than any other, and the President of Armenia,

when I met with him in his office, there is more light in the phone booths in any phone booth in this capital than there were in the President of Armenia's office, and that is deplorable. People are starving in both countries. The Armenian troops are allied with the people occupying almost 20 percent of the territory in Azerbaijan, yet not one soldier from Azerbaijan is on the soil, is on the soil of the Republic of Armenia.

Mr. Chairman, the first time I went to Azerbaijan they said, ''How could freedom-loving and democracy-caring people from America take sides in this historic, long-running dispute?'' And if Americans were truly fair, if Americans were fair, they would treat both sides to this dispute equally. They would allow aid to both countries, or they would deny aid to both countries.

So I urge my colleagues to take this into consideration. I have visited with people in both countries, and they are wonderful people. They want peace. They want peace in their lifetime for themselves and for their children, and we can talk about Azerbaijan being a Moslem country, but, while I was there the first time I visited, in a Jewish synagogue they were worshiping as they desired without interruption, and it is important to let the peace process work. Today for over 10 months there has not been warlike action. Let us give the people of that country, without interruption from this body, without interference of the American Congress, let us give the people of Azerbaijan and Armenia a chance to find peace for their people, and that is all we are asking for those who are trying to oppose the Visclosky amendment.

There are no Armenian immigrants in the 14th District of Texas, and there are no Azerbaijani immigrants in the 14th district of Texas. What we are trying to deal with here is to find a way for peace and to suggest that countries on the south and countries on the east can blockade a country is a misrepresentation of a military blockade, and today in Azerbaijan there are no Russian troops because the Azerbaijan government prohibited, prohibited Russian troops from being there, and that is not the case in Armenia.

The last point I want to make, Mr. Chairman:

When we talk about the Freedom Support Act and trying to help create democratic institutions across the former Soviet Union, why in the name of democracy from America do we single out one republic? One republic? There is a reason why we should lift this ban, and that is that in the fall they are trying to schedule elections, and how many republics across the former Soviet Union are trying to have parliamentary elections this year?

So, I urge my colleagues to oppose the Visclosky amendment. It is well intentioned, but let democracy work and support democracy.

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

Mr. Chairman, many elements of this debate defy common sense and defy logic. The suggestion that these two countries, Armenia and Azerbaijan, are on equal terms and should be treated equally defies history and defies the truth.

The truth is that since 1992 our country, the United States of America, has said that the Government of Azerbaijan, not the people, the Government of Azerbaijan, will not receive governmental assistance from the United States so long as it continues its blockade of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh.

Let me tell my colleagues this. This blockade is for real. The suggestion by speakers here that it does not exist defies fact. The fact is that this blockade imposed by Azerbaijan has affected the entire population of Armenia. It has prevented the delivery of assistance to 300,000 Armenian refugees driven out of Azerbaijan and obstructed the rebuilding of earthquake-damaged regions of Armenia where 500,000 persons were left homeless. The impact on Armenia is well documented. Azerbaijan has continued this blockade for 5 years, cutting off the transport of food, fuel, medicine, and other commodities to Armenia.

Mr. Chairman, to suggest for a moment, that the Armenians and Azerbaijanis are in equal status here is to ignore the truth, and the truth has been obvious for a long time, at least since 1992, in our policy. So why in the early hours of the morning are we debating whether we should change this United States policy, whether we should give a new status to Azerbaijan and ignore this blockade of Armenia?

I will tell my colleagues the simple truth of the matter. It is because they have discovered something in Azerbaijan which makes them very valuable to a lot of people, and do my colleagues know what it is? It is the same thing that took us to war in the Persian Gulf. It is oil. It is the oil of Azerbaijan. It is the opportunity for profit. It is companies that are hiring lobbyists in Washington to convince us to ignore the blockade of Armenia and concentrate on the opportunity for profit. It is greed, simple greed again, and that is why the Visclosky amendment is so important.

Mr. Chairman, the Visclosky amendment reminds us again of the principles we stood for in 1992. Unless and until Azerbaijan removes its blockade of Armenia, stops the oppressive conduct toward the people of that country, we in the United States shall continue to say to Azerbaijan, ''You are doing the wrong thing, you cannot be treated as a friend in the family of democratic nations.''

Mr. Chairman, when I listen to this debate and hear people say these are just two countries, treat them equally, it defies logic, and the only thing that draws my colleagues into this illogical and somewhat distorted debate is the fact that Azerbaijan has some wealth, the wealth of oil, and that wealth of oil again turns the heads of too many policymakers, and it should not turn ours.

Support the Visclosky amendment. My colleagues know it is the right and principled thing to do, and it is what our country stands for.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman for his remarks, and I think there is another lesson from the Middle East, and that is when we let a problem fester, we will pay a far greater price over the long haul than if we take a principled stand in the beginning. History owes a great debt to the Armenians, what they have gone through as a people. There has been too much silence in the world, and they have suffered already, and to let some opportunity that may be economic get in the way of justice once again with the Armenians is something that we should not allow here in this Congress.

I know the gentleman from Illinois has led fights on human rights and equity around the globe, and this is another case where the gentleman needs to be commended, as Mr. VISCLOSKY is, because this is a very clear case. The Armenians once again are being victimized, and the question for this democratic body is whether we will side for short-term oil profits which will cost us much more in the long term or stand up for what is right and stand with the Armenian people.

□ 0045

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

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am at a loss to understand how standing up for human rights and at the same time repealing a provision that will feed starving Azeri children are compatible. I do not understand how one equates the two.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DURBIN was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to helping the people of Armenia. I think that we should. But I do not understand how anybody can justify coming to the well of the House and saying we should not help starving people in Azerbaijan.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, that is exactly the argument that Saddam Hussein makes. Saddam Hussein

goes into Kuwait, violates international borders in his case, tries to go to Saudi Arabia. When the entire would joins together to remove him from Kuwait and then tries to stop him from killing Kurds, he complains that the economic embargo is killing children. If the Azerbaijanis would stop the embargo, we would not need this debate here.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would point out to the gentleman that the gentleman from Texas, Mr. LAUGHLIN, was just over there, and he pointed out in the well that Armenian troops and their allies are in Azerbaijan and that there are no Azeris in Armenia.

Now, I do not know how that relates to the hypothetical that was just advanced by the gentleman from Connecticut, but the point is, the language that the gentleman from Indiana is trying to change simply says that we are trying to provide humanitarian assistance to people that really need it. Now, they happen to be Azerbaijani. I have no Azerbaijanis in my district or in Louisiana. I do not think I have many Armenians either. And I do not think the United States has any business inserting itself into a conflict between two faraway countries. We ought to be helping people in both countries who need assistance.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would ask of the sponsor of the amendment, are we precluded now from providing humanitarian aid to the Azerbaijanis?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, we are not. And as of March 31, as I indicated, more than $60 million have been provided to nongovernmental organizations. If the government, the sympathetic government who is so concerned about those poor suffering individuals, wants to help them, all they have to do is to comply with the 1992 act and begin to lift the blockade. But, instead, they are more concerned about persecuting people within their own country.

I would quote from the State Department's Human Rights Practices Report of 1994. Both governmental and societal repression and discrimination against ethnic Armenians continue in Azerbaijan. The 18,000 ethnic Armenian and part-Armenians, most of them members of mixed families, continue to live in an atmosphere of fear and uncertainty. There are credible reports of denial of medical treatment to ethnic Armenians, confiscation of their travel and resident documents, and most of those Armenians who lost jobs in previous years are still unemployed. Many are too frightened to appear in public. That is a State Department document.

If the Government of Azerbaijan wants the money of the Government of the United States, they ought to respect human rights of everyone.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, if we did not have the issue of an oil rich Azerbaijan, I do not believe we would be engaged in this debate. We would view Azerbaijan as an oppressor which has imposed a blockade on a helpless country. Everyone who is familiar with history knows that Azerbaijan controls 85 percent of the trade going into Armenian. They have strangled Armenia for more than 5 years with a blockade. We have taken the same principled position we did time and again during the cold war, saying we will not stand on the side of an oppressor. What has changed the debate? Simply the factor of oil. Oil in Azerbaijan, which American and international companies want to exploit.

Mr. Chairman, one person was sold out for 30 pieces of silver in our history. Let us not sell out the Armenians. In this situation, they need our strong support, I am in favor of humanitarian aid for Azerbaijan as I am for Armenia. But make it clear once and for all to the Government of Azerbaijan: As long as they strangle the economy and people of Armenia through their blockade, the United States will stand resolute and firm in the position that we will not provide any direct assistance to their government. To say anything else is to sell out the most fundamental principle which we have stood for throughout our history.

Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman's amendment from Indiana. I urge all my colleagues, who saw this issue so clearly during the cold war, to think in terms of this new world and the new challenges, and not to be clouded in their thinking by the existence of oil in Azerbaijan.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Visclosky amendment and in support of the language in title V, section 507, which reads—and I hope Members will pay close attention to this—it is very simple language:

> Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Azerbaijan shall be eligible to receive funds provided under title II of this act, to be solely used for humanitarian assistance or for democracy building purposes.

The rationale for this language, I think, is self-evident. In today's circumstances, how can anybody vote against allowing U.S. Government aid to go to the government of Azerbaijan for the purposes of building democracy or for humanitarian assistance? They are in dire straits in Azerbaijan.

Mr. Chairman, when I introduced the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act in February, and successfully attached it to the foreign relations authorization bill when it was going through committee and approved by this House about a month ago, I argued that it was simply wrong for any country receiving U.S. assistance to impede the delivery of U.S. humanitarian aid to any other country. The Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act specified no countries, but it was clearly directed at Turkey, which has been blockading Armenia for over 2 years and greatly complicating the delivery of United States aid to over 300,000 refugees in that country. The case I made at the time was simple and based on a very basic principle, on the desire to help refugee.

In the same light, Mr. Chairman, I argue today that it is simply wrong to vote against direct government-to-government aid designed not to help the Azerbaijan government, but to help the refugees in that country. A refugee is a refugee, Mr. Chairman, regardless of nationality or religion. Democracy building, including the facilitation of free and fair elections, is important to U.S. foreign policy, regardless of the nationality or religion of the country in question.

True, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY] said, section 907 of the 1992 Freedom Support Act, which prohibits United States Government aid to the government of Azerbaijan, permits humanitarian aid to be given through NGOs. Over 60 million has been expended as of December 31, 1994. But the need is so much greater than that, considering that Azerbaijan has almost 1 million refugees. And according to the State Department's Office for the Coordinator of Assistance for the Newly Independent States, there are relatively few PVOs in Azerbaijan to distribute and to administer U.S. humanitarian aid.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, U.S. officials tell my office that fear of violating the restrictions imposed by section 907 keeps them from addressing the dire humanitarian needs of refugees. For example, they do not send prescription drugs to Azerbaijan, because such medicine must be administered by doctors, who can hardly be found outside the framework of government-run hospitals. Consequently, our aid to Azerbaijan is not nearly as effective as it could be, and Azerbaijanis are left to feel that the United States only cares about certain refugees, but not about others.

As for democracy, Azerbaijan frankly needs all the help it can get. The country was economically and strategically pivotal, with one of the sorriest records in the USSR for coups d'etat and extraconstitutional changes of leadership. How can it possibly be against United States interests or anyone else's interests to help Azerbaijan's government develop democratic institutions?

More specifically, after innumerable starts and stops, the parliament has set a date for new elections for November 12. These elections are a landmark and offer a great possibility and great hope.

Again, I wanted to say to my colleagues, I take a back seat to nobody in this Chamber on behalf of human rights. I serve as chairman of the Helsinki Commission and the International Operations and Human Rights Committee. I happen to believe that human rights violated anywhere against anyone must be spoken out against. But here we have refugees

with this narrowly construed language in the bill, and I want to salute the gentleman from Louisiana, [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] for having the wisdom to say we have got to get the help to these people. They need it. And I know it is against some of the wisdom on this floor and it is against the Armenian lobby, of which I am very often in support and they in support of me. But when somebody is suffering and we can provide tangible assistance, I would submit, respectfully, we ought to try to do it.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has brought a very important dimension to this debate that has not been made clear before, and that is, and would the gentleman agree with me, that Azerbaijan, even though they are a part of the former Soviet Socialist Republic, they have completely expelled the Russian army——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

(On request of Mr. WILSON, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WILSON. And as a former Soviet country that so much of the health care delivery system and so many of the shelters and so many of the other things that we ordinarily try to provide to refugees must go through the government because the facilities are all government owned. Because of 907 it is impossible to deliver humanitarian refugee assistance under those circumstances.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for making that very, very important point. We would rather go through PVO's and nongovernmental organizations. But experience has shown us and demonstrated in a very tangible way the intended recipients, the suffering men, women, children, the family are hurting simply because we have got to go through those other mechanisms. We do not like it, but the gentleman makes an excellent point. If we want to help suffering people, the underlying language in the bill of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] and himself, which was spoken to by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and others, is the only way to really accomplish that.

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

Mr. Chairman, the history here is very clear. If there is a people in the world that has suffered, there are not many that have suffered more than the Armenians. When Hitler proposed his extermination of the Jews, there was some opposition in the room. He silenced his opposition by asking the question, who remembers the Armenians?

We are here today in a very simple situation, in essence. If we wanted to provide assistance elsewhere, if we wanted to find a way to help the others here, they simply need to end their blockade. The Armenians have suffered from nature and from their neighbors. Half a million people were left homeless in 1988. The blockade prevents the rebuilding of those homes and prevents assistance to some 300,000 refugees.

I go back to what I said earlier about Saddam Hussein. At every opportunity Saddam Hussein brings up the orphans of the war and their plight. The plight of the Iraqis is not the result of what the United States and other countries did. It is the result of what Saddam Hussein did.

The same is here. Azerbaijan needs only to lift the embargo to have this entire House embrace and assist its people. This is not a vengeful Congress that will complain for decades about previous actions even by this very government that exists there today. End the blockade against Armenia, and you will not find Members of this House on either side of the aisle arguing for continued resistance to support any economic needs that we can provide for Azerbaijan.

The Armenians have suffered enough in history. The request is small enough. End the blockade and you will not see a Visclosky amendment.

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I want to identify myself with the remarks of the gentleman. Three years ago this Congress took an important stand, both because of an historic obligation to the Armenian people, for certainly the world owed them some recognition of their suffering, but also because of a barbaric blockade.

The situation in Azerbaijan and Armenia is not the same. Eighty-five percent of all products going to Armenia must flow through Azerbaijan. Ninety-five percent of people now of Armenia are living on under a dollar a day. It is not a sustainable situation. This country is in a test of wills with Azerbaijan. We have said clearly, lift this blockade, allow the world's assistance to get to the Armenian people, or we will not be there for you.

□ 0100

Now at this late date, 3 years into this struggle, for us to lift this sanction would send a message that would be seen around the world, and certainly this blockade then would never ever be lifted.

Azerbaijan has spoken in this test of wills. They have done nothing; nothing has been lifted. I am sensitive to the comments of the distinguished chairman of the committee that certainly we do not wanted refugees to suffer. But when the Congress enacted this provision, we spoke to that need. Under section 907, refugees are exempted to ensure that as we are in a test with the Azerbaijani Government, refugees themselves do not suffer.

I ask members of the committee to stand with what has been a proud 3-year provision of American law. The obligation is not on the United States. It is on the Azerbaijani Government. Now at this late date in history, after so many years, the Armenian people fought for their own homeland; after so many years their struggles and their sufferings were ignored, not at this late date to turn our backs on them once again.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, under the agreements that were made by the international community at the end of World War II, a blockade is actually considered an act of war. In that sense, the United States would be assisting a country that is presently committing an act of war against the Armenian people.

We need to make sure that we can as a country make a clear statement here so that elsewhere in the world we will not lead to confusion. Our actions and our consistent policies in favor of peace-loving people, people who are trying to rebuild their lives after earthquake, Soviet oppression and now a blockade, to turn that aside would be the height of irresponsibility.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I believe that the rationale behind the policy that is on the books today is as strong as it was in 1992 when it was adopted.

I believe that those who have tried to establish an equivalence or a parity between Armenia and Azerbaijan are just mistaken. There is only one of those two nations that is imposing a blockade. There is only one of those two nations that is a victim of a blockade. And the theory behind the Freedom Support Act and the theory behind the Humanitarian Aid Corridors Act is that a country which imposes a blockade on another country should not be provided aid.

This blockade does exist. There is no disputing that. In fact, it is referred to on page 34 of the report of the Committee on Appropriations. It is referred to as causing dire effects on the Armenians. It is causing untold human suffering and damage to their economy.

It should be our business to try to lift that blockade as we have made it our business to lift any blockade that is barring humanitarian aid to another nation.

There is another aspect of this amendment that I have to bring to light, and I believe that this amendment is as important for the integrity of the legislative process and the reputation of this Congress as it is for the benefit of the people of Armenia and

Nagorno Karabagh. I am referring to the millions of dollars that have been spent in lobbying efforts by the Government of Azerbaijan, spent to hire a former Member of this House, who is a convicted felon, who has served time in prison, who in turn has hired other ex-Members of this House to lobby for Azerbaijan. I believe this is an example of the revolving door at its worst. It is why we need reform in the rules that specify when our former colleagues should be allowed to lobby us.

I believe that on the merits, on the substance, we must support this amendment. I believe as a matter of retaining the integrity of our own process and our own reputation, we must approve this amendment. So I urge my colleagues to support the proposal from the gentleman from Indiana.

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

Mr. ZIMMER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to just point out, I have the utmost respect for my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the fact is that he has been a tremendous supporter of Armenia and, of course, is the author of the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act. But just following on what the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] said, the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act, the way I understand it, would basically prohibit the United States from helping countries that are in affect blockading or preventing assistance from coming to other countries.

And I just wanted to ask the gentleman how that is consistent. In other words, it seems to me that the Freedom Support Act, the way it currently stands, under current law would be very consistent with the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act. But now if we are going to reward the Armenia Government at the same time that they are participating in an ongoing blockade of Armenia, that seems to be me to be very inconsistent with the goals of the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIMMER. I yield of the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the language says notwithstanding any other provision of law, so it is seeking to carve a very narrow exception. This would not be necessary if it was not for the fact that the NGO community cannot provide the kind of help, not to the government, I do not care about the government. I frankly resent some of the comments that were made earlier by speakers that somehow oil is influencing this vote. I frankly could not give a damn about that.

What I care about is the fact that a million refugees are suffering a horrible and cruel fate. We have the means, by way of the language, the true humanitarian language, it may not have the surface appeal that this particular amendment has, but this language in the underlying bill that has been put there says, we can make differentiations. We can see when somebody is actually hurting and say, that over there, the government, as much as we despise them, is the only way that we can get that aid to the people who are suffering.

So, yes, it is an exception. Again, I am the prime sponsor of the Humanitarian Aid Corridors Act. That has been introduced year in and year out, never went anywhere. I attached it to the foreign relations bill and it passed. It passed this House just a month ago. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] put it on this bill. It will probably pass. I do not think anyone is taking a shot at it.

If you want to help people and leave all the politics aside and the high-powered PR firms, I do not care about that. They never contacted me. In my Helsinki Commission and on our subcommittee, we looked at the suffering people. That is all I care about. A refugee is a refugee is a refugee. I think we ought to stop trying to play some partisan politics trying to appease certain groups and other groups.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] has expired.

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

Mr. ZIMMER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I am not suggesting in any way that the gentleman from New Jersey is influenced by the oil lobby. I know he is very much a supporter of Armenia and is, in fact, the author of the Humanitarian Aid Assistance Act. My only concern is the fact that I believe very strongly that it is wrong, a violation of international law, the other things that were mentioned here today, for the Azerbaijan Government to continue the blockade of Armenia.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. PALLONE. It seems to me that the only way we will get them to lift that is if we keep section 907 in place. I understand your argument with regard to humanitarian assistance, but it seems to me that if they are expecting that humanitarian assistance that the least they could do is lift the blockade which is hurting Armenia.

I think we all know that Armenia is not blockading Azerbaijan. In fact, I know the gentleman from Louisiana and from Texas previously talked about how there are no Azeri troops in Armenia. Of course, the reference there is Nagorno Karabagh. Nagorno Karabagh is an Armenian enclave in Azerbaijan.

The reason why there are Armenians there is because they have been there historically for years. They were involved in the act of self-defense to protect their own homes and their own lands. So naturally there are going to be Armenians on the soil of Azerbaijan because they have lived there for centuries, for a millennium. I think that we have to look at this fairly.

The bottom line is, one country is blockading the other, and the other is not. It seems only fair to me under those circumstances to continue with section 907.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, just let me say, in conclusion, the operative principle to me is how do we get the humanitarian aid through. Well meaning as it was, the Freedom Support Act section did not accomplish the end of bringing down that hated, and I hated it as much as you do, blockade of the aid to the Armenians by the Azerbaijanis.

Let me also say that it has been my experience, as a member of 15 years in working on this subcommittee and doing human rights work throughout the world, that dictatorships and authoritarian regimes do not care about refugees. That includes their own refugees.

I looked at the Government of Azerbaijan in this instance as a means to an end, to get the aid from our government and our people down at the White House and the State Department, who desperately want to provide real humanitarian aid, the PVO's are doing a good thing, but they cannot do it all. We have to get it to the doctors and those that could help those suffering people. It carves out an exception to the Humanitarian Aid Corridors Act. I am the author of that, and I think that is a necessary exception.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Visclosky amendment and ask that we vote to maintain the ban on direct United States assistance to the Government of Azerbaijan. We cannot lift the sactions of Azerbaijan while its vicious blockade is ongoing with reference to Armenia.

Clearly, for a substantial period of time, for 5 consecutive years, the Government of Azerbaijan has maintained a complete blockade of Armenia and Nagorno Karabagh. The blockade has cut off the transport of food, fuel, medicine and all other commodities. The blockade has driven 94 percent of Armenia's population below a poverty level of $1 a day. As many as one-third of Armenia's 3.6 million people have fled the country because the winters are unbearable and the factories stand idle.

This effort to gut the law restricting United States aid to Azerbaijan represents a retreat from the principled position strongly adopted by the Congress in 1992, that Azerbaijan must make progress toward peace by lifting its blockade and abandoning a military solution to the conflict over Nagorno Karabagh. Congress would be sending

the wrong message by moving to weaken this restriction when Azerbaijan has done nothing but reject any conditions for United States aid.

A cease-fire has been in effect for over a year. But unfortunately, talks toward a settlement of the conflict have obviously not been successful. Retreating from the conditions enacted in the Freedom Support Act would seriously threaten the fragile peace that exists and reward Azerbaijan for failing to comply with United States law.

The cease-fire is in effect in part because the United States has taken a strong stand on this issue. We should not back down now.

These are very complicated times for all of us and particularly for our country. In this area of the world, we cannot find ourselves in a position now where section 907 should not be changed until Azerbaijan lifts its blockade of Armenia. Actually, that is what we should be about in this country.

Let me repeat for the Members what we did in 1992. Just so that Members who have not had the opportunity to be on the Committee on International Relations will understand, that section 907 of the Freedom Support Act adopted by Congress states that

United States assistance under this or any other act, other than assistance under title V of this act, may not be provided to the government of Azerbaijan until the President determines and so reports to Congress that the government of Azerbaijan is taking demonstrable steps to cease all blockades and other offensive use of force against Armenia and Nagorno Karabagh.

As I indicated before, we have maintained that position now rather substantially.

□ 0115

Mr. Chairman, the blockade imposed by Azerbaijan has affected obviously the entire population of Armenia.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

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

Mr. DOGGETT. I am very impressed that at this hour, now well after 1 o'clock in the morning, that you are sufficiently committed on this issue and concerned for what is happening in Azerbaijan and Armenia that you are here speaking out on it. I think that is commendable. But, of course, there is the possibility of the deck being stacked, of there being blockades, of their being interference with the normal political process even closer to home than Nagorno-Karabakh, right here in this House, is there not?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I would be terribly remiss if I did not agree with my good friend the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS] has expired.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. COX of California. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, if the purpose of the extension of time is to trivialize a very important debate over a human rights issue by dragging into this debate wholly inappropriately concerns about whether or not a Democrat who has changed to the Republican Party will be seated on Ways and Means, I would object.

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

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I moved to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS].

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I at the very same time would wish to reply that during the course of my comments, I made absolutely no statements at all about anything having to do with any seat that was sold for anybody to be on the Committee on Ways and Means. I resent the fact that someone would suggest that. I was talking about section 907 when a question was put to me by my friend the gentleman from Texas which I tried to answer.

Section 907 prohibits government-to-government aid. It does not deny humanitarian aid to Azerbaijan. As a matter of fact, Azerbaijan had received $61.8 million in United States assistance as of March 31 through NGO's and PVO's.

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

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Certainly the gentleman would not feel we would be trivializing our concern for human rights in Nagorno-Karabakh, in Armenia or any other part of the world if we expressed concern about rights right here on the floor of the House, would you?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I would not think that that would be trivializing. We just fought the same kind of process concerning opportunities for those less fortunate than us in Haiti.

Mr. DOGGETT. In other words, if we stack the deck against the people that are concerned about cuts in Medicare or tax breaks for the rich, that would be consistent with a concern for human rights in Armenia, would it not?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. There are serious violations that we see every place and indeed it would be. But the fact of the matter is that we have before us the Visclosky amendment to the foreign aid appropriations measure which is of critical importance with reference to the lifting of the blockade.

We stand here all the time for human rights around the world. In this particular one, we cannot find ourselves abandoning the American position.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

At this hour, I want to summon up some solemnity to mourn the death of a principle. A couple of hours ago, a Member of the majority offered an amendment and he said to the people of Haiti, ''No democracy, no money.'' That strong principle apparently is going to last about 2 hours, because I do not regard Azerbaijan as a democracy. Some of us were suggesting before that the people of Haiti for a variety of reasons were being held to a standard of democratic purity that was not applicable elsewhere. I would venture to say that Haiti is making much greater strides toward democracy today than Azerbaijan. I was given by one of the gentlemen from New Jersey the quotes from the State Department human rights report about Azerbaijan in 1994, talking about while the government tolerates the existence of political parties, it has demonstrated a disregard for the right to freedom or peaceable assembly and association when it has deemed in its interest to do so.

I think it would be a grave error to cut back on this legislation, not simply to try to give aid to the brave people of Armenia, but let us not have this newly found insistence on democracy as a condition for the extension of American foreign aid die so soon.

Does the majority not want to at least spend a day as defenders of human rights? Is it like only a couple of hours? You said, ''No democracy, no money.'' Well, if Azerbaijan is a democracy, then Haiti must be ancient Greece. The inconsistency is overwhelming. I therefore urge the passage of the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana both on its own terms and because what you gentlemen decided was sauce from the Haitian goose ought to equally apply to the Azerbaijani elephant, if we are going to talk about relative lack of democracy. The fundamental principles that you have applied are now being called into question.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Visclosky amendment. But I would want to say that I think the sufferings of the minority party on this floor whether it be Democrats in the minority or Republicans in the minority do not compare to the sufferings of the people in Armenia and Azerbaijan and that part of the world. I think it truly does trivialize what was a very fine debate about a very important matter to bring in our own petty controversies.

I want to rise in support of the Visclosky amendment. I want us to remember that Azerbaijan has systematically sought over a number of years to strangle Armenia, to freeze and starve her people. In spite of pressure from the United States and many other nations, Azerbaijan has persisted in its blockade. At any time Azerbaijan could have received assistance from our Government if it had been willing to lift the blockade that has cost so many lives and caused so much starvation and anguish in Armenia.

We know that the United States has provided over $60 million through nongovernmental organizations to meet humanitarian needs in Azerbaijan.

It is late and I am not going to belabor this subject. But this is a nation that has systematically blockaded the Armenians and does not deserve at this time the treatment that it is receiving in the bill. I urge my colleagues to support the Visclosky amendment, to stay true to the policy we adopted in 1992, now 3 years past, to try to break the roar of starvation and suffering that is going on in this part of the world and force the parties to the table to create a real peace.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Visclosky amendment. Some time ago, I had the opportunity in the dead of winter to visit Armenia. I arrived in Yerevan in the middle of the night, a cold wintry night, drove from an airport with no lights, through the streets of Yerevan, so dark that you could not see across the street from one building to the next. The next morning we got up after a bitterly cold evening in a cold hotel room, and I went out and visited an orphanage. The orphanage was so cold that the urine soaking the children's, the little babies' clothes was frozen solid.

I went to a hospital and saw senior citizens that could not leave their hospital rooms because of the bitter cold, blanket after blanket laid on top of elderly people without any heat whatsoever. A thermometer inside one of those hospital rooms showed that it was 18 degrees, 12 degrees in a room where mothers were delivering little babies.

The fact of the matter is, there is terrible suffering that has taken place in Armenia. Terrible suffering. Children without arms and legs that have been victims of this violence that this legislation if it is not passed, if we do not take up the Visclosky amendment, will continue.

This poor nation of Armenia is cut off by the Turks on the west, the Azeris on the east, the Iranians in the south, and the Georgians on the north.

The fact is that it is a very serious situation with a country that has no option, if it cannot gain humanitarian assistance, if it cannot gain the kind of trade that is necessary to be able to conduct normal economic affairs with the rest of the world. The only way that is possible is if trade with the Azeris begins to take place.

This bill would affect the Azeris in a way that would enable them to circumvent world opinion, be able to ignore the terrible plight that has taken place in Armenia in order for us to make some sort of arrangement with the Azeris which could be economically beneficial to a few people here in the United States.

The fundamental fact of the matter is that we ought to have the guts to stand up for human rights and we ought to stand up for the Armenian people that have made the United States their home, in so many cases has contributed so much to the quality of life of the American people.

In my own district in Watertown, MA, you see what the Armenian people have done, in adopting a new Nation and making this their home, and keeping the quality of life, and keeping the basic beliefs in their ethnicity alive, having parades, speaking their own language, going to their own churches and yet participating fully in the American life. That, it seems to me, is what we want to encourage in this country. We can only do that by standing up against the tyranny that we have seen in Azerbaijan, the tyranny that we have seen by the Turks in regard to their feeling toward the Armenians.

Let us stand up for human rights. Let us stand up for the Armenian people. Let us support the Visclosky amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, while all of you folks were in your caucus, some of us were sitting here on the floor listening to the gentleman from Florida, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON], and the gentleman from Illinois, and I am really irritated that the gentleman from Texas would come here and demean this debate made by your own Members who are trying to make a case for the amendment from the gentleman from Indiana. You do no good for his amendment by coming here and trying to politicize what we are trying to do here.

0130

This is ridiculous for the gentleman to do what he has done. And the gentleman does no good for his friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY] to do that, because a lot of the Members on his side of the aisle support this amendment.

This is an important debate and I know the gentleman wants to politicize it and I know that the distinguished minority whip wants to politicize the debate; it cannot be done on this one though. Try it on another one.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think in some respect we might have people who protest slightly too much and perhaps they are trying to politicize this important debate now, but let me speak directly to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this effort. I think it is entirely appropriate that we focus in now on what we can do to help alleviate a very tragic situation faced in Armenia. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Florida, [Mr. HASTINGS,] and the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. KENNEDY,] who just spoke and I would like to encourage all of my colleagues to favorably consider this amendment.

We cannot disconnect American foreign policy from American ideals. And I think that those two things are inextricably intertwined and that the blockade and the suffering that has taken place in Armenia, on top of the historical sufferings and atrocity faced by the Armenian people and the genocide that took place there, is something that deserves both the full recognition and hopefully the support of this Congress in rectifying this situation.

So I would ask for favorable consideration of this amendment. For those who want to talk about the immediate matters facing the House, there will be, believe me, an opportunity for us to continue that discussion.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Visclosky amendment and urge my colleagues to support it as well.

The senior Senator from my State, Mr. BRADLEY, has observed in the recent past that throughout this century our country has defined ourselves by what we are against. We took a somewhat belated but leading role in opposing Naziism and totalitarianism in World War II and led the world in defeating Hitler and his allies throughout the world.

In the days that followed, we took a leading role in opposing the tyranny of Soviet state socialism in its satellites and in the Soviet Union itself. Generations who have gone before us have labored and fought and sacrificed so we could win the cold war and distinguish ourselves by being against the tyranny of state socialism and communism.

The defeat of state socialism and communism has begged the question, what are we for? If the major forces that we have opposed are no longer present in the world, then what are we for?

I believe that we are for two great principles. The first is that we respect the right of every person to live to the fullest extent of their dignity as a human being and the second is that we respect the rule of law among countries. We respect processes and peace as a way of resolving disputes between countries.

Mr. Chairman, if this is what we are for, then under what pretense, under what circumstances are we removing

the protective language that used to be in our law by striking that section from this bill?

Under what moral or strategic principle are we once again opening up the door for U.S. tax dollars to be spent directly or indirectly to subsidize the regime of Azerbaijan in its heartless, inhumane, cruel blockade against the people of Armenia?

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, there is only one justification, one, for ignoring conduct which contradicts our basic principles of respect for human rights and respect for the processes of law and peace among nations. That one exception is if the strategic national interests of this country are somehow at stake and if they somehow demand us to make an exception.

Tonight we have looked at the possibility of some of those exceptions. We said very clearly there is no exemption when it comes to Castro and Cuba, so by voice vote we accepted the Menendez amendment to cease the possibility of nuclear power plants being built with our tax money in Cuba.

We had a long debate over whether conditions should be placed on our aid to Haiti, because we want to promote the idea of human rights and the rule of law both within that country and in its relations with other countries. Mr. Chairman, there is no exception there and there is no exception here.

There is no vital strategic interest of the United States that would justify an exception to the principles of human rights and respect for international law.

There is no strategic justification for lifting the protective language that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY] would once again promote.

Ladies and gentlemen, the world watches us and asks the question, What are we for? When the students in Tiananmen Square risked and give their lives for the principle of liberty in their own country, they hoisted a statue of the Statue of Liberty. When Nelson Mandela rose to prominence in a free and fair election in South Africa, he cited the principles of our forefathers, those who went before us, framed our Constitution, and built our institutions. The rest of the world, Mr. Chairman, looks at us and asks, ''What does America stand for?''

When we support with the hard-earned tax dollars of our constituents the tyrannical policies of Azerbaijan with respect to the Armenians, we are giving a pathetic and indefensible answer to that question. We are saying that we are for expediency over principle. We are saying that we are for blindness in favor of understanding.

Let us give a better answer to the world and restore the legal protections that existed before this bill. Let us support the Visclosky amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, on both sides of the aisle, Members have risen and acknowledged that this is a very serious issue. We voted today on a flag amendment and that was important to people who voted on either side. The flag of the United States is a very special flag like none other in the world, because it stands like no other flag in the world for principles of freedom and justice and human dignity.

All of us who are privileged to serve in this House as representatives of the people of the United States of America will forever, throughout our lives, be proud that we were able to serve in this House that represents for the peoples of the world the beacon of freedom.

Mr. Chairman, few countries, when they meet in their legislature assembled, can have an impact on other parts of the world like the United States of America. That is why, my friends, I rise in support of the Visclosky amendment.

Like some others who have spoken on this floor, I have been to Yerevan. I have spoken to President Ter-Petrosyan. I have met with the people of Armenia. As the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] intoned, and as have others in this body on both sides of the aisle, we have seen the pain.

Let us also acknowledge that the Azeri people are in pain as well. But the fact of the matter is that the pain visited upon the Armenians in many ways was a direct and proximate result of the actions of the Government of Azerbaijan.

That is why tonight, without politics, but as Americans, we ought to make once again a strong statement that America stands for the freedom, the dignity, the independence, of the Nation of Armenia; and not just Armenia, but the nations of the world.

As all of my colleagues know, I have been involved very deeply in the Helsinki process since 1985. I now have the privilege of serving with Chairman SMITH as the ranking member of the Helsinki Commission.

We ought to say once again that, yes, we understand that there are problems as I am sure the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] the ranking member has pointed out.

But this is a statement of principle. We have made it before. Let us make it again.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana, the distinguished author of this amendment, whose amendment I support.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding and I do think we are at a natural conclusion. I would begin my remarks by thanking all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their attentiveness in the debate and the fact that this was a bipartisan discussion of a very important issue.

I would like to respond to a number of the points made during the last hour and a half to 2 hours of debate.

The first is the issue of those who are suffering. There is no question of everyone's agreement here that that problem ought to be solved. The simple point of the language of my amendment is to ensure that we do not pay money directly to the Government of Azerbaijan until they cease an economic and military blockade of Armenia.

They have it within their power to relieve that suffering. And when the Red Cross asked to transport relief through Armenia in January of this year to remote regions of Azerbaijan and the Armenians agreed to it, the Azerbaijanis refused that assistance.

If the government, and that is what we are talking about here, was so concerned about those individuals, they would have let that Red Cross assistance that had traveled through Armenia be used for those suffering individuals that so much concern has been expressed about.

Mr. Chairman, there has been talk about the Turkish blockade and talk about Georgia by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAUGHLIN]. No one in this debate has suggested that the Azerbaijanis have lifted their blockade. Three wrongs do not make a right. And in the 1930's, I think we learned that we do not pay money up front. We do not give land up front.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] has expired.

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, payment in advance, whether it is dollars, whether it is assistance, whether it is land for peace or the hope of good intentions not shown over a period of years, is inverting the type of firmness that we ought to exhibit in this circumstance.

There has also been talk of the democratization of Azerbaijan. We have repeated reports again in 1994 aid report relative to the type of Government in Azerbaijan, including, and I am quoting, police and Ministry of National Security entrusted with national security, they are responsible for widespread human rights abuses.

We have had a good debate. We have good people in need. The Government of Azerbaijan should act in peace, lift the blockade, and everyone can be made whole. Short of that, having the blockade continue in existence, it should not for all practical purposes be lifted by this House. I would ask that the amendment be adopted.

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

Mr. Chairman, Chairman SMITH of New Jersey made a point that he does not represent any oil interests and that the gentleman did not like the implication that big oil was behind all of this.

I would like to say that I represent a lot of the suburbs in Houston, which

has an immense number of employees of oil companies of all sizes, and I have not been contacted by a single one of them.

□ 0145

So this issue has very little to do with oil interests in the United States.

Second, I would like to say that the gentleman from Illinois was successful in putting a humanitarian-corridor amendment into the foreign operations bill which I think will bring great encouragement to Azerbaijan because a humanitarian corridor, according to Mr. PORTER's amendment, I believe will automatically cut off funds to Armenia.

Third, I would like to say one more time, as we have said so many times, that we cannot provide assistance to these refugees without going through the Government of Azerbaijan simply because their entire structure, as a result of all the years that they were part of the, probably involuntarily a part of the, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the entire structure is government-owned. I would like to remind the Members of the House that the Azerbaijanis have been the only former state of the Soviet Union that has refused to allow the presence of a Russian army on their soil. I would also like to point out that it is the only republic that I know of that has free elections scheduled for this fall. These elections will certainly be supervised internationally, which I think is extremely important.

Now we should remember over and over that there was a war over in Nagorno-Karabakh. There was a war. The Armenians essentially won the war. They now occupy 20 percent of the territory of Azerbaijan. I say to my colleagues, it is not normal when you have wars, and one country occupies 20 percent of the other country, that the country which is occupied opens its borders to the occupier; it is just not usually done. The United States is trying very hard to arbitrate that situation.

Under the current president, who was not the president at the time all this commotion started, a cease-fire has been put into effect. Not only has a cease-fire been put into effect, but the United States is trying every, very hard, trying very, very hard, to bring the parties together to end all the blockades, to keep a cease-fire and to make peace.

Finally, as Chairman SMITH said, there are a million suffering people. There are a million suffering people, many of whom are children, many of whom are Armenians in Azerbaijan, and this is the only way that we can possibly get any effective relief to all of those people.

I would also like to point out to the House that for every $8 that goes to the suffering people in Azerbaijan, $130 goes to the suffering people of Armenia. The administration very much wants a chance, to make a true peace here. It wants a chance to relieve the suffering entirely. We should allow it that chance. The only way we can allow it that chance is to defeat the amendment from the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY].

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

Moving to weaken the law restricting United States aid to Azerbaijan will represent a retreat from the principled position, adopted by this body in 1992, that Azerbaijan must make progress toward peace by lifting its blockades.

The restriction of aid to the Azerbaijani Government does not prevent the delivery of United States humanitarian aid to nongovernmental organizations within Azerbaijan.

Furthermore, according to section 907 of the Freedom of Support Act passed by Congress in 1992, the President has the full authority to provide United States assistance to the Azerbaijani Government once he determines that Azerbaijan has lifted its blockades and ended its aggression against Armenia.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, any attempt to lift the ban now will only encourage Azerbaijan to resist a political solution to conflict and keep its blockades in place.

I urge my colleagues to vote in support of the Visclosky amendment.

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Visclosky amendment to maintain the ban on United States aid to the Azerbaijan Government.

Mr. Speaker, for the past 5 years, the Government of Azerbaijan has maintained a blockade of Armenia. This cruel and vicious act of war on Armenia has caused a tremendous humanitarian crisis in that country. The blockade has prevented the delivery of assistance to 300,000 Armenian refugees and crippled the efforts to rebuild the earthquake torn regions of Armenia. Azerbaijan is an undemocratic government that is using oppressive force to deny basic human rights and humanitarian aid to the people of Armenia.

Armenia is introducing free market reforms and is attempting to integrate its economy with the West. Yet the Azerbaijan Government is strangling these efforts.

Mr. Speaker, each year I join with the Armenian community of New York and this Nation to commemorate Armenian Martyrs Day to remember and pay tribute to the more than 1.5 million Armenians killed by the Turkish Ottoman Empire between 1915 and 1923. The Armenian people join to proclaim that never again shall the world allow such a senseless tragedy to occur.

But if we allow American dollars to flow to Azerbaijan, we are allowing the tragedy of the Armenian genocide to happen again. The suffering people of Armenia deserve our support.

I urge my colleagues to support the Visclosky amendment to maintain the ban on aid to Azerbaijan until it lifts the blockade on Armenia.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

(Mr. SAXTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. Chairman, I had intended to offer an amendment tonight, and the amendment has been duly filed. However, I must say that I am sorry that we have not been able to arrive at an accommodation in order that the amendment might have been considered in a meaningful way. The amendment had to do, and I just would like to explain what it was, because I think this is very important to get this on the record; the amendment would have stricken $540 million from section 585. That is moneys that were intended for the Palestinian authority.

Mr. Chairman, at a ceremony on the White House lawn in September 1993, Yasser Arafat signed an agreement and pledged to move toward peace and coexistence with Israel. He committed to the PLO to renounce terrorism, to condemn individual acts of terror, assume responsibility over all PLO elements and personnel to stop terrorism, to discipline those who engage in terrorism, to call upon the Palestinian people in the West Bank and Gaza to reject violence, to amend the sections of the PLO Covenant that call for the destruction of Israel and urge violence against Israel. Not one of these has been complied with in the 21 months since the signing on the White House lawn.

Then, last May, when PLO self-rule began in Gaza and Jericho, the PLO promised to take all measures necessary in order to prevent all acts of terrorism including acts committed by groups like Hamas and Islamic Jihad, to abstain from incitement, including hostile propaganda, and to take legal measures to prevent incitement by any groups within its jurisdiction, to adhere to internationally accepted norms and principles of human rights and to extradite suspected terrorists to Israel. These, too, have all been violated.

And, in addition, they have failed to condemn 184 terrorist attacks that took place from May 1, 1994, to May 1, 1995, which they also promised to do.

So we should not be surprised that the PLO, despite signing these accords, was, is, and in my opinion apparently plan to continue to be committed to the destruction of the State of Israel and to replace it with an Arab state.

Let me quote directly further from Yasser Arafat in a November 1994 letter to the heads of anti-Israel organizations. He said, and I quote:

> In order to obtain the goal of returning to Palestine, all of us sometimes have to grit our teeth. But it is forbidden that this harm the continued struggle against the Zionist enemy. Cooperation and understanding between the PLO and the rejectionist organizations is what will lead to the speedy retreat of Israel from the occupied territories in the first stage, until the establishment of a Palestinian state with its capital in Jerusalem.

And, let me quote further from one of Arafat's closest advisers and the chief negotiator with Israel this past January as he was quoted in the Palestinian media,

> The PLO has no intention of annulling the articles in the PLO Covenant [calling for the destruction of Israel].

Another senior PLO official this past April in a speech in Gaza said,

The PLO and the Islamist opposition complement each other . . . We regard Hamas and the Islamic Jihad as national elements . . . The main enemy, now and forever, is Israel.

If you think that these acts are bad enough to stop the flow of aid, just hold on a minute. We have just recently obtained information directly from the Palestinian Economic Council for Development and Reconstruction, known as PECDAR, supposedly an independent organization set up to distribute donor funds. We know that the deputy chairman of PECDAR has acknowledged that the PLO signed the peace agreements with Israel primarily in order to get foreign funds. He explained, ''The money is the carrot for signing the peace agreement with Israel and we have signed.''

We have also obtained PLO documents. These documents are requests from the Secretary of the Treasury of the PLO and the PNA to PECDAR for the transfer of funds to specific projects that are in direct violation of the peace agreements. Further, responses from PECDAR to the PLO confirm that Arafat's instructions were followed and the money were indeed transferred. These documents confirm that the PLO has diverted funds to illegally acquire land in Jerusalem, to illegally purchase apartments in Jerusalem for loyal PLO supporters, to illegally establish a Palestinian publicity center so that disinformation can be fed to the West and hence weaken Israel. Moneys were also spent in the investment of a computer company owned by the sons of the key negotiator with Israel, for programs inside Israel that would strengthen pro-PLO forces, including money to Arab members of Knesset and also for the establishment of companies under private auspices. Again. All in direct violation of the peace accords.

Congress must make difficult, sometimes unpopular, decisions in these days of budget balancing. Choices on Medicare, school lunches, law enforcement, healthcare and, yes, foreign aid.

The American people are quite rightly focused on foreign aid because so much has been wasted in the past. If we are to preserve some foreign aid, as we must for our own national interest, we must be conservative stewards of the peoples' pocketbook. If not, we may well face a day when no foreign aid, even when our own national security depends on it, is available because the American people see what happens to the bad use of foreign aid.

This foreign aid line item is the best example of bad foreign aid policy I can recall in the decade that I have served here. My amendment would have addressed this. I am sorry we were not able to get to it, but because of circumstances that seems to have been impossible.

Mr. Chairman, that is my statement. I understand that we are going to be able to fight this battle on another day. I look forward to taking part in those discussions.

PLO DOCUMENTS

Although there have been various citing of violations by the PLO and the PNA (Palestinian National Authority) of the agreements signed by Arafat, following are summations of recently-disclosed documents of specific violations. These not only demonstrate the disregard for the spirit of the agreements, but also indicate the urgent response required by the facilitator of the accords (the U.S.) at this junction.

These documents are a series of top-secret documents that are exchanges between Muhammad Nashashibi, the PLO/PNA Minister of Finances, and the leadership of the Palestinian Economic Council for Development and Reconstruction (PECDAR). PECDAR was established on November 4, 1993, as an independent body entrusted with the distribution of foreign donations for the rebuilding and improvement of the Palestinian economy free of any political considerations; Arafat and the PLO/PNA were to have no role in the administration of PECDAR. PNA can not have funds transferred from or to PECDAR. PECDAR is supposed to be supervised by the World Bank. However, in July 1994 PECDAR distributed an internal chart depicting it as being directly subordinate to the PLO/PNA. Moreover, the entire leadership of PECDAR is comprised of Arafat loyalists.

In general, all the 28 top-secret documents constitute a series of 14 pairs: Each pair is comprised of (1) a letter over the signature of Nashashibi, the PLO/PNA Minister of Finance, with instructions to transfer funds to specific individuals and projects, and (2) a response from PECDAR confirming that the instructions were followed and the monies transferred. In his letters, Nashashibi invariably stresses that his instructions are on behalf of Yassir Arafat and/or based on Arafat's decisions. All the responses from PECDAR are concluded with the request to inform Yassir Arafat that the instructions were fulfilled and implemented. (Concerning the last sentences in the PECDAR letters: In some of the letters, the phrasing in Arabic is vague—that is, it could be read as either ''the'' instructions/orders or ''his'' [Arafat's] instructions/orders. In others, including as Document 4, the sentence reads specifically to inform Arafat that ''his instructions'' or ''his orders'' were implemented.)

Following are the Documents in order of importance:

DOCUMENT 1

August, 1994. Nashashibi's instructions on behalf of Arafat to funnel $20 million to clandestine political activities inside Israel to strengthen pro-PLO forces, including Members of Knesset, and organizations as the beginning of PNA political presence among Israeli Arabs. Nashashibi writes that Arafat ordered that ''PNA's activities will expand inside Israel and concentrate on the Arabs and Palestinians inside'', pushing them to work toward ''the establishment of the Palestinian State that includes the city of Jerusalem.'' Among the specific tasks of this program are financing political parties and individual politicians supporting the establishment of a Palestinian State, spread of financial support to local bodies, social organizations and charities in order to push them to political activism. Dr. Tibi is in charge and the money was deposited in his clandestine personal accounts abroad.

DOCUMENT 2

August, 1994. Nashashibi's instructions on behalf of Arafat to arrange clandestine funding to acquire land in Jerusalem. The acquisition is a part of the ''consolidation of the foundations of the Palestinian States . . . while concentrating on Jerusalem in order to solidify our foot hold there and increase our activities there in an active and strong manner.'' The letter stresses the clandestine character of the deal ''because we do not want to have this activity appear under the name of the PNA so that it would not be utilized against us for political reasons in international circles by the other side . . . particularly the American administration.'' Therefore, $15m were allocated for clandestine transfer to Dr. Tibi for a host of ostensibly private land acquisition and development projects in East Jerusalem.

DOCUMENT 3

August, 1994 (Following Document 2). Instructions on behalf of Arafat to arrange clandestine funding for apartments in Jerusalem to be given to loyal Arabs. Dr. Tibi is to supervise this project for which $12 million is allocated.

DOCUMENT 4

November, 1994. Nashashibi issued instructions on behalf of Arafat for clandestine funding for Raymonda Tawil, Arafat's mother-in-law, and Ibrahim Qar'in to open a Palestinian publicity center, ostensibly independent and without acknowledgment of connection with Arafat, in ''Arab al-Quds [Jerusalem], the Capital of Palestine.'' PECDAR's response stresses that Raymonda Tawil was thanking Yassir Arafat in person for the funding.

DOCUMENTS 5, 6, 7

Discuss clandestine investment in computer companies of Ali and Mazan Sha'at, the sons of Dr. Nabil Sha'at (key negotiator with Israel). Nashashibi not only stresses that Arafat ordered the projects, but adds (in Document 5) that ''We must emphasize that the brother leader Abu-'Amar [Yassir Arafat] gives special importance to this company.'' It is note worthy that after the Sha'at sons were provided with these funds, Dr. Nabil Sha'at was nominated by Arafat to the PECDAR board. This was done to ensure that no one individual would have a full understanding of the totality of the funds available and their actual use.

DOCUMENTS 8, 9, 10

Series of documents in which Nashashibi informs PECDAR that Arafat decided to order a close loyalist, Dr. Amin Haddad, to establish several companies, including import-export operations, under private auspices so as to maintain control over the local economy and employment in the West Bank. In its response, PECDAR confirmed that the funds were transferred to Haddad's private accounts, and (in Document 8) that they have Haddad's assurance that ''this stock company belongs to the PNA and is only a trust in his hands.''

DOCUMENTS 11, 12, 13

Nashashibi writes to PECDAR that in order to establish ''effective control over the commercial market,'' that is, to control the financial market and key import-export financing, throughout the West Bank, Arafat ordered the establishment of a series of import-export companies, insurance and contracting firms to be overseen by Jamil Tarifi, an Arafat crony. These companies should also be established, and the funding for them be transferred, in a clandestine manner so as to ensure that they appear privately owned.

DOCUMENT 14

Nashashibi writes that the establishment of a chicken farm was directed by Arafat in order to divert Palestinian workers from internationally-controlled development programs. He instructs PECDAR on behalf of

Arafat to clandestinely transfer $1.5 million to Ibrahim Qar'in. In its response, PECDAR confirms that the sum was transferred clandestinely from its ''special accounts'' to the private accounts of Ibrahim Qar'in. Nashashibi concluded his letter with the comment that Arafat gives special importance to this project because it is creating a PNA-controlled employment. The PLO repeatedly seeks to establish alternatives to the various development programs launched by the international donors in order to ensure that the PNA/PLO remains the main and choice employer.

AN UPDATE ON THE FINANCIAL CONDITION OF THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY ON THE EVE OF THE DONOR NATION CONFERENCE IN PARIS

The Donor Nations to the Palestinian Authority are conducting a two-day conference, beginning today, 27 April 1995. The purpose of the conference is to discuss the future of monetary assistance to the Palestinians, given the serious financial crisis currently gripping the Palestinian Authority.

On 21 March 1995 Peace Watch published a comprehensively report on the financial condition of the Palestinian Authority, and attempted to trace the causes of the crisis faced by the Palestinian Authority. The following is an update prepared on the eve of the resumption of discussion of the issue by the donor nations. This report details for the first time the demands made on Israel and the Palestinian Authority by the donor nations, as they are to be raised at the Paris conference. In addition, it includes the major highlights of the previous report and surveys the main changes that have occurred since its publication. This report is based on material collected from sources in the Palestinian Authority, Israel, and the donor nations, as well as from monitoring of World Bank publications and Palestinian newspaper accounts.

A. THE DEMANDS MADE ON ISRAEL AND THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY BY THE DONOR NATIONS

According to Peace Watch sources, the donor nations have complied two working documents in preparation for the Paris conference. These documents detail the demands made on Israel and the Palestinian Authority by the donor nations.

The demands on Israel are:

1. A repetition of an earlier demand made by the donor countries that Israel fulfill its commitments as expressed in the economic protocols which it signed in Paris in April last year, which later formed an integral part of the Cairo agreement between Israel and the PLO.

2. An Israeli guarantee of work for the Palestinians, even under Israeli closure of the territories.

The demands on the Palestinian Authority are:

1. An immediate wage and hiring freeze in all Palestinian Authority institutions.

2. A commitment that the construction of a port in Gaza be conducted in coordination with Israel, and not with the European nations alone.

3. A repetition of an earlier demand made by the donor nations for an improvement in the tax collection capabilities of the Palestinian Authority.

4. The preparation of a detailed report on the ways and means of raising private capital in the context of the Palestinian economy.

5. The submission of a report on plans for the development of banking in the territories.

6. The submission of a Palestinian Authority expenditure estimate for 1996.

B. HIGHLIGHTS OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PEACE WATCH REPORT

The comprehensive report issued by Peace Watch on 21 March 1995 underscored the critical financial condition of the Palestinian Authority and detailed the reasons for the crisis:

1. Most of the international monetary assistance that was promised the Palestinian Authority has not arrived, and those sums which were finally disbursed to the Palestinian Authority were used to cover operating budget deficits, and not for the purposes they were intended—namely, development projects and the establishment of infrastructure.

2. The Palestinian Authority failed to establish an orderly tax collection system which would enable it to overcome its deficit crisis and balance its budget.

3. A pipeline for the disbursement of international financial assistance which is agreed upon by all parties has not yet been established. This has negatively influenced the amount of assistance money arriving, and has indirectly harmed the Palestinian Authority's economy. The main Palestinian economic institution—PECDAR—was established in order to serve as such a pipeline, but due to structural problems in the institution and to political disagreements in the Palestinian leadership, it has not managed to fully serve in its intended capacity.

4. The donor countries, especially the US, have attempted to limit the economic freedom of action of the Palestinian Authority and its leadership, mainly by establishing subcommittees working under the Local Aid Coordination Committee—subcommittees which have taken up responsibility for the ongoing financial operations of the Palestinian Authority.

The conclusion reached by the comprehensive report was that no significant improvement in the financial condition of the Palestinian Authority is foreseeable in the near future. Without additional monetary assistance from the donor countries, the Palestinian Authority will not be capable of surviving financially for more than a handful of months.

C. THE MAIN DEVELOPMENTS SINCE THE PUBLICATION OF THE PEACE WATCH COMPREHENSIVE REPORT

It can generally be asserted that since mid March 1995 a number of changes have taken place in the financial situation of the Palestinian Authority, changes which can be divided into two types: positive and negative developments. The changes which have increased the changes that the Palestinian Authority will receive additional monetary assistance are; the finalizing of a more or less agreed upon Palestinian budget proposal, and the agreement attained between Israel and the Palestinians on the subject of the establishment of industrial parks. In contrast, the changes likely to decrease the possibility that the Palestinian Authority will receive additional monetary assistance are: the lack of agreement among the donor nations as to the proper destination of the assistance funds; internal disagreements among the Palestinian as to the destination of the assistance funds; and a growing Palestinian Authority budget deficit which shows no sign of decreasing in the near future.

The proposed budget

In April 1995 the Palestinian Authority came to an agreement with the World Bank on a proposed budget of $444 million. This was in effect a compromise between the previous proposal submitted by the Palestinians, for a $600 million budget, which was rejected by the World Bank, and a World Bank counter proposal for a $425 million budget. The $600 million figure calculated by simply summing together the proposed budget of each ministry within the Palestinian Authority, with each ministry submitting a separate proposal.

It should be noted that the $444 million budget has not yet been formally approved by the World Bank, although it is likely that approval will be granted since the figures arrived at by the Palestinians were calculated with the assistance of experts from the World Bank. The budget proposal must also be approved by the Palestinian Authority itself, and it is not unlikely that there will be reservations expressed by some of the Palestinian Authority's cabinet ministers.

The establishment of industrial parks

The managing director of the Israeli Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Uri Savir, and the Palestinian Authority Economics Minister, Abu Alaa, prepared a joint working paper—which has not yet received final approval by either party—on the subject of industrial parks. These working papers were presented at the Washington donor conference. The decision to establish eight industrial parks, with the first park slated to be located in Gaza, served in an unintended manner as a means for overcoming differences of opinion between the donor countries and disagreements between Israel and the Palestinian Authority. Israel agreed to concentrate the balance of the assistance it had promised to the Palestinians in grants provided towards the construction of the park in Gaza. The sum of money involved is a balance of $20 million out of $25 million over five years originally promised to the Palestinian Authority by Israel. The World Bank supports this initiative, and there is no known European opposition to the idea. However, Yasser Arafat's silence about the project has raised uncertainty as to his position on the subject, since he has yet to express either support or opposition.

Although the working papers have not yet been finalised, the very fact that they were jointly prepared is an achievement in itself, and if a decision is taken in favour of establishing the industrial parks it can serve as a catalyst for the increased flow of funds for development projects.

Sharpening disagreements among the donor countries

The existing disagreements among the donor nations—between the US and the World Bank on the one hand, and the EU on the other—have sharpened in the past month. The disagreements revolve around requests made by the Palestinian Authority and around development plans. The EU of the opinion that the World Bank requirements that the Palestinian Authority run a transparent accounting system are exaggerated. It also disagrees with World Bank and US-sponsored development plans. Those plans are opposed to vast 'nationalistic projects', such as the construction of air and sea ports in Gaza, while granting priority to economic development plans which stress the needs of the Palestinian communities in the territories and not external national symbols of the Palestinian Authority.

On 4–5 April 1995, an informal meeting of the donor nations was conducted in Washington, D.C., in an effort to overcome the disagreements among them, but no success was attained towards that goal. The Europeans demanded that the 'nationalistic' development projects be funded instead of the World Bank plans. The EU announced, for the first time, that it would not disburse the funds that it had promised the Palestinians through the Holst Fund of the World Bank, but rather directly to the Palestinian Authority through the offices of either Nabil

Sha'ath's Ministry of Planning or Zuhadi Nashashibi's Treasury Ministry.

The Chairman of the Palestinian Authority, Yasser Arafat, thanked the Europeans for their position in a meeting with a French economic delegation, which visited Gaza on 19 April 1995. He repeated his demands that supervision over the Palestinian Authority's budget be removed from the World Bank to UNRWA on a number of occasions, most notably in a Palestine Broadcasting Corp. radio address on 8 April 1995. In that same broadcast Arafat made light of the World Bank's conditions for transparency in Palestinian Authority accounting procedures.

Sharpening internal disagreements among the Palestinians

There were also internal disagreements over development plans among the Palestinians. The Economics, Trade, Capital and Industry Minister, Ahmed Qria, (Abu Alaa), supports the World Bank position, and the organization he heads, PECDAR, is attempting to implement his policies. Other economic ministers, especially Nabil Sha'ath, support the European position, and represent the opinion of the Chairman, Yasser Arafat. As part of the Palestinian political power struggle, Arafat appointed Nabil Sha'ath as a member of the PECDAR Board of Directors on 25 April 1995, as a counter-balance to Abu Alaa. The fact that he sent Nabil Sha'ath, who supports the European position, to the Washington talks rather than Abu Alaa, who supports the World Bank/US position, revealed his predilections and policies, and his preference for the European positions.

Peace Watch has learned that Abu Alaa will not attend the Paris conference as the PECDAR representative, and that Muhammad Shtaya, who heads the Administrative and Financial Services Department in PECDAR, will attend in his place. Abu Alaa's absence at the Paris discussions comes on the heels of his absence at the donor nation meeting held in Washington, and is another indication of the disagreements between PECDAR and the Palestinian Authority.

The Palestinian authority budget deficit and its lack of success in improving tax collection

Thus far, the Palestinian Authority's budget deficit has not decreased. This is due to its inability to collect taxes in an efficient manner, and because the bulk of the promised assistance funds have not arrived—including the sums of money committed by Israel. According to Peace Watch sources, the Palestinian Authority spends some $30 million per month, while its income from taxation comes to $6 million per month. These figures are based on the Palestinian Authority's income and expenditures balance for the months of December 1994 and January 1995, but Peace Watch has learned that there has been no improvement in tax collection since then. As a result, in March 1995 the Palestinian Authority paid the salaries of its employees from loans it took from banks operating in the territories, and there is some concern that it will be unable to repay those loans—which could harm the future functioning of those banks.

It can be ascertained from statements made by Nabil Sha'ath upon his return from the Washington talks that the Palestinian Authority operating budget deficit will come out to some $136 million in 1995, but Israeli officials told Peace Watch of a projected Palestinian Authority deficit of some $250 million, given low expectations for efficient tax collection.

Given these figures, the Palestinian Authority is clearly in grave financial condition, especially since there are no expectations that it will be able to improve its tax collection capabilities in the near future.

At the informal Washington conference held on 4–5 April 1995, the donor countries promised to meet their original promises of development funding, but only if a complete distinction can be maintained between money earmarked for development assistance and the Palestinian Authority's operating budget. The Palestinians were therefore asked to hurry up the full implementation of their tax collection system, while Israel was asked to increase its assistance to the Palestinians in tax collection, pay its commitments and reduce to a minimum its closure policies.

According to Peace Watch sources, Israel is behind in paying its debts to the Palestinian Authority. Although it is difficult to calculate exactly how far behind schedule Israel is in its debt payment to the Palestinian Authority, estimates show it to be clearly at least $10 million behind. As stated above, Israel has committed itself to providing the Palestinian Authority with $5 million per year as an outright grant, in addition to the taxes collected for the Palestinian Authority by Israel, such as income taxes taken at the source from Palestinian labourers working in Israel. Israeli officials point out that it is difficult to estimate the true scope of Israeli debt to the Palestinian Authority, given the varied forms the debt takes, the difficulties in canceling out pre-payments given to the Palestinian Authority with unpaid debts, and the fact that Palestinian Authority debts to Israel, which are mainly unpaid electricity and telephone bills, must also be taken into account.

PEACE WATCH ISSUES CRITIQUE OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT REPORT ON PLO COMPLIANCE

Peace Watch issued a critique today of the U.S. State Department's June 1, 1995 report on PLO compliance. Peace Watch views the State Department report as a significant document on compliance that is worthy of being addressed. In its critique, Peace Watch notes a number of instances where the State Department report presents information which is inaccurate or misleading and, if uncorrected, might cause errors in understanding. In addition, the critique cites a number of cases in which the State Department's methodology in assessing compliance is at variance with methods generally employed by monitoring organizations.

It should be stressed that Peace Watch's critique does not aim to give an overall assessment of the State Department report. Similarly, Peace Watch only relates the report's statements about compliance, and takes no position regarding its policy recommendations. The critique's main points are:

The State Department report claims that it is evaluating PLO and Palestinian Authority (PA) compliance with all commitments. In practice, however, it focuses on five obligations undertaken in Chairman Arafat's letters of September 9, 1993, and largely ignores other obligations in the Declaration of Principles and especially in the Gaza-Jericho accords. It also focuses on improvement in compliance, rather than on the degree to which PLO behavior currently conforms to its legal obligations.

The State Department claims to ''have no information that incidents of terrorism were perpetrated or organized by PLO elements under Arafat's control during the period covered by this report,'' that of December 1, 1994 to May 31, 1995. If this claim is correct, the State Department must be excluding from its definition of terrorism cases in which Fatah activists attacked and injured Israelis and killed Palestinians. This definition of terrorism is not standard, and the report should have stressed why it was adopted.

The report notes with approval that the PA set a May 14th deadline for the registration or confiscation of all guns. It neglects to mention, however, that virtually no steps were taken after the deadline elapsed which included two and a half weeks during the State Department's reporting period and that senior PA figures stated they do not plan to disarm Hamas or Islamic Jihad.

The State Department lists incidents in which PA leaders claim to have preempted attacks from being launched against Israelis, along with the proviso that they could not examine all cases. The State Department should have invested more effort in checking claims. At least one of the claims was publicly shown to be false, when it turned out that 200 kilograms of ''explosives'' was actually pesticides.

The report notes that the PA has given Israel partial lists of the individuals serving in its police force. It does not mention, however, that the actual obligation was to allow Israel to see all names in advance and exercise veto power, nor that the names of the most potentially troublesome recruits, veteran Intifada activists from Gaza and Jericho, were not submitted to Israel at all. The report notes that Israel has submitted three formal requests to the PA for the transfer of suspected terrorists from Gaza to Israel. The report nowhere states, however, that the PA rejected one of the requests, and has so far refused to give an answer in the other two cases.

The State Department makes no mention of the 7 Palestinian Authority institutions which operated in Jerusalem during the reporting period, even though there is an explicit prohibition on their doing so, making this a significant breach of compliance.

The report notes that ''Israel officials have stated that the number of police in Gaza and Jericho exceeds the numbers permitted in the Gaza/Jericho agreement,'' implying that this claim is not necessarily accepted by others. It neglects to point out that the mandated limit is 9,000 policemen, and that the heads of the Palestinian police and the UN coordinator in the territories are on public record stating that the actual force has upwards of 15,000 policemen.

The report notes that the PA does not show adequate respect for human rights and the rule of law. It neglects to point out, however, that the PA held a number of trials at night, some of which lasted as little as 15 minutes. The report also ignores instances of torture during detention, and at least two cases in which Palestinian prisoners were killed in jail by their PA investigators.

PLO SELF-RULE IN GAZA AND JERICHO AFTER ONE YEAR, MAY 4, 1994–MAY 4, 1995: AN ASSESSMENT OF PLO COMPLIANCE WITH THE ISRAEL-PLO SELF-RULE ACCORDS

(By Morton A. Klein)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

I. The PLO's Obligations

On May 4, 1994, PLO self-rule began in the Gaza Strip and the city of Jericho. The Israel-PLO self-rule accords require the PLO to ''take all measures necessary in order to prevent acts of terrorism'' against Israelis; to ''abstain from incitement, including hostile propaganda'' against Israel; to ''take legal measures to prevent such incitement by any organizations, groups or individuals within [its] jurisdiction''; to adhere to ''internationally-accepted norms and principles of human rights''; and to extradite suspected terrorists to Israel.

These requirements were in addition to the PLO's obligations under the September 1993 Israel-PLO peace accords: to ''renounce the use of terrorism'' and condemn individual acts of terror; to ''assume responsibility over

all PLO elements and personnel'' to stop terrorism; to ''discipline'' those who engage in terrorism; to ''encourage and call upon the Palestinian people in the West Bank and Gaza Strip'' to ''reject violence and terrorism''; and to make ''changes'' in the PLO Covenant to eliminate the 30 (out of 33) clauses that call for Israel's destruction or urge violence against Israel.

II. The PLO's Violations During the First Year of Gaza-Jericho Self-Rule

Senators Joseph Lieberman (D-CT) and Connie Mack (R-FL), in a letter to Secretary Christopher (on Dec. 9, 1994) wrote: ''So long as the PLO and Mr. Arafat are not held to the commitments they have made, there will be no peace.''

Throughout the first year of PLO self-rule in Gaza and Jericho, Arafat and the PLO have consistently violated virtually every major and minor requirement of the peace accords. Arafat has:

failed to take the necessary steps to prevent terrorism and combat terrorists, such as outlawing terrorist groups, prosecuting terrorists (so far only a token handful have been prosecuted); disarming terrorists; closing down terrorist bases; and making speeches condemning the terrorist groups and individuals who perpetuate terrorism;

failed to honor Israel's requests for the extradition of terrorist suspects;

failed to ''discipline'' PLO members and factions that engage in terrorism;

failed to condemn the 184 terrorist attacks that have taken place between May 4, 1994-May 4, 1995 (leaving 102 dead and 308 injured) [the total from September 1993 to April 1995 is 373 attacks, leaving 176 dead and 465 injured];

failed to change the PLO Covenant;

failed to make speeches to Arab audiences, denouncing anti-Israel violence;

failed to refrain from engaging in hostile propaganda against Israel, such as Arafat's speeches calling Israel ''the Zionist enemy,'' hailing killers of Jews ''heroes'' and ''martyrs,'' and repeatedly urging a jihad (Islamic holy war) against Israel;

failed to respect human rights (by torturing prisoners, banning newspapers, and more) and failed to implement democracy in the self-rule areas;

failed to refrain from taking steps relating to the ultimate sovereignty of the territories.

III. The PLO's Misuse of International Donations

The Clinton administration pledged to send $500-million to the PLO over a five-year period. Will that money be used properly? The British government is investigating the PLO's misappropriation of a $500,000 British donation, while Norway and the United Nations are investigating the disappearance of a $100,000 Norwegian grant to the PLO. A donation of $16-million for humanitarian projects in Gaza and Jericho was diverted to PLO military and propaganda activities in Lebanon and Jordan.

IV. Suggested Options for Congressional Action on U.S. Aid to the PLO

1. The U.S. could set a date, sometime later in 1995, by which U.S. aid will be terminated if the PLO is not complying with major requirements of the accords.

2. The U.S. could withhold specific amounts of U.S. aid in response to specific major PLO violations. Partial PLO compliance would permit continued U.S. funding, at reduced levels.

3. A bipartisan Congressional committee could be established, under the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House International Relations Committee, to help determine if the PLO is complying with the peace accords.

The State Department's reports, which have claimed that the PLO is complying, were seriously flawed and were criticized by leading Republican and Democratic members of Congress and U.S. Jewish groups such as AIPAC, the ZOA, and others.

PLO SELF-RULE IN GAZA AND JERICHO: BACKGROUND

On May 4, 1994, the Government of Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization began implementing PLO self-rule in the Gaza Strip and the city of Jericho (the ''Gaza-Jericho First'' plan). The PLO was given control over all aspects of daily life—except for matters of external security—in Gaza and Jericho.

In exchange, the PLO agreed that its governing body in Gaza and Jericho, known as the Palestinian Authority, will ''take all measures necessary in order to prevent acts of terrorism'' against Israel and Israelis in the territories;[1] will ''abstain from incitement, including hostile propaganda'' against Israel; will ''take legal measures to prevent such incitement by any organizations, groups or individuals within [its] jurisdiction'';[2] will adhere to ''internationally-accepted norms and principles of human rights and the rule of law'';[3] and will extradite suspected terrorists to Israel.[4]

These requirements were in addition to the obligations that the PLO agreed to, and is required to fulfill, according to the text and side letters comprising the September 1993 ''Declaration of Principles'': to ''renounce the use of terrorism'' and condemn individual acts of terror;[5] to ''assume responsibility over all PLO elements and personnel'' to stop terrorism;[6] to ''discipline'' those who engage in terrorism;[7] to ''encourage and call upon the Palestinian people in the West Bank and Gaza Strip'' to ''reject violence and terrorism'';[8] and to make ''changes'' in the PLO Covenant to eliminate the 30 (out of 33) clauses that call for Israel's destruction or urge violence against Israel.[9]

When the Gaza-Jericho self-rule plan began, Israeli officials described it as an experiment that would determine if the PLO had sincerely transformed itself from the terrorist organization that is always was. it would be a test to determine if the PLO was interested in, and capable of, governing in a civilized, peaceful and democratic manner. The plan was ''reversible,'' Israeli Deputy Foreign Minister Yossi Beilin noted. ''If there are problems on the way to implementing the agreement and if they cannot control their opposition and there is no order, we will say we can't go on . . . As in any other agreement, there is the belief that both sides will be able to implement it and can be trusted, but if there is a clear violation, it will be more than understandable that we cannot adhere to it . . . the plan is conditional on the Palestinians being able to prevent Islamic fundamentalist groups who oppose the peace talks from carrying out terrorist attacks against Israel.''[10]

One year has now passed since the beginning of PLO self-rule on May 4, 1994. Has the PLO lived up to its commitments?

THE PLO'S VIOLATIONS OF ITS SPECIFIC OBLIGATIONS

I. PREVENTING TERRORISM AND COMBATTING TERRORISTS

The peace accords require the PLO to ''take all measures necessary to prevent'' terrorists from attacking Israel or Israelis in the territories, and ''take legal measures against offenders.'' Has it done so?

(a) PLO's Failure To Outlaw Terrorist Groups

Prime Minister Rabin has urged Arafat to ''outlaw Hamas and Islamic Jihad,'' just as Israel and other countries have declared specific terrorist groups illegal. If Arafat took such action, membership in Hamas and Islamic Jihad, and any activity by those groups, would be prohibited. This would give the PLO greater legal ability to arrest terrorists and shut down their facilities. It would also send a powerful message to the Palestinian Arab community about the unacceptability of anti-Israel terrorism. Yet Arafat has not outlawed them.[11]

(b) PLO's Reluctance To Prosecute Terrorists

Throughout the first year of Gaza-Jericho self-rule, the typical response of the PLO to a terrorist attack by Hamas or other groups against Israelis has been to detain some members of the group in question, and then quietly release them within days or weeks. Prime Minister Rabin has described those PLO roundups as ''just public relations,''[12] Ze'ev Schiff, the respected military affairs analyst for the Israeli daily Ha'aretz, has characterized them as ''fictitious arrests.''[13] Between August 1994 and April 1995, there was a total of eleven such roundups, in which a total of 800 people were detained, but nearly all of them were released within a short time.[14]

According to Major-General Nasser Yussef, commander of PLO police in Gaza and Jericho, the issue is not one of ability but of desire: ''The Palestinian police can stop Hamas terrorists, but have not been given the instructions to do so . . . We cannot act without the instruction of the political echelon . . . When we receive instructions, we will stop them.''[15]

Prime Minister Rabin has strongly criticized the PLO's behavior: ''We don't feel that the Palestinian authority takes the measures that they can take against terror, Hamas, and the Islamic Jihad . . . The basic limitation that will decide the success of the agreement with the Palestinian (is) their readiness, not just capability, but readiness to use power against the extreme Islamic terror organizations.''[16]

Foreign Minister Peres likewise remarked, in August 1994: ''They [the PLO] are still not doing enough [about preventing terrorism]. The problem is terror of every kind, not just of Hamas—and that's their clear obligation. We demand a 100 percent effort, not 100 percent success.''[17]

In February 1995, there were some media reports suggesting that the PLO had recently arrested several terrorists who were planning to attack Israelis. It was not clear if they were arrested because of their plans, or if they were arrested for different reasons and in the course of their interrogation disclosed their intention to attack Israelis. Commenting on these reports, a ''senior Israel security official'' told the Jerusalem Post: ''We don't expect 100% success [by the PLO in preventing terrorism], but there should be 100% effort. Until recently, there was zero effort. Now there is 5% effort.''[18] Israeli cabinet minister Shimon Shetreet questioned the significance of the reported PLO actions, saying ''Here and there they happened to catch a car that had ammunition, so they stopped it. This is not preventing terror. I have not heard that they have disarmed the Islamic Jihad or the Hamas, that train themselves openly, that dance when there is a terrorist activity in our cities and that burn as a matter of daily activity the flag of Israel.''[19]

In February, Arafat claimed that the PLO police had prevented six terrorist attacks against Israelis. A few weeks later, he said the number was ten. But at the news conference where he made the claim, Arafat refused to divulge any details about the alleged prevention of anti-Israel terror.[20] A spokesman for the Israeli Army intelligence division said that Israel ''has no way of confirming'' the PLO's claims.[21] Another Israeli

official said that ''There are, let's put it mildly, discrepancies between what we know and what we are told'' about the PLO's supposed success in stopping terror attacks.[22] American diplomats have told the Washington Post that in addition to Arafat's refusal to provide details in public, ''he had provided few in private.''[23]

In one instance, the PLO police showed reporters two of the alleged captured terrorists. The two, aged 19 and 16, were described by the police as members of the Islamic Jihad organization, although spokesmen for that group denied that they were members. According to the police, the two were receiving ''religious preparation on Islamic concepts of martyrdom,'' and therefore were presumed to be planning a terrorist attack. However, when questioned by reporters, the police conceded that the teenagers had not been found to be in possession of any weapons, and that there was no evidence that they had chosen any specific targets to attack.[24] Was this really a case of the PLO foiling a terrorist attack against Israel, or were the teenagers falsely presented as terrorists in order to deceive critics of the PLO's failure to crack down on terrorist groups . . . ?

Another of the alleged terror plots that may have been included in Arafat's estimate was the case of Majdi Abu-Hilal, who was arrested by the PLO police in early February 1995, on the grounds that he was in possession of 200 kilograms of explosive material. The police officers who interrogated Abu-Hilal soon realized that, in fact, the material in question was used for cleaning bird hatcheries and had no connection to any terrorist plans. Abu-Hilal later told the Gaza newspaper El-Watan his interrogators said they would nevertheless keep him in prison for some time longer so that the Palestinian Authority could tell ''the Israelis they succeeded in capturing explosive material.'' Abu-Hilal quoted one of the investigating officers as saying that ''we will keep you until after the Rabin-Arafat meeting at the Erez Checkpoint for propaganda purposes.''[25]

During a joint press conference with U.S. Vice President Al Gore in Jericho on March 24, 1995, Arafat promised to take unspecified action against ''those who are jeopardizing the peace process.'' Israeli officials told the Washington Post that they regarded Arafat's statement as ''empty,'' since he ''has promised a crackdown many times.'' The Post noted that just before Vice President Gore arrived, Arafat delivered a speech in Jericho's municipal square in which he ''singled out just one Palestinian for praise: 'my beloved brother Skeikh Ahmed Yassin,' the spiritual leader of the Islamic Resistance Movement, or Hamas.''[26]

After two Arab terrorist attacks in Gaza that killed eight Israelis and injured 59 on April 9, 1995, the Palestinian Authority detained a number of suspects. How many were actually seized is unclear; the San Francisco Chronicle put the number of detainees at 170; the Associated Press reported that the number was ''nearly 200''; while the Los Angeles Times reported that 300 had been detained.[27] By April 14, just five days after the attacks, the arrests had ceased and by April 16, half of the detainees had been set free.[28] In any event, none of those detained in April were actual terrorists, according to the Jerusalem Post. It quoted Brigadier Samir Siksik, a spokesman for PLO police commander Nasr Youssef, as saying that there had not yet been ''an order from the political level'' for the ''roundup of the hard-core terrorists.''[29]

PLO spokesman Faisal Husseini asserted on April 14 that the PLO ''will take no more moves against Islamic extremists until Israel implements in full the 1993 agreement.'' Husseini said if there were a crackdown on the terrorists, ''people will turn against us.''[30] In addition, a senior Hamas leader who openly vowed ''that no one from his group would turn in his weapon'' took part in an April 16 public panel discussion with one of Arafat's top aides, Nabil Sha'ath.[31]

At the same time, the Palestinian Authority claimed that it had sentenced five Palestinian Arabs to prison terms. The first of the convicts, Islamic Jihad activist Samir Ali Jedi, was prosecuted not for attacking Israelis but for mistreating six young Muslim terrorists (Jedi had buried them alive for several minutes to test their resolve).[32] Two of the five convicts were punished for taking part in the murder of an Israeli, but they were sentenced to just two years in prison each.[33] Since the alleged court proceedings were held late at night and behind closed doors, many of the details remain shrouded in secrecy.[34]

Has Arafat undertaken a serious crackdown on terrorists? The chief of Israeli Army intelligence, General Uri Saguy, said that despite the alleged sentencing, ''Arafat has not yet implemented any real change in policy aimed at battling extremists.''[35] Commenting on the roundups and sentencing, Prime Minister Rabin criticized Arafat ''for not taking stronger steps to control terrorism.''[36] Major-General Shual Mofaz, chief of the Israeli Army's Southern Command, met with Arafat while the 'crack down' was underway. Mofaz said afterwards that ''it is obvious that he lacks the determination to stop Hamas and other terrorists.''[37]

(c) PLO's Failure To Disarm Terrorists

Asked by an interviewer (on Radio Monte Carlo) if he was willing to ''disarm opposition organizations,'' Arafat replied by asking ''Why?'' and complained that the Israeli government had not disarmed those who attended a recent rally by rightwing Jews.[38] On other occasions, Arafat has explicitly asserted that ''I am not going to fight Hamas terrorists''[39] and that he ''will not disarm Hamas.''[40] After Arafat made a statement saying he would fight against ''terrorism,'' but ''not against Hamas,'' Israeli Foreign Minister Shimon Peres criticized Arafat as ''smart-alecky—because it's Hamas that is setting terror in motion.''[41]

According to Israeli media reports, the PLO police in Gaza have confiscated just 11 of the more than 26,000 illegal weapons that are in the hands of private citizens.[42] Arafat's senior police officials confirm that no disarming of terrorists has been ordered. Asked by the Washington Post why no such order had been issued, Major-General Nasser Yussef, police commander for the terrorists, replied, ''You can check up there with the big man. We are awaiting the instructions of the political leadership.''[43] Likewise, Ghazi al-Jibali, the PLO police chief for Gaza, has declared that ''the police will not disarm Hamas activists.''[44] Jibril Rajoub, PLO security chief for Judea-Samaria, has gone even further, asserting: ''We sanctify the weapons found in the possession of the national factions which are directed against the occupation . . . If there are those who oppose the agreement with Israeli, the gates are open to them to intensify the armed struggle.''[45]

(d) PLO's Statements Defending Hamas

On numerous occasions, both Arafat and his senior aides have publicly praised Hamas or its leaders. In his address upon entering Gaza for the first time, in July 1994, Arafat said, ''I send a warm blessing to all the prisoners and first among them, the Sheik Ahmed Yassin [the imprisoned Hamas leader]. Indeed, I say to you, and I say to him, be sure my brother that we are with you, Ahmed Yassin, and we will not rest or be quiet until you stand with us here, here, here.'' In the same speech, Arafat referred to Yassins as ''my brother Ahmed Yassin the warrior.''[46]

Farouk Kaddoumi, the PLO's ''foreign minister'' has said that ''Hamas attacks against Israeli soldiers are still legitimate in the West Bank . . . I'm calling on them to continue this as long as the Israelis are there.''[47] Kaddoumi has also said that ''Hamas are our brothers in the struggle.''[48]

(e) Collaboration Between the PLO and Hamas

Israeli ''security sources'' told the Jerusalem Post in January 1995 that Arafat not only ''refuses to crack down on Islamic terrorists'' but in fact ''has quietly encouraged them . . . Senior General Security Services officials, including its head, have concluded that Arafat regards Hamas and Islamic Jihad as essential for the Palestinians to achieve concessions [from Israel].''[49]

In early 1994, Muin Shreim, first counselor to PLO's Mission to the United Nations, had this to say about the PLO-Hamas relationship: ''We don't disagree with [Hamas]. Our tactics vary; our schedules might vary . . . There is a local cooperation between Fatah and Hamas.''[50] An investigation report by the Washington Jewish Week confirmed that the PLO ''has quietly built up a working relationship with [Hamas] . . . beginning with a little-known non-violence pact signed by both factions. This newfound close coordination between the PLO and Hamas raises the question of which group, in the end, will be co-opted.''[51] Shortly thereafter, the Jerusalem Post quoted ''Israeli and Arab intelligence sources'' as saying that there was evidence of ''increasing cooperation between Hamas and members of Arafat's Fatah organization . . .''[52]

Asked by an interviewer on Radio Monte Carlo, in February 1995, about his relationship with Hamas and the other ''opposition factions,'' Arafat replied by urging those groups to ''carry out operations from the Syria borders, or the Jordanian borders,'' rather than within the self-rule areas, which could result in Israeli relation against the PLO. Once again, in April, Arafat urged Hamas to refrain from launching attacks ''from areas under his political control,'' implying that he had no objection to attacks against Israelis from areas not under his control. His approach suggested that the difference between the PLO and Hamas is tactical rather than ideological.[53]

PLO ''foreign minister'' Farouk Kaddoumi put it this way: ''The Hamas movement is a national movement, whose methods may differ from ours, but it is still part of the national struggle. This movement is different than extremist movements, which exist today in various nations. We have ties with the Hamas. This movement can take any position, as it wishes.''[54] According to Ehud Barak, the then-Chief of Staff of the Israeli Army: ''The PLO and Hamas are two faces of the national movement, with very similar long-term goals in all that regards Israel.''[55]

II. EXTRADITING TERRORISTS TO ISRAEL

The peace accords require the PLO to honor requests by Israel for the extradition of terrorists who have taken refuge in the Gaza and Jericho selfrule areas.

Yet the PLO has rejected Israel's request for the extradition of Arab terrorists Ragah Abu-Sitra and Amru Abu-Sitra, who murdered an Israeli. In addition, the PLO has ignored five other Israeli requests for the extradition of terrorist suspects. And it has ignored Israel's request for the extradition of 10 fugitive Arab terrorists who were included among the graduates of a recent PLO police training program in Jericho.[56]

PLO officials have given no indication that they have any intention of extraditing any terrorists who were included among the graduates of a recent PLO police training program in Jericho.[56]

PLO officials have given no indication that they have any intention of extraditing any terrorists to Israel. PLO police chief Nasser Yussef has said that his forces ''will refuse to hand over to Israel alleged perpetrators of operations against the Jewish State who seek refuge in the self-rule area.''[57]

III. ''DISCIPLINING'' TERRORISTS

The peace accords require Arafat and the PLO to ''discipline'' any PLO members who violate the pledge to halt terrorism. This is intended to deter terrorism both by making terrorists pay a price for their deeds and sending a message to the broader Palestinian Arab community about the unacceptability of violence.

There are a variety of punitive measures Arafat could take. For example, if individual members of Arafat's Fatah faction of the PLO commit terrorism on their own, they could be expelled from Fatah.

The PLO is an umbrella organization, to which nine factions belong, including several factions that openly reject the peace accords and continue to practice terrorism, such as the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine (DFLP) and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP). Arafat could expel them from the PLO altogether.

During the first year of Gaza-Jericho (May 4, 1994–May 4, 1995), Arafat took no ''disciplinary'' steps against any Arab terrorists or terrorists groups in the PLO.

IV. CONDEMNING TERRORISM

The peace accords require Arafat to ''renounce terrorism.'' Congress, in the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1994, expressed its conviction that Arafat's obligation includes ''condemning individual acts of terrorism and violence.'' President Clinton has also said that Arafat ''is duty-bound at a minimum to condemn'' individual acts of terrorism.[58]

During the first year of Gaza-Jericho, there were at least 184 Arab terrorist attacks (leaving 102 dead and 308 injured). (Note: These figures are part of the total of 373 attacks—including 176 murders and 465 injuries—that took place between the signing of the Israel-PLO peace accords, on September 13, 1993, and the beginning of Gaza-Jericho self-rule, on May 4, 1994.)

Of the 184 attacks, 164 of them were carried out by non-PLO groups, such as Hamas and Islamic Jihad. Twelve of the attacks (killing 12, wounding 1) were carried out by Fatah or the Fatah Hawks, which are Arafat's own wings of the PLO. Eight of the attacks were carried out by other factions of the PLO: 3 (in which 2 people were killed, and 2 wounded) by the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine (DFLP) and 5 (in which 1 person was killed, and 7 wounded) by the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP).

Arafat did not explicitly condemn any of these attacks, nor did he condemn the individual perpetrators. (The closest he came was when he referred to one attack as ''condemnable.'' In addition, in response to an attack in October 1993—prior to the beginning of Gaza-Jericho self-rule, Arafat, under severe U.S. and Israeli pressure, issued a terse, three-sentence fax that was read by a spokesman, condemning a terrorist attack.[59])

On several other occasions, PLO officials claimed to Western journalists that Arafat had privately ''condemned'' terrorist attacks. For example, after the January 1995 massacre of 21 Israelis in Beit Lid, PLO officials quoted Arafat as having said that the attack was a criminal one that threatens the entire peace process'' and ''harmed the prospective release of prisoners and the transfer of authority.'' Arafat himself, however, declined to make any public statement of condemnation on that or other occasions. Following the April 1994 attack on a bus in Afula (in which 8 Israelis were killed and 50 injured), Arafat abruptly walked away without comment when reporters asked if he condemned the attack.[60] In the case of the August 1994 murder by Arab terrorists of two Israeli construction workers, Arafat said the killing was just ''a labor dispute.''[61]

The Jerusalem Post, quoting an analysis by an Israeli Army intelligence officer who monitors PLO statements, reported that in Arafat's remarks about anti-Israel terrorism, ''There is no use of the word 'condemn' or 'criticize' in any of his statements . . . Arafat, in his comments in Arabic, had used the word assaf which means 'sorry,' but had refrained from using istinkar, tandid, or shajab, even to condemn the attack in general terms.''[62]

V. CHANGING THE PALESTINE NATIONAL COVENANT, WHICH CALLS FOR THE DESTRUCTION OF ISRAEL

The peace accords require Arafat to ''submit the [PLO Covenant] to the Palestinian National Council [PNC] for . . . the necessary changes'' so that the articles of the Covenant no longer ''deny Israel's right to exist'' or urge violence against Israel.

The Covenant was adopted at the time of the establishment of the PLO, in 1964. (At the time, the Arabs ruled the administered territories of Judea, Samaria [the West Bank], Gaza, Sinai, Golan Heights and eastern Jerusalem.) It defines the ideology and strategy of the PLO, and, according to the PLO Constitution, is binding upon the PLO's member-organizations. It can only be changed (according to Article 33 of the Covenant) by a vote of a two-thirds majority of the total membership of the PLO National Council. (The current total membership is 480).

Articles 15, 19, 20, 22, and 23 of the Covenant directly deny Israel's right to exist, by declaring that the purpose of ''the liberation of Palestine'' is to attain ''the elimination of Zionism in Palestine'' (15) and that ''the partition of Palestine in 1947 and the establishment of the State of Israel are entirely illegal, regardless of the passage of time.'' (19) These articles also redefine Judaism as ''a religion, not an independent nationality'' which is therefore unqualified for statehood. (20).

Articles 1–6, 8, 11–14, 16–18, 21, 24–26, 28 and 29 indirectly deny Israel's right to exist, by granting the Palestinian Arabs the sole legal and historical right to the Holy Land and by denying the right of any Jews to live there except those who were already residing there prior to ''the beginning of the Zionist invasion,'' in 1917. (Thus, those Jews who arrived, or were born, in the Holy Land in 1918 or later—meaning nearly all of today's Israelis—are considered by the PLO to be illegal aliens.)

Articles 7, 9 and 10 directly call for the use of ''armed struggle'' (violence) against Israel.

Articles 27 and 30 indirectly call for the use of violence.

Thus, a total of 30 of the 33 articles in the Covenant either directly or indirectly deny Israel's right to exist, or directly or indirectly call for the use of violence against Israel. All of these would have to be deleted or at least substantially altered in order to conform with the terms of the Israel-PLO peace accords. (The remaining three articles would not have to be changed.)

During the first year of Gaza-Jericho, Arafat took no steps to change the PLO Covenant. In July 1994, Arafat said in Paris that he would convene the PNC ''in the very near future.''[63] But he has not done so. Indeed, Radio Monte Carlo reported that on August 10, 1994, Arafat sent a message to PLO delegations in Arab countries, assuring them that ''I will never give my hand to the annulment of one paragraph of the Palestinian National Covenant.''[64]

At a press conference with Foreign Minister Shimon Peres in Gaza on August 20, 1994, Arafat blamed Israel for his failure to change the Covenant, claiming that a session of the Palestine National Council could not be held because ''many of our leaders have been prevented from arriving in Gaza or Jericho. There are still security blankets on the other side.'' Peres interrupted Arafat, saying ''I told the chairman we shall not object to having the PNC meet in Gaza and invite all its members to come and participate in the meeting.''[65] Arafat made no further comment. Peres later expressed disappointment at Arafat's attitude: ''We have an agreement with the PLO, not with Tunis, and we expect Arafat to honor what he has promised. I hope they will not once again label themselves as those who do not keep commitments.''[66]

Other PLO officials have made similar statements about the Covenant. Nabi Sha'ath has said that the Covenant will not be changed prior to the holding of elections in the territories.[67] Farouk Kaddoumi has said that the Covenant will not be changed ''until an Israeli withdrawal is completed from all Arab territories,'' until the signing of peace treaties between Israel and ''all Arab partners'' and until Israel recognizes the establishment of a Palestinian state.[68] According to PNC Deputy Speaker Salim Za'Noun, the PNC will not be convened to consider the issue ''until all Palestinian prisoners are released.''[69] Jihad Karshuli, director of the PLO's department of Education, Culture, and Science has said that the Covenant ''is holy to the Palestinian people.'' Before it is changed, Karshuli asserted, Israel should ''void the charter of the Zionist movement which calls for the establishment of greater Israel from the Euphrates to the Nile.''[70] (In fact, the Zionist movement never had any such charter, nor has any Zionist faction ever advocated such a position.) On August 20, 1994, the Central Committee of Arafat's Fatah wing of the PLO declared the Covenant will not be changed before Israel recognizes the establishment of a Palestinian state with Jerusalem as its capital.[71]

IV. URGING ARABS TO REJECT TERRORISM

The peace accords require Arafat to ''call upon'' Palestinian Arab audiences in the territories to ''reject terrorism and violence.''

Israel's leaders insisted that the peace accords include a requirement that Arafat make such appeals both because they would demonstrate that Arafat has sincerely transformed himself from being a terrorist, and because they could influence the Palestinian Arab masses to change, too. Such speeches are necessary to begin to change the atmosphere and create a new moral tone among the Palestinian Arabs, and to make it crystal clear that the Palestinian Arab leadership will not tolerate this continuing and escalating violence. It would send a loud and clear message to the Arab world that terrorism is immoral and must cease.

Instead of making speeches opposing anti-Israel violence, Arafat has made many belligerent speeches inciting violence against Israel. Best-known perhaps, are his repeated calls for jihad (Islamic holy war) against Israel. Speaking to a Muslim audience in South Africa on May 10, 1994, Arafat called for a jihad against Israel.[72] On November 21, 1994, Arafat vowed to a Gaza audience that ''this Palestinian people will continue, will continue their struggle and jihad . . . until a young girl from Fatah raises the flag of Palestine over the walls of Jerusalem, over the churches of Jerusalem, over the minarets of

Jerusalem.''[73] He told a Gaza audience on January 3, 1995 that ''we have the weapon of faith, the weapon of martyrdom, the weapon of jihad.''[74] Speaking by telephone to an Arab rally in Hebron on February 14, 1995, Arafat declared ''Our nation is a nation of sacrifice, struggle and jihad.''[75]

In a speech to an audience of young Palestinian Arab women in Gaza, in January 1995, Arafat said ''We are proud of the role of Palestinian women, from Avir to Dalal.'' He was referring to two prominent female PLO terrorists, one who was involved in the murder of an Israeli in Ramallah, and another who took part in the Tel Aviv Highway Massacre of 1978, in which 38 Israelis were killed.[76] In another speech, he praised the killers of Jews as ''heroes.''[77]

Arafat has also publicly praised the violent Palestinian Arab intifada, saying that is must ''continue, continue, continue.''[78] He has declared (on the very day that he received his Nobel Peace Prize) that ''the intifada will continue until Palestine is redeemed with blood and fire.''[79] Speaking in Gaza on November 15, 1994, Arafat referred to Israel as ''the Zionist enemy'' and described the peace accords as the first phase in the PLO's traditional ''Strategy of Phases'' for destroying Israel step by step.[80] A message sent by Arafat to PLO officials in Arab countries in November 1994 likewise referred to Israel as ''the Zionist enemy'' and asserted that the creation of a PLO state in the territories ''can continue the struggle to remove the enemy from all Palestinian lands.''[81]

Senator Arlen Specter (R–PA), who is co-chair of the bipartisan Peace Accord Monitoring (PAM) Group in the U.S. Senate, has urged Arafat to ''make a major public address, delivered in Arabic on radio and television, call[ing] for an end to the use of violence against Israel.''[82] Arafat did not reply.

PLO officials have given a variety of explanations when questioned about Arafat's speeches. Asked why Arafat had not made speeches to Arab audiences, in Arabic, against violence, Nabil Sha'ath said it was because ''he is not a very good public speaker, particularly in English.'' Sha'ath did not explain why Arafat has frequently made anti-Israel speeches.[83] When the PLO's director of economic affairs, Ahmed Qreia (Abu Alla) was asked about Arafat's anti-Israel speeches, he replied that Arafat ''never made any such speeches.''[84]

VII. ANTI-ISRAEL PROPAGANDA

The peace accords require the PLO to ''abstain from incitement, including hostile propaganda'' against Israel and ''take legal measures to prevent such incitement by any organizations, groups or individuals within their jurisdiction.''

In addition to Arafat's numerous hostile speeches against Israel (see section VI of this study), numerous PLO officials have engaged in anti-Israel propaganda during the first year of Gaza-Jericho self-rule. Arafat and the PLO have taken no action against any of them.

For example, in recent interviews, the PLO's Foreign Minister, Farouk Kaddoumi, has denounced ''the Israeli enemy'' and asserted that terrorist attacks against Israelis ''are still legitimate.''[85] At a meeting of United Nations groups in Geneva in December 1994, PLO representative Nabil Ramlawi compared Israeli behavior to that of ''the Nazis during World War II.''[86] When three heavily-armed veteran Arab terrorists, on their way to carry out an attack were killed by Israeli soldiers in April 1995, senior Arafat aide Nabil Sha'ath declared: ''I express sorrow at the killing of three Palestinian martyrs.''[87] On April 13, 1995, the PLO's Minister of Justice, Freih Abu Meddein, told an Arab audience in Gaza: ''The greatest enemy of the Palestinian people, now and always, is the Israelis.''[88]

The PLO has also published hostile propaganda against Israel. In the spring of 1995, the Ministry of Information of the PLO's Palestinian Authority issued two sharply anti-Israel booklets.

The first booklet was entitled ''Jewish Immigration to Palestine and its Devastating Effects on the Peace Process.'' In some sections, the booklet used the term ''Palestine'' to refer to the administered territories; but in other sections, it referred to all of Israel as ''Palestine,'' in effect condemning all Jewish immigration to both Israel and the territories. The booklet attempted to demonstrate a connection between Jewish immigration and what it called Israel's ''atrocities,'' ''thievery,'' and ''confiscation of Palestinian land,'' which it traced to ''the Zionist mentality'' (pp. 3–4) and ''Zionist expansionist goals'' (p. 6). It accused Israel of having a secret ''plan,'' according to which ''the original inhabitants [of the territories] will be uprooted from their land and replaced by new immigrants'' (pp. 6–7).[89]

The second booklet was entitled ''Palestinian Refugees and the Right of Return.'' It rejects both the 1917 Balfour Declaration the 1947 United Nations Partition Plan, and alleges that ''brutalities were perpetrated by the Jews against the Palestinians.''[90]

In addition, the PLO took no action against the public staging, in Gaza, of a skit praising the kidnap-murder of Nachshon Waxman, an Isaeli soldier.[91]

VIII. HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES

According to the peace accords, the PLO's Palestinian Authority (PA) must ''adhere to internationally-accepted norms and principles of human rights and the rule of law.''

During the period since the beginning of self-rule in Gaza and Jericho, the PA ''has committed a number of disturbing human rights violations,'' including the torture and murder of prisoners and the suppression of opposition newspapers, according to a study by the organization Human Rights Watch.[92]

There have been at least two, and possibly three, cases of Palestinian Arab prisoners being beaten or tortured to death by the PLO police. Farid Jarbua, 28, of Gaza, was killed in July 1994,[93] and Salman Jalayta, 45, of Jericho, was killed in January 1995.[94] A third prisoner, Rashid Fityani, 23, of Jericho, has been missing since January 1995 and according to some media reports, was killed by his PLO interrogators.[95]

Prisoners who are suspected of having cooperated with Israel have been subjected to beatings by their PLO captors. (Prisoners affiliated with Muslim terrorist groups have only rarely complained of physical mistreatment.[96]) Tareq Abu Rajab, an official of the PLO's General Intelligence branch, has admitted that prisoners are sometimes deprived of sleep or forced to stand for periods of time.[97] In other cases, PLO interrogators beat prisoners with electric cables.[98] Many other human rights abuses by the PLO police have gone unreported because the victims are afraid to complain.[99] Asked by an interviewer if lawyers are permitted access to the Jericho prison, PLO security chief Jibril Rajoub replied: ''Yes, there is a lawyer there to supervise. A lawyer from our Preventive Security.''[100]

The PLO has taken other action against its Arab political opponents. Raji Sourani, a 41 year-old attorney who heads the Gaza Center for Rights and Law, was arrested by the PLO police and charged with ''incitement'' after he publicly expressed concern about ''the militarization of Palestinian society and its institutions.''[101]

There have also been reports of violent abuse of civilians by the PLO police in Jericho. An investigative report by Israel's second-largest daily newspaper, Ma'ariv, concluded that ''random beatings, rapes, and torture'' by the more than 1,000 PLO policemen in Jericho have ''turned the lives of the city's 12,000 residents into a living hell.'' The article described several brutal rapes by PLO policemen that the PLO leadership has refused to investigate on the grounds that in each case, ''she consented.'' The Ma'ariv report also recounted the case of a Christian Arab from Bethlehem, Victor Alias, who was arrested in Jericho for publicly criticizing a PLO policeman's violent behavior. Alias was severely beaten in prison and forced by his interrogators to chant Muslim religious sayings.[102] According to the national U.S. Jewish weekly Forward, the city of Jericho has become ''the world's smallest police state.''[103]

The PLO has also repeatedly taken action to suppress or intimidate Arab newspapers that have deviated from the Arafat line. In July 1994, the PLO blocked distribution of the An-Nahar newspaper and the magazine Akhbar al Balad because they were, in the PLO's words, reflecting ''a line that contradicts the national interests of the Palestinian people.''[104] The PLO also ordered another Palestinian Arab newspaper, Al Quds, to stop using the byline of its reporter Daoud Kuttab, because he signed a petition criticizing the closure of An-Nahar.[105] Five weeks later, An-Nahar was allowed to resume publication when its editors publicly pledged their loyalty to the PLO.[106] But in November 1994, the PLO suspended distribution of An-Nahar and another newspaper, Al-Quds, for five days as punishment for having given coverage to Arafat's rivals.[107] In February 1995, the PLO banned the publication of the Gaza-based magazine Al Rafed because it disapproved of its editorial slant.[108] In March 1995, the PLO police seized shipments of another Gaza magazine, Sahil al-Filastini because it contained an article critical of PLO police officials. The magazines were released two days later, with the article removed.[109] In April 1995, PLO police raided the Gaza home of Palestinian Arab journalist Taher Shariteh (of the Reuters News Agency), whose reporting has displeased PLO officials. Not finding Shariteh at home, the PLO policemen beat his brother unconscious with their rifle butts.[110] At the same time, Shariteh's other brother, a CBS-TV cameraman, and several other Palestinian Arab journalists were detained by the PLO police for having quoted critics of the PLO leadership in their reporting. They were subjected to seven hours of interrogation, and then released with a warning ''not to incite people with their reporting.''[111]

Bassam Eid, a Palestinian Arab activist who works for the Israeli organization B'Tselem, has said: ''The whole attitude of the Palestine National Authority is one of 'Don't interfere in the affairs of the regime.' It's like Syria or Iraq. We're still in the Arab mind-set, which has no idea of the meaning of the word democracy.''[112] The situation is so desperate that Eid has ''called on the international community not to give funds to the new Palestinian Authority unless it guarantees freedom of expression and practices democracy.''[113]

Local human rights activists have not fared well under PLO rule. Raji Sourani, head of the Gaza Center for Human Rights and Law, was arrested by the PLO police in February 1995 when he publicly questioned Arafat's commitment to human rights. He was released, but when he again publicly criticized the PLO leadership, in March, he was fired from his job.[114] When the Gaza Center for Human Rights tried to hold a public seminar on human rights in March, Gaza police chief Ghazi Jabali announced that it

could not be held because ''it planned to discuss internal Palestinian affairs with foreigners.''[115]

Human Rights Watch concludes: ''[T]he PA has not demonstrated a commitment to installing a rule of law. It is responsible for a series of arbitrary and repressive measures while at the same time failing to make clear what laws and regulations are in effect and to show any commitment to investigating and punishing human rights violations.''[116]

IX. POSTPONING SOVEREIGNTY ISSUES

The peace accords require issues concerning sovereignty over the administered territories to be postponed until the 1996 ''final status'' negotiations between Israel and the PLO. Yet the PLO continues to use stationery featuring a map which labels all of Israel as ''Palestine.''[117] The stationery is headed ''State of Palestine,'' and Arafat refers to himself as ''President of Palestine.''[118] Similarly, a map distributed by PLO official Faisal Husseini shows all of Israel as ''Palestine.'' It also characterizes the cities within Israel's pre-1967 borders, such as Tel Aviv and Haifa, as ''Jewish settlements.'' Questioned by reporters, Husseini defended the map and said it would not be changed unless ''the process moves ahead, and there is an agreement.''[119]

In an attempt to stake a claim to sovereignty in parts of the territories beyond Gaza and Jericho, and in Jerusalem, the PLO has undertaken a number of official activities in those areas. The PLO's bureau of municipal affairs issues orders to the chairman of town councils throughout the territories.[120] The PLO's police force carries out a variety of operations in the territories and in Jerusalem.[121] Seven branches of the Palestinian Authority are operating in Jerusalem: its Statistics Center, Energy Center, Religious Affairs division, Office of the Mufti, Broadcasting Authority, Economic Council for Development and Reconstruction, and Orient House which as a de facto foreign ministry. In addition, a branch of the PA's Transfer Office has been established in Ramallah, and the PA's Education Office is headquartered in Bethlehem.[122] The Palestinian Authority has issued a variety of documents apparently intended to give the impression that it has the powers of a sovereign state, including passports, postage stamps, and international drivers' licenses.[123] The PA has also taken control of the twenty Muslim schools operating in eastern Jerusalem.[124]

CONCLUSION

In December 1994, the Office of the Israeli Chief Military Judge-Advocate for International Law, acting on behalf of the Israeli government, published a lengthy report detailing the PLO's consistent, numerous and flagrant violations of virtually every major and minor aspect of the Gaza-Jericho self-rule agreement. The report listed military violations, economic violations, civil violations, and foreign relations violations.

These continuing violations have led many Israelis to the conclusion that the Gaza-Jericho experiment is failing. Recent public opinion polls have shown that a majority of Israelis oppose further concessions to the PLO. A recent study by the prestigious Jaffee Center for Strategic Studies, at Tel Aviv University, found that only 36% of Israelis still support the peace process. A mid-April 1995 survey by Israel's largest daily newspaper, Yediot Ahronot, found just 30% of Israelis support continuation of the current peace process, while 69% favor suspending or stopping the process. Numerous leading Israelis from across the political spectrum have called for a suspension of the Israeli-PLO negotiations, including members of Prime Minister Rabin's own Labor Party, such as cabinet minister Binyamin Ben-Eliezer, Labor Knesset Member General Avigdor Kahalani, the outgoing Israeli Army Chief of Staff, General Ehud Barak, and President Ezer Weizmann, who has twice publicly called for a halt to the talks.[125]

The PLO's misrule in Gaza and Jericho also has serious implications from the American perspective, since the Clinton administration has lent its prestige, credibility and political support to the PLO, and has committed a substantial amount of U.S. taxpayers' money to the Gaza-Jericho experiment, pledging to send $500-million over a five-year period. Americans have good reason to be concerned about how the PLO will use the foreign donations that it receives. In 1994, Britain's Overseas Development Agency sent $5-million to pay the salaries of 9,000 PLO policemen, with specific instructions that none of the money be given to Arafat's plainclothes ''preventive security forces''—yet more than $500,000 was given to those forces, prompting a British government investigation.[126] Meanwhile, Norway's attorney general and a United Nations oversight committee are investigating the disappearance of a $100,000 Norwegian, grant for a PLO agricultural project.[127] In August 1994, $16-million in international contributions that were supported to go for humanitarian projects in Gaza and Jericho was diverted to PLO military and propaganda activities in Lebanon.[128] On December 31, 1994, the PLO's Palestinian Authority took $1-million in international donations and gave it to the PLO ''Martyrs Fund,'' in Amman.[129] Although the peace accords permit the PLO to maintain a police force of 9,000, Arafat has hired 16,000, paying them, in part, by misappropriating donations that were sent from abroad for other purposes.[130]

No wonder that, as Senator Richard Shelby (R–AL), co-chair of the Peace Accord Monitoring (PAM) Group in the U.S. Senate, recently pointed out, increasing numbers of Americans citizens look at the PLO's rule in Gaza—which has been characterized by totalitarianism, corruption, human rights abuses, terrorism and internecine violence—and ''wonder why we should be pouring money into a sinkhole of deepening chaos and disorder.''[131]

Meanwhile, at the request of Rep. Benjamin Gilman (R-NY), chairman of the House International Relations Committee, the General Accounting Office (GAO) is conducting an investigation to determine the extent of the PLO's financial assets.[132] A study in 1993 by Great Britain's National Criminal Intelligence Service concluded that the PLO has worldwide assets of $7–$10 billion and an annual income of $1.5–$2 billion.[133] If the GAO determines that the PLO does indeed have substantial sums of money at its disposal, American citizens will justifiably wonder—for this reason alone—why they should contribute additional hundreds of millions of dollars to Arafat.

SUGGESTED OPTIONS FOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON U.S. AID TO THE PLO

1. The U.S. could set a date, sometime later in 1995, by which U.S. aid will be cut off if the PLO is still not complying with the accords.

For example, if by the specified date the PLO is not complying with major requirements of the accords, such as preventing terrorism and combatting terrorists, changing the PLO Covenant (which calls for Israel's destruction), disarming terrorists, and extraditing terrorists to Israel, U.S. aid would be terminated.

Nearly two years have passed since the Israel-PLO peace accords were signed, and a year has passed since PLO self-rule began in Gaza and Jericho on May 4, 1994. The United States has been more than patient in waiting for Arafat and the PLO to stop violating the accords. It is time to use U.S. aid as leverage to stop the violations, which are destroying hopes for any real peace.

2. The U.S. could withhold specific amounts of U.S. aid in response to specific major PLO violations.

There could be specific deductions in U.S. aid in accordance with specific PLO violations of major aspects of the accords, such as preventing terrorism and combatting terrorists, changing the PLO Covenant, disarming terrorists, and extraditing terrorists to Israel.

Making such specific deductions is exactly what the Clinton Administration has been quietly doing with the $10-billion in loan guarantees that the U.S. approved for Israel in 1992. The State Department calculates how much Israel spends in Judea, Samaria, Gaza, Golan, and eastern Jerusalem, and then deducts that amount from the loan guarantees as punishment ($653-million was deducted in 1993–1995). If U.S. aid to Israel is significantly reduced because the Administration disapproves of a particular Israeli policy, why shouldn't the same principle apply to the PLO? If a loyal democratic ally is subjected to financial penalties, shouldn't a totalitarian organization that is responsible for numerous murders of Israelis and Americans (such as Cleo Noel, the U.S. ambassador to Sudan in 1973, and the U.S. tourist Leon Klinghoffer, aboard the *Achille Lauro* in 1990) be subjected to comparable penalties?

Withholidng specific amounts of U.S. aid from the PLO would be a practical and appropriate first step towards improving PLO compliance with the accords. Arafat and the PLO must understand that they will have to pay a price—literally—for their continued violations.

According to this proposal, partial PLO compliance would permit continued U.S. funding, at reduced levels. Only if there were no compliance with major aspects of the accords would all U.S. funding be terminated.

3. A bipartisan Congressional committee could be established, under the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House International Relations Committee, to help determine if the PLO is complying with the peace accords.

Until now, the State Department has had the exclusive authority to determine, for the President, whether or not the PLO is in compliance with the peace accords. Congress could take an important role in helping determine PLO compliance, by establishing a committee under the aegis of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House International Affairs Committee, to periodically report on the PLO's record.

The need for such a Congressional role is illustrated by the many flaws in the State Department's first three biannual reports on PLO compliance. All three reports were strongly criticized by leading Republican and Democratic members of Congress and prominent American Jewish organizations, such as the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), the Zionist Organization of America (ZOA) and others.

The first State Department report was issued on January 10, 1994. Senators Joseph Lieberman (D–CT) and Connie Mack (R–FL) said that parts of the report ''read most like a defense of the PLO's lapses than a constructively critical guide to better behavior . . . [it] glosses over and too easily excuses the occasions when the PLO may be unwilling or incapable of [fulfilling its commitments] . . . This report accepts the PLO's failures without comment and thereby seems to excuse them rather than establishing any benchmark by which to measure progress.

This undermines the U.S. effort to improve compliance by implying that no progress is necessary''[134]

The second State Department report was issued on May 30, 1994. In a June 9 letter to Secretary of State Christopher, Senators Lieberman and Mack criticized the report for not holding the PLO to a ''sufficient standard of compliance.'' They noted that ''While suggesting that the PLO should 'do more' to condemn terrorism, the report does not clearly describe standards for adherence . . . We cannot allow Arafat to shirk responsibility for condemning and combatting terrorism by defining every terrorist incident as outside his control.'' Representatives Howard Berman (D–CA), Benjamin Gilman (R–NY), Eliot Engel (D–NY) and Jim Saxton (R–NJ) [the latter two are co-chairs of the Peace Accord Monitoring (PAM) Group in the House] were also critical of the State Department report. They wrote: ''We should demand swift and unequivocal responses [by the PLO] to all acts of terror.'' They urged the State Department ''to hold the PLO to a more exacting standard.''[135] In a detailed analysis, the ZOA found that the State Department report ''minimizes and excuses the PLO's numerous and serious violations of the agreement.''[136]

The third State Department report on PLO compliance was issued on November 30, 1994. Senators Lieberman and Mack expressed their ''disappointment over the State Department's report'' and said they were ''distressed by the report's apologetic tone.'' The report ''continues the practice, begun in earlier reports, of moving the goalposts: PLO failures are excused and no clear standards are fixed.'' The State Department report, they said, ''fails in its obligations to the Congress and, by too easily excusing the PLO's and Palestinian Authority's failures, will ultimately impede the successful conclusion of the peace process.''[137] Senator Richard Shelby (R–AL) characterized the State Department report as ''muddled at best.''[138] Representative Eliot Engel (D–NY) said that the report should have been ''more balanced'' and ''does not hold Yasir Arafat to a high enough standard . . . The difficult political circumstances faced by Yasir Arafat should not excuse his failure to follow through on his solemn agreement.''[139]

AIPAC expressed its ''disappointment'' with the report.''We are disappointed that [the PLO's] failures are generally attributed to administrative inefficiencies and difficulties facing the Palestinian Authority rather than to the deliberate policies of, and errors of judgment by, the head of the Authority, PLO Chairman Yasir Arafat. This report fails to hold Arafat to a high enough standard.''[140]

Representative Benjamin Gilman (R–NY), chair of the House International Relations Committee, wrote to Secretary of State Christopher on December 30, 1994, that ''none of the parties will be favorably served if we continue to ignore reality about the PLO's repeated and persistent lack of compliance with the commitments it voluntarily assumed.'' He added that the PLO's failure to comply with the accords was ''the result of Yasser Arafat's lack of will to comply.''[141]

The ZOA, in its analysis of the report, concluded that ''The State Department has ignored, minimized, or whitewashed the PLO's numerous and serious violations.''[142]

The current peace process is not likely to bring about peace between Israel and the Arabs unless meaningful pressure is put on Arafat and the PLO now to honor their obligations and act in a peaceful and civilized way in Gaza and Jericho. This must be done before they are given additional territory, since once they have additional territory they will have even less incentive to abide by the accords. Such action is the only way to ensure the integrity of the peace process so that it leads to real peace. As Senators Lieberman and Mack have stated (in a December 9, 1994 letter to Secretary of State Christopher), ''So long as the PLO and Mr. Arafat are not held to the commitments they have made, there will be no peace.''[143]

NOTES

[1] Gaza-Jericho Agreement, Article XVIII, and Annex III, section I.5.
[2] Gaza-Jericho Agreement, Article XII.
[3] Gaza-Jericho Agreement, Article XIV.
[4] Gaza-Jericho Agreement, Annex III, Section II.7.
[5] Arafat letter to Rabin, September 9, 1993; Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1994, Part E of Title V of Public Law 136–203, Section 583(b)5; Presidential Documents, Administration of William J. Clinton, November 12, 1993; Washington Post, September 13, 1993.
[6] Arafat letter to Rabin, September 9, 1993.
[7] Arafat letter to Rabin, September 9, 1993.
[8] Arafat letter to Holst, September 9, 1993.
[9] Arafat letter to Rabin, September 9, 1993.
[10] Wall Street Journal, September 1, 1993.
[11] Associated Press, February 15, 1995.
[12] Jerusalem Post, August 18, 1994.
[13] Ha'aretz, October 11, 1994.
[14] Jerusalem Post, April 12, 1995.
[15] Israel Radio, August 23, 1994.
[16] Jerusalem Post, September 5, 1994.
[17] Israel Radio, August 19, 1994.
[18] Jerusalem Post, February 24, 1995.
[19] Jewish Telegraphic Agency Daily News Bulletin, February 13, 1995.
[20] Jerusalem Post, February 24, 1995; Washington Post, March 11, 1995; Washington Post, March 11, 1995.
[21] Israeli Radio Channel 7 News, March 22, 1995.
[22] Washington Post, March 11, 1995.
[23] Ibid.
[24] Jerusalem Post, March 9, 1995.
[25] El-Watan (Gaza), February 28, 1995.
[26] Washington Post, March 25, 1995.
[27] San Francisco Chronicle, April 15, 1995; Associated Press, April 16, 1995; Los Angeles Times, April 13, 1995.
[28] San Francisco Chronicle, April 15, 1995; Associated Press, April 16, 1995.
[29] Jerusalem Post, April 12, 1995.
[30] Israel Radio, April 16, 1995; Jerusalem Post, April 16, 1995.
[31] New York Times, April 13, 1995.
[32] Jerusalem Post, April 11, 1995.
[33] New York Times, April 17, 1995.
[34] New York Times, April 11, 1995 & April 12, 1995.
[35] Jewish Telegraphic Agency Daily News Bulletin, April 12, 1995.
[36] Washington Post, April 17, 1995.
[37] Ma'ariv, April 14, 1995.
[38] Radio Monte Carlo, February 20, 1995.
[39] Reuters, August 18, 1994.
[40] Reuters, August 24, 1994; Reuters, September 8, 1994.
[41] Israel Radio, August 19, 1994.
[42] Ma'ariv, March 10, 1995; Ha'aretz, February 17, 1995.
[43] Washington Post, February 27, 1995.
[44] Israel Radio, August 20, 1994.
[45] Yediot Ahronot, May 27, 1994.
[46] New York Times, July 2, 1994.
[47] Los Angeles Times, July 15, 1994.
[48] FBIS, January 6, 1995.
[49] Jerusalem Post, January 26, 1995.
[50] Washington Jewish Week, February 10, 1994.
[51] Washington Jewish Week, February 10, 1994.
[52] Jerusalem Post, April 20, 1994.
[53] Radio Monte Carlo, February 20, 1995; New York Times, April 15, 1995.
[54] Sharq al-Ausat (London), February 25, 1995.
[55] Yediot Ahronot, April 27, 1994.
[56] Near East Report, September 5, 1994; Jerusalem Post, December 7, 1994.
[57] Radio Monte Carlo, May 29, 1994.
[58] Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1994, Part E of Title V of Public Law 136–203, Section 583(b)5; Presidential Documents, Administration of William J. Clinton, November 12, 1993; Washington Post, September 13, 1993.
[59] Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS), November 15, 1993.
[60] Jerusalem Post, April 7, 1994.
[61] Jerusalem Post, August 29, 1994.
[62] Jerusalem Post, April 20, 1994.
[63] New York Times, July 8, 1994.
[64] Radio Monte Carlo, August 10, 1994.
[65] Jerusalem Post, August 21, 1994.
[66] Jewish Telegraphic Agency Daily News Bulletin, August 23, 1994.
[67] Yediot Ahronot, August 23, 1994; Ha'aretz, January 24, 1995; Jerusalem Post, January 12, 1995.
[68] Jerusalem Post, July 26, 1994; FBIS, August 22, 1994.
[69] Jerusalem Times, February 3, 1995.
[70] El-Ro'i (Jordan), March 7, 1995.
[71] Jerusalem Post, August 22, 1994.
[72] FBIS, May 17, 1994.
[73] FBIS, November 22, 1994.
[74] New York Times, January 4, 1995.
[75] Voice of Palestine Radio, February 14, 1995.
[76] PLO Television, Jerusalem, January 24, 1995.
[77] New York Times, July 2, 1994.
[78] Associated Press, January 7, 1994.
[79] Jerusalem Post, December 11, 1994.
[80] Jerusalem Post, November 18, 1994.
[81] Jerusalem Post, November 18, 1994.
[82] Specter letter to Arafat, October 29, 1994.
[83] Jerusalem Post, February 7, 1995.
[84] Qreia conversation with Morton A. Klein, Jerusalem, February 27, 1995.
[85] Los Angeles Times, July 15, 1994; FBIS October 11, 1994.
[86] Jewish Telegraphic Agency Daily News Bulletin, December 2, 1994.
[87] Jewish Telegraphic Agency Daily News Bulletin, April 18, 1995.
[88] Máariv, April 16, 1995.
[89] Palestinian National Authority-Ministry of Information-Press Office, ''Jewish Immigration To Palestine And Its Devastating Effects On The Peace Process,'' Ramallah, February 1995.
[90] Jerusalem Post, March 1, 1995.
[91] Reuters, December 16, 1994.
[92] Human Rights Watch-Middle East, ''The Gaza Strip and Jericho: Human Rights Under Palestinian Partial Self-Rule,'' New York: February 1995, p.14.
[93] Jerusalem Post, July 13, 1994.
[94] Jerusalem Report, February 23, 1995.
[95] Ibid.
[96] Human Rights Watch report. p.19.
[97] Ibid., p.20.
[98] Ibid., p.21.
[99] Reuters, August 4, 1994; Jerusalem Report, February 23, 1995.
[100] Jerusalem Report, February 23, 1995.
[101] San Francisco Chronicle, February 16, 1995.
[102] Máariv, March 24, 1995.
[103] Forward, March 31, 1995.
[104] New York Times, July 30, 1994.
[105] Washington Times, August 16, 1994.
[106] New York Times, September 6, 1995.
[107] New York Times, December 4, 1994.
[108] Al Akhbar [Cairo], March 1, 1995.
[109] FBIS, March 13, 1995.
[110] Associated Press, April 12, 1995.
[111] Ibid.
[112] Jerusalem Report, February 23, 1995.
[113] U.S. News and World Report, August 22, 1994.
[114] Jerusalem Post, March 23, 1995; Jerusalem Post, April 5, 1995.
[115] Jerusalem Post, March 23, 1995.

[116] Human Rights Watch report, p.14.
[117] Copy in the possession of the ZOA.
[118] Jerusalem Post, December 17, 1993; Headquarters of the Israel Chief Military Judge Advocate,''Palestinian Violations of the May 4, 1994 Cairo Agreement,'' Jerusalem: Dec. 13, 1994, section 30.
[119] Jerusalem Post, March 29, 1995.
[120] Headquarters of the Israel Chief Military Judge Advocate, ''Palestinian Violations of the May 4, 1994 Cairo Agreement,'' Jerusalem: December 13, 1994, section 25.
[121] Headquarters of the Israel Chief Military Judge Advocate, ''Palestinian Violations of the May 4, 1994 Cairo Agreement,'' Jerusalem: Dec. 13, 1994, section 25.
[122] Jerusalem Post, August 12, 1994; Jerusalem Post, March 8, 1995; Jerusalem Post, March 24, 1995; Headquarters of the Israel Chief Military Judge Advocate, ''Palestinian Violations of the May 4, 1994 Cairo Agreement,'' Jerusalem: December 13, 1994, section 25.
[123] Headquarters of the Israel Chief Military Judge Advocate, ''Palestinian Violations of the May 4, 1994 Cairo Agreement,'' Jerusalem: December 13, 1994, sections 34, 38, and 44.
[124] Jerusalem Post, March 24, 1995.
[125] Jerusalem Post, Jan. 23, 1995; Jerusalem Post, March 19, 1995; New York Times, April 12, 1995; Yediot Ahronot, April 14, 1995.
[126] Jerusalem Post, November 7, 1994.
[127] Jerusalem Post, November 7, 1994.
[128] Jerusalem Post, March 22, 1995.
[129] Jerusalem Post, March 22, 1995.
[130] Washington Post, February 27, 1995.
[131] Transcript of remarks by Senator Shelby, Zionist Organization of America annual dinner, New York City, December 11, 1994.
[132] Jerusalem Post, November 22, 1994.
[133] Jerusalem Post, November 22, 1994.
[134] Lieberman-Mack letter to Christopher, January 24, 1994.
[135] Near East Report, June 20, 1994.
[136] ZOA Analysis of the 2nd State Department Report, June 8, 1994.
[137] Lieberman-Mack letter to Christopher, December 9, 1994.
[138] Remarks at ZOA Dinner, Dec. 11, 1994.
[139] Press Release by Office of Congressman Eliot L. Engel, December 5, 1994.
[140] AIPAC Press Release, December 2, 1994.
[141] Gilman letter to Christopher, Dec. 30, 1994.

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the gentleman's deciding not to offer this amendment, but I do believe, given the comments that have been made, that a response is required because this is a significant issue, and I think that we need to talk about this issue frankly on both sides of the aisle.

I know that for a long time in many circles in this country and elsewhere that the PLO has been thought of as being a naughty word. But the fact is, and I think we all have to face this, there will be no peace process in the Middle East without the constructive participation of the PLO.

Now that organization, like many others throughout history that has been engaged in essentially revolutionary activity, has a lot of factions, and some of them are more easily controllable than others. But it seems to me that, if Mr. Rabin can deal with the PLO in the interests of the security of the state of Israel, that we ought to follow that example and be prepared to assist in their doing that.

I would point that there is an alternative to the PLO. It is called Hamas, and I do not think that that alternative is especially a good one for Israel, for us, or anybody else in the region. And there are even worse organizations in that part of the world which could pose even greater long-term threats to peace and stability in the region. I think we need to understand that at this point the PLO is one of the organizations being used, to deliver health assistance to people in that region, in the occupied territories, to deliver education, to deliver policing, imperfect though their policing is, and to assist in the development of infrastructure.

□ 0200

I do not know how many of you have been in refugee camps and Palestinian camps in the Middle East. I have. They are not a pretty sight. What they are breeding in terms of resentment and hatred because of those conditions will not be very healthful for the region in the long term.

I do not know how many of you have had an opportunity to talk with Mr. Arafat. I have, on a number of occasions. It has often been a very frustrating experience. But it is a necessary component of Israel's efforts to finally defang the situation in the Middle East to the point where that region becomes safe for all parties, including Israel.

So I would suggest that while we can talk all we want, I do not think we should be deceived. We must have the active and constructive participation of the PLO if we are to have security and peace in that region. And it seems to me that given the fact of what our State Department, the Government of Israel, Mr. Rabin, who has taken himself great political risks for peace, have done, it seems to me that we can do no less. And it seems to me, therefore, that our support for that organization is part of the effort to see to it that the PLO is constructively rather than destructively engaged in the region.

So I appreciate very much that the gentleman has withdrawn the amendment, because it would not have helped a very delicate situation.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Chairman, if this is to be revisited later, and I certainly welcome his comments, would it not be appropriate in the course of revisiting it, by this committee or any other, for us to consider both sides of the difficulty of bringing peace to the Middle East, one portion of which is the continued news we read in the newspapers about the Government of Israel sanctioning the taking of lands from Arabs who have lived on these lands for hundreds of years? You know, we have had a little history on this issue in the past. I had an amendment a few years ago to deal with what the Likud government was doing.

The current government is much, much better. There are many things about its activities in this regard that deserve commendation. If we are going to take up the problem of peace in the Middle East, we need to look at both sides of this problem, and give some support to the constructive parts of the government which have fought against the unjust land seizing at the same time we are talking about whether the PLO is holding up its end of the bargain.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I understand the gentleman's comments and do not disagree with them. I once asked a former Prime Minister of Israel about that issue. I asked him about a specific piece of land.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. OBEY was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I asked the gentleman for an assurance that a specific piece of land held by an Arab in that area was not going to be, in effect, confiscated. I was assured it was not. A week later it was. So I understand directly what the gentleman is raising. But I think that that is water over the dam. We have, in my view, the most constructive effort that has been made by Israel in my memory to try to bring peace to the region and reach an agreement with her neighbors. I think that bringing the PLO along in that process is essential, and I commend the present Israeli Government for their willingness to do that, and urge them to continue. I think our State Department is right to promote the process as well.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to compliment the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] on his statement. The situation in the Middle East is extraordinarily complex. The United States has hung in there for many, many years in hopes of bringing about a balanced peace to the entire region. The sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Wisconsin are right on target. We cannot be in a position of taking sides. We have to work with the most moderate of all parties on all sides. Frankly, it would serve no purpose for the United States to start withholding support from the PLO when in fact they are going to be an integral part of a future peace in that part of the world.

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

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to pay tribute to my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] for the work that he has done in this regard, and thank him for withdrawing his amendment, which I know he feels very strongly about. Just yesterday the gentleman from New Jersey and I, along with the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] and the gentleman

from Texas [Mr. DELAY] introduced a bill called the Middle East Peace Compliance and PLO Accountability Act of 1995.

What we are saying in this bill, which is very relevant to the discussion today, is that the PLO needs to keep its promise and needs to comply with the agreements it made when Yasir Arafat shook the hand of Prime Minister Rabin on the White House lawn, September 15, 1993. I wholeheartedly support the peace process and want to see the funds continued to the PLO, because I do agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin that the PLO can play and should play a very constructive role in Middle East peace.

The question is will they play that constructive role, and that question can only be answered by Mr. Arafat and the people of the PLO.

What our bill does is simply this: If the PLO complies with its commitments, then the U.S. aid will continue to flow. If the PLO, on the other hand, does not comply with its commitments, then the U.S. aid would stop.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] said there can be no peace process without the constructive participation of the PLO. I agree. But the key word there is constructive participation. If they will have constructive participation, then peace will come and American money will flow. If, on the other hand, they are not constructive, then we ought not to give them money, if they renege on their promises.

Only they can determine that. I hope that Mr. Arafat will do the things he promised. I hope that he will condemn terrorism and all acts of terrorism, not only in English for American public consumption, but also in Arabic, so that his people can hear his condemnation. I hope he will proactively continue to track down and prosecute those responsible for committing terrorist acts, and I hope he will comply with all the other things to which he agreed.

Now, I would also hope, and I know the chairman of our Committee on International Relations is here, I would hope that we would be able to hold hearings on my bill and Mr. SAXTON's bill, and that we would talk actively at these hearings about a PLO compliance.

So I would like to yield to the chairman of the committee to engage in a colloquy briefly with him, to ask him if we are prepared to in the future hold hearings on our Middle East Peace Compliance and PLO Accountability Act of 1995, so we can be assured that the PLO will live up to its commitment so American aid can continue to flow.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman, we certainly will be holding hearings on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, in commitments that the PLO voluntarily assumed since September 1993, the PLO promised to renounce terrorism and the use of violence, discipline violators, and seek peaceful political change. It also promised to amend the Palestinian Covenant to remove all references calling for the destruction of Israel.

Over a year and a half later, we are still witnesses to wanton violence. The American people have waited patiently for the violence against innocent Israelis and Americans to end, and for PLO chief Yasser Arafat to display the kind of leadership necessary to make this experiment work.

The State Department's most recent report on PLO compliance, issued on June 1, 1995, demonstrated yet again that the Palestinian track of the Middle East peace process is still the cause of great concern and consternation.

The report once again fails to hold the PLO to an adequate standard. The report ignores many issues, for example the failure to renounce and prevent terrorism and violence, the failure to prosecute violators, the failure to turn over terrorists whose extradition was requested by Israel, the failure to enforce human rights standards toward those arrested by the Palestinian authority, and most glaringly, the failure to amend the Palestinian Covenant's references to the destruction of Israel.

Later this week, the President's authority under the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act will expire. A 45-day extension, adopted by the other body last week, will soon be considered in this House. This will allow U.S. support for the Middle East peace process to continue, while giving the House and Senate the opportunity to comprehensively review the reauthorization of the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act, which the Senate has committed to considering in its State Department reorganization measure. I also want to commend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL] for withdrawing their amendment at this time.

I, therefore, wish to assure the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] that his concerns about U.S. funding for the Palestine Liberation Organization will be taken into account, and that I welcome his input, as well as that of other Members, as we prepare to discuss this important issue with the Senate, and in our committee.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the chairman for his remarks, and I just want to say that last year, the gentleman from New Jersey and I formed the peace accord monitoring group, which we cochair. I think that our Middle East Peace Compliance and Accountability Act of 1995 is a logical extension of the peace accord monitoring group to make sure that all sides are complying with what they promised.

I would say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT] who had some questions before, that it is not the Government of Israel that we worry about in terms of keeping its commitments to peace, because the Government of Israel has shown time and time again it keeps its commitments to peace. We are worried about the Palestinian side and the PLO. Again, only the PLO can determine whether or not it keeps its commitments to peace. I fervently hope it will, and fervently hope, therefore, that United States money will continue to flow. But time will tell.

I would say to Chairman GILMAN that I would hope that after the 45 days that the money is automatically extended, that we would use our bill as a core for the hearings to see that what we finally go beyond the 45 days, that we will have some teeth in terms of insisting that all sides, including PLO, comply with what they promise. Again, if they do, money will continue to flow. If they do not, it will be nobody's fault but their own.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. I just wanted to respond once again. I fully agree with your desire to press the PLO to comply.

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

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York be allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Chairman, I object, and I will object any time anyone on either side requests extra time.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] for his restraint in deferring in his amendment to withhold aid to the PLO, not because it did not have the correct items on the merits, but because it was moving the dialog forward at this time for later debate.

I believe it is important to note to my colleagues that the PLO has failed to keep its promises, not only the White House lawn peace accords in September 1993, but in the self-rule accords as well. It also should be noted that the acts of terrorism against Israel by the PLO are well documented.

In contrast, Israel, as the only democracy in the Middle East, has been one of America's best friends, if not its best friend, a trading partner, involved in cultural exchange, and a champion for human rights. The victory we had in the Desert Storm war would not have been realized in my opinion, and I am sure the opinion of many of my colleagues and Americans, without Israel's assistance and Israel's restraint. So I say thank you to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

□ 0215

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

I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT].

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to identify with the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL] a moment ago and others with regard to the PLO.

I fully agree that we should act in every constructive way to see to it that they comply with their peace agreements. I also think it is wrong of us to get up here and only take the popular side.

The fact of the matter is, there are elements within the Israeli Government and Israeli society who believe it is OK to take away land from Arabs who have lived on it for hundreds of years. I do not think anybody here agrees with that. I think they view it as wrong. It is very dangerous to the peace process. If we are going to take this matter up, we ought to also make clear to the Israeli Government and others in that society that we do not sanction that and we view that as a threat to the peace process as well.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I think it would be an extremely destructive thing for us to in any way interfere with the assistance that has been committed to the PLO. This money is to go for schools, for water, for infrastructure, and it is absolutely essential to maintain the balance in the peace process.

I would like to further say that there is just, there is nobody in the world that admires the current Government of Israel as much as I do. I believe that Yitzhak Rabin is my political hero. I think the courage that he is showing under enormous pressure at home, the enormous pressures that are coming at him from every direction, the courage and the durability and the determination that he and his foreign minister have demonstrated to the world should be a great example to all of us.

I think they would be the last ones that would want us to do anything that would in any way upset the peace process.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH].

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I would take some exception to both what the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the ranking member of the subcommittee said in terms of the PLO.

By saying that they are moderates does not make them moderates. I think something that every Member in this Chamber and everyone in America needs to understand is that the fundamental test in the agreements still deals with the destruction of the state of Israel. One of the wisdoms, one of the things that was said that was going to be done 18 months ago regarding taking out part of the covenant and the PLO covenant that calls specifically for the state of Israel's destruction still exists, has not been taken out. And that, in a sense, is the essence of the debate that still goes on.

By us projecting our hopes and our desires onto Yasser Arafat does not change Yasser Arafat. I, along with six of my colleagues, just came back from Israel during the Memorial Day break where some of us met with Mr. Arafat. And some of his statements were bizarre, to say the best.

Mr. Arafat specifically said to this group that he believed that terrorist incidents that occurred in Israel, like the bombing in Tel Aviv where innocents that were killed were done by Israelis, without any proof, without any information.

He specifically talked about Israelis going through their internal security process and stealing passports and giving them to members of Hamas, without evidence. He would be willing to do things like that, because he has done things like that. He would be willing to kill innocents because he has been willing to do that previously.

Yet that is the person that Members in this Chamber are projecting as moderates. The reality is that people who have committed acts of terrorism that the Israeli Government knows are within the jurisdictional areas of the PNA in Jericho and in Gaza are there, they are identified by name, yet they are not being released to the Israeli Government.

There are clearly fundamental problems with what is going on right now. It is not the only path to success. By us projecting that, that is a real problem. I support the effort of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] to get accountability, that the United States taxpayers, $100 million a year went last year, is supposedly going this year in a system of accountability that has real problems.

Other governments have withdrawn their aid. Other governments have withdrawn their aid.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I wanted to make a statement echoing what the gentleman says.

I do want to say that the gentleman from New Jersey has raised a very serious concern and one I share, demanding adequate accountability of American taxpayer dollars regardless of what country it goes to.

I insist that they live up to the standards before we give them the aid.

I want to assure the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] and others that we will work with him in ensuring that the funds are spent properly. I will encourage the authorizing committee to maintain close oversight of this program, and I want to thank him for raising this very important matter. I look forward to working with him to ensure the proper management of this program is maintained.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to correct what I think was an inadvertent comment, the implication of a comment made by my friend from Wisconsin who as chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations has consistently promoted and led the fight for assistance to Israel and for security and for support of the peace process.

This is not the first Israeli constructive effort to try and bring peace to that region. Any study of the history of Israel since its founding, since its inception, would recognize that in 1948, in 1967, in the early 1970's, again in the Camp David process, Israel has over and over again reached out for that process.

What is different this time is the parties that were never willing to acknowledge the right of Israel to exist, some of those parties are now accepting that right and moving forward. But the history of Israel for its 45 to 47 years of existence is filled with efforts by its leaders to reach out to its Arab neighbors to bring an end to this particular conflict. I want to correct that for the RECORD.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the 5 minutes. I just want to make a couple of observations. Number one, as the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] says, the Israeli Government for many years and many times has tried to reach out to the Arab countries to everyone involved to make peace. Usually until recently, she has been met with a stone wall. In the last couple of years that has changed. The peace process has been undertaken.

Second, no one really suggests credibly that the PLO is a moderate force. The PLO is not a moderate force. The PLO has been recognized and has been a terrorist organization and has engaged in terror. But one makes peace with one's enemies, not with one's friends. One makes peace with the extremists on the other side, not with the most moderate elements. That is easy.

The question involved in the entire peace process is, has the PLO changed, have circumstances changed, have they changed enough, can you do business with them? I believe the jury is still out on that question.

Not can you trust them, because you do not make peace agreements based on trust; you make peace agreements based on mutual interests if you can find them. But I believe the jury is still out on the question. And the valiant effort of the government of Israel to make peace should be supported, and the valiant effort of the United States Government to assist that should be supported.

I would have opposed the Saxton amendment because I think it would have brought the peace process to a dead stop. The bill that the gentleman

from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL] have designed instead, which they will introduce or they just introduced, may be a constructive effort to push the PLO to use the lever of American aid to push them a little further in the direction of compliance.

Have they complied, has the PLO complied with what they promised? No. Have they complied with some of it? Yes. Have they complied with enough so you can make a peace agreement? We do not know yet.

We have to be careful in our actions here to take actions that will advance the cause of peace and not throw an unnecessary roadblock in there. I am glad the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] withdrew his amendment. I suspect the bill that he has gotten together with Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. DELAY may be a step toward advancing that effort rather than restarding it. I hope we will discuss that in future days.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT: Page 78, after line 5, insert the following new section:

PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS

SEC. 564. SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that, to the greatest extent practicable, all equipment and products purchased with funds made available in this Act should be American made.

(b) NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—In providing financial assistance to, or entering into any contract with, any entity using funds made available in this Act, the head of each Federal agency, to the greatest extent practicable, shall provide to such entity a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, this is standard buy American. It was offered in the last Congress and placed on all the appropriations bills. I am only going to take a couple minutes.

I am not here to become an expert on the Middle East. I am sure trying to become an expert on the Midwest. I just want to point out to the Members of this Congress that we here in the Congress of the United States borrow money from Japan and Germany. We borrow from the Social Security trust fund. And we sell Government debt instruments to American citizens and basically pension plans. And then we pay interest. I would like the attention of everybody. I sat through all this intriguing debate. Then we pay interest on this borrowed money.

Now, I do not know where this $12 billion comes from. Is it the money we borrowed from Japan and Germany? Is it from the forays into Social Security? Is it the Government debt instruments that we sold to the pension plans that underfunded every major industrial pension plan in America? And the next major one that fails, the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation is going to have to bail it out. The next major bank that fails will exhaust the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and we are going to be asked for more money for the savings and loans fiasco.

I keep hearing all about the superpower. If we evaluated America on a corporate standard, we would be considered deficient and possibly bankrupt.

All my little buy-American amendment says is we are going to ask people, to the greatest extent practical, if they find it in the goodness of their heart, to try not to buy the goods from Japan and Germany.

But there is one other thing I want to say. I have a 1-percent cut that will be coming up. I have never seen so many reasons to convince me that I should not bring it. My colleagues, we have cut education. We have cut housing. We have got more murder in America than any of these countries we are giving the money to.

I do not want to tarnish one bit the great job the chairman has done. This is the best foreign aid appropriation bill I have seen, and I am going to give you the credit for that and to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] here. I do not want you to take it personal, but if I had 400 votes, not one of them would go for this bill; because, my colleagues, I think it is unconscionable and immoral to pay your neighbor's rent bill when the bank is foreclosing on your family home.

Now, damn it, I am tired of talking about the Mideast. I want to talk about the Midwest. Tell you the truth, this does not endear me to a lot of people, Israel and Egypt do not take a penny cut in this new Congress. My veterans get a hit. My seniors get a hit. Our housing gets a hit. Our education gets a hit.

So my little 1-percent cut will exempt the basic poor countries, certain African accounts, certain development assistance, certain narcotics accounts, certain terrorist approaches and programs, so we could help where we are really needed.

Do you know what it does? The 1 percent is going to hit everybody. If the White House decides not to hit Israel and Egypt, then, yes, like the chairman tells me, other countries are going to even get hit harder. I cannot deal with that. But I am so damn sick of seeing my people go without jobs. I have to come down here, run to the chairman, talk about programs for America; when we do, there is no money.

□ 0230

Look, I just have a little very simple approach. I want you to accept my little Buy American amendment. At least these countries have to get a notice, but I want you to support a 1 percent cut.

If you are talking about deficits around here, damn it, this bill is not sacred, either, and let's really stand up for once.

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

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. I just want to tell you, you have convinced me. I am going to accept your amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, the ranking member, who is ecstatic about the amendment. In fact passes over it without prejudice.

Mr. WILSON. I appreciate the the gentleman yielding. For clarification, did the chairman say he was going to accept both of your amendments or one of your amendments?

Mr. TRAFICANT. You will have to deal with that in conference.

Reclaiming my time, the major cities of America should secede from the union, qualify for foreign aid, and do a hell of a lot better.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, is the amendment before us the Buy American sense of Congress or is it the 1 percent across-the-board?

The CHAIRMAN. It is the Buy American amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT: Page 78, after line 5, insert the following new section:

ACROSS-THE-BOARD REDUCTION OF AMOUNTS

SEC. 564. (a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for the following:

(1) ''Export and Investment Assistance'' (title I of this Act).

(2) ''Development Assistance Fund''.

(3) ''Development Fund for Africa''.

(4) ''International Disaster Assistance''.

(5) ''African Development Foundation''.

(6) ''Inter-American Foundation''.

(7) ''Peace Corps''.

(8) ''International Narcotics Control''.

(9) ''Anti-Terrorism Assistance''.

(10) ''Nonproliferation and Disarmament''.

(11) ''Contribution to the International Development Association''.

(12) ''Contribution to the Asian Development Fund''.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I am only going to offer the 1 percent. It may not even pass.

My God, cutting foreign aid in the Congress of the United States. You might even get an opponent with a half a million dollars staring at you in less than a week. But I guess, I played football without a helmet, I could handle that.

Except as provided in subsection (b), each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by the fat margin of this big 1 percento.

Exceptions: Export and Investment Assistance. Certain programs that help very poor countries. The Development Assistance Fund, the fund that helps again very poor countries, people with their stomachs hanging out, bloated hungry.

The Development Fund for Africa. International Disaster Assistance. The African Development Foundation. The Inter-American Foundation. The Peace Corps. International Narcotics Control. Anti-Terrorism Assistance. Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund. Contribution to the International Development Association. Contribution to the Asian Development Fund. These about cover those basically very poor entities at the bottom of the list fighting for a few bucks.

I say this to the Congress: We have gone through a budget process around here, where I heard speaker after speaker come up and say nothing, nothing is sacred, everything is on the table. The debate we have right now is Medicare, Medicaid, senior citizens, children.

Well, there are some sacred cows in this bill. Now, I don't know about you. I am not a Member of the Japanese Diet. I am not a Member of the Israeli Knesset. I am not a member of the British Parliament and quite frankly, Scarlett, that is not my job.

If the Congress of the United States cannot make a 1-percent cut in this bill, then the Congress of the United States has, No. 1, lost all anatomy and cannot make tough decisions to govern.

Had this bill not come in at what is a very responsible approach by this chairman, I would have offered a bigger amendment, even though it would have failed. I am not going to belabor the time. But there is not a bill that comes before this Congress that cannot stand a 1-percent cut. I think I have taken care of those needy groups and those countries that are really deserving and need help. That is basically all I have to say.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman form Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Is the amendment a 1 percent cut across the board for all areas of the bill? Everything?

Mr. TRAFICANT. Yes, there are.

Mr. VOLKMER. There are no exceptions?

Mr. TRAFICANT. Other than these exemptions. These exemptions that were listed, I don't want to go through the time to belabor them again, but you can read the amendment. There are quite a few exemptions.

Mr. VOLKMER. You did not cut those that you listed? That you read?

Mr. TRAFICANT. They are exempted.

Mr. VOLKMER. They are exempted. Everything else is cut 1 percent?

Mr. TRAFICANT. From what I understand, there is not an earmarking here and what the chairman tells me, that this could come to the Economic Support Fund, the $5.2 billion, and in fact there are certain groups in there that may not even take a cut.

What his concern is, for example, that if Israel and Egypt don't take any cut after it is all over, there will be bigger cuts for these smaller countries.

I do not deal with that. If there is no earmarking in this bill, then I cannot deal with the earmarking. The legislative intent of the Traficant amendment is to cut everybody that gets a dollar from us, to cut them one penny, everybody. That is my legislative intent. If that means anything anymore. Legislative intent if somebody offers an amendment to Congress.

Mr. VOLKMER. You are talking about direct aid to those countries?

Mr. TRAFICANT. Yes, I am.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio, but I recognize the symbolism of what he is saying and support the symbolism. But to accept a 1-percent cut, especially one that just applies to certain areas—and I notice that you have taken selective programs out that you did not want to cut—but if I agree to accept your amendment, it would be an admission that I did not do the very best job I could do while still protecting the ability of the administration to have a foreign aid policy.

Let me just say that, first of all, I have cut the President's request by 19 percent; 20 times what the gentleman is suggesting, I have already cut. I have cut every single account almost in this foreign aid bill. I am below the budget allocations. I am below last year. This is the lowest level in the past probably 40 years of a foreign operations bill.

So if you come along at the last minute with this symbolic cut, I know that will gain great headlines and sound good. You might even be invited to the Donahue show, but let me tell you, I do not admit that this bill could be lower than I have made it. I have worked with your side of the aisle, with my side of the aisle, and we have compromised back and forth to the point of insisting that this bill not be any higher than it is right now.

In your bill, there is a possibility that because it does not exempt the Camp David countries, including Israel and Egypt, maybe they would be threatened by the 1 percent. It would not hurt them, you are right, but is that what you want to do?

The Child Survival Fund for some reason was left out of your exemption. You talk about these flies and these starving children, and you left child survival out. You say cut the Child Survival Fund. Cut the immunization programs by 1 percent. Maybe that 1 percent might inoculate some 15,000 kids. Maybe it would feed thousands of kids, but you did not exempt that.

I would submit to you that this committee, the subcommittee, the full committee, when we brought this bill to the House, it was done with great deliberation and done with the maximum amount of money that we are permitting or suggesting to be permitted for this administration to have for the next fiscal year.

I recognize the symbolism, I appreciate the symbolism, but let us give credit to where we already are. When the President came to us and asked us for $15 billion and we told the President, ''We're sorry, we're going to cut you 19 percent, we're going to cut your ability to have a foreign policy by the largest amount in history,'' I think we have gone far enough.

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

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I think the President came in asking for too much money. That is not unusual, No. 1.

No. 2, if you want to add those exceptions, I would be glad to accept them.

Mr. CALLAHAN. It has already been cut 19 percent.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I am not asking you to vote on symbolism. I am asking you to vote on a cut, and I want the vote to be recorded on the cut.

I want to say one other thing to you: If everybody who came in here said, ''Look, we did a great job, nobody should be cutting our bills,'' then we would not have any cuts to any bills.

This is not directed to you. I in fact support you. I am glad to see you in the position. In my opinion, I think everybody could take a 1 percent cut, and this is no different. That is what it is.

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

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

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if the distinguished chairman could tell me, is it correct that this bill cuts the administration's request by nearly $3 billion? Is it correct that the bill you have brought to the floor cuts the administration's request by nearly $3 billion?

Mr. CALLAHAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BERMAN. Is it correct that the bill you have brought to the floor was nearly $2 billion below this year's funding level?

Mr. CALLAHAN. That is correct.

Mr. BERMAN. Is it correct that when your bill passes, that the 150 account, of which your bill takes up by far the biggest portion, no other function of the Federal Government will have been cut more in the past 10 years than that 150 account?

Mr. CALLAHAN. That is absolutely right.

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

Mr. Chairman, I guess we could say over and over again that the bill has been cut by 20 percent below the President's request, it has been cut $2.8 billion below the President's request. In real dollars this is probably the smallest foreign operations bill brought before the House in the last quarter century.

I am going to address the Middle East situation. The proposed cut would reduce both the Economic Support Fund and foreign military sales, and in my opinion cuts to these programs would add a great deal of unsteadiness to the Middle East peace process.

I think that particularly in Israel's case, and in Egypt's as well that the Government is as strained as it could possibly be in trying to hold together the peace process especially within Israel itself. I think any cut by the American Congress at this time would have terrible consequences in Tel Aviv tomorrow. It is hard enough as it is.

I would also like to point out, and this was probably an oversight on the gentleman's part, but the cut would also reduce funds for refugees and disaster assistance, endangering the lives of children and adults all over the world who are at the very, very greatest risk.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully ask the Members to vote against the amendment.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Traficant amendment. I am a strong supporter for our foreign aid program but I have also made the tough choices to cut the program's budget—but if you do not believe me—do believe the National Taxpayers Union and Citizen's Against Government Waste who endorsed our committee's authorization bill.

Under the authorizing bill as approved by this House, we voted to cut $1 billion from the foreign assistance budget for 1996. The authorizing bill this House supported cuts another $2 billion from the foreign assistance budget in fiscal year 1997. Over the 7-year glidepath, the authorizing bill would save a total of $21 billion.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. CALLAHAN'S appropriation bill is below those cuts in the authorizing bill. Yesterday, the House cut another $73 million in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that we have cut significantly from the foreign assistance program. We have vital national security, economic and humanitarian interests throughout the world. Mr. TRAFICANT's amendment would cut all of these vital programs. The gentleman's amendment would cut aid to our allies, to Russian nuclear-disarmament related programs, and to multilateral trade promotion programs to higher income countries needed to employ Americans whose jobs depend on exports.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a strong ''no'' vote on this amendment.

□ 0245

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

Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to run down, once again, the numbers to emphasize what both the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] have said.

To put this amendment in perspective, in 1985, this bill spent $18.5 billion. Last year, this bill spent $13.6 billion. And this bill comes in at $11.9-and-some million. That means that this bill is almost a 20 percent cut from last year and it is a huge cut.

I am on the Committee on Appropriations so I cannot figure that fast, but the fact is if you take 18.5 and 11.9, it is almost a 40 percent cut over that time.

As the gentleman from California indicated, my colleagues cannot name another appropriation bill in this country that has been cut by anywhere near that amount.

I know what the public impression is. When my colleagues take a look at the polls, you see that 27 percent of the people in this country think that foreign aid is the largest expenditure in the budget, when, in fact, it is about 1 percent.

We have had a lot of distress and a lot of anger and a lot of frustration in this House for the past few years. But I think we have to ask ourselves whether or not our processes mean anything. And we have to ask ourselves whether we really have respect for the process by which we bring a product to the floor.

That process is called the committee system. People fight to get on various committees around here, and if either party places a person on the Committee on Appropriations, they ought to do it only if they think that that person will contribute to doing the best possible job at sorting out budget priorities and budget levels.

If my colleagues do not think people are worth it and are going to do that, they should not put them on the committee in the first place.

But the problem Members face if they are members of the Committee on Appropriations, very frankly, is that no matter how much we cut, it is always convenient for some Member to say, ''Well, no matter what you do, boys and girls, we are going to one up you by 1 or 2 percent.''

That is very easy to do. Not very complicated. Sounds great. Sounds simple. But the fact is that what that encourages people to do is to begin padding the accounts so that they take into account the fact that something like this might pass.

This bill has obviously not been padded. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] has seen to that. So it seems to me that sooner or later both Members of this institution, and the so-called experts in these so-called outside groups who rank us, ought to take into account not just the votes that occur on the floor, but the actions taken in the committee itself.

This committee not only has reduced the bill from previous years' levels, as I have indicated it is almost $400 million below the authorization bill. It seems to me if a committee has done a good job in establishing fiscal discipline, it has a right to expect to be backed up by this House, and it seems to me when they have cut this much, no one in this body can reasonably ask for more.

So I would suggest that sooner or later, if you want people to serve and do what is right on the Committee on Appropriations, when they make the kind of reductions that have been made in this bill, which obviously are very tight, their judgment ought to be backed up.

I would respectfully request that you support the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] and oppose this amendment, because it is simply a ''one-upper'' and we ought to be above that.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will take much less than 5 minutes. I want to commend the chairman and the committee for the work they have done on this bill. It is a great bill and I would support it. However, I rise to support the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT], and I would just like to tell you why.

You know, if we went out, not in the middle of the night like this, but went out in the daytime and picked out in any place in America and picked out 435 people, the first 435 people we ran into, and we asked them to come in and vote on this issue, how do my colleagues suppose they would vote? There is no question. Take any poll. There is no question how they would vote. They would vote to support it.

I think we should support it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count for a quorum.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, are Members afraid of going on record? You cut education and housing and veterans, but you will not go on record on this vote? I ask for a vote.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is attempting to count for a quorum.

Mr. TRAFICANT. I will withdraw it if you give me a vote.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend while the Chair counts for a quorum. The Chair counts 106 Members, a quorum is present.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. Members favoring a recorded vote will now rise and be counted.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 139, noes 270, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 442]

AYES—139

Allard
Archer
Baker (CA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Bevill
Bilirakis
Brewster
Browder
Bryant (TX)
Canady
Chabot
Chapman
Chenoweth
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cunningham
Deal
DeFazio
Dingell
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Duncan
Edwards
Emerson
Everett
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goodlatte
Goodling
Graham
Gutknecht
Hancock
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Holden
Hunter
Hutchinson
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kennedy (MA)
Kleczka
Klug
Laughlin
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lucas
Luther
Manzullo
McHugh
McKeon
Meehan
Metcalf
Mica
Minge
Montgomery
Moorhead
Myers
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Orton
Parker
Pastor
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Petri
Pombo
Portman
Poshard
Quillen
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Roberts
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Roth
Royce
Sanford
Schaefer
Schroeder
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shuster
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thurman
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Volkmer
Wamp
Ward
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)

NOES—270

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Barr
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cardin
Castle
Chambliss
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clinger
Clyburn
Collins (IL)
Conyers
Cox
Coyne
Cubin
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Dreier
Dunn
Durbin
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Gonzalez
Gordon
Goss
Green
Greenwood
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heineman
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hyde
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McHale
McInnis
McKinney
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Pryce
Quinn
Radanovich
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schiff
Scott
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Studds
Stupak
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Young (AK)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—26

Coleman
Collins (MI)
Evans
Foglietta
Ford
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Martinez
McDade
McIntosh
McNulty
Meyers
Moakley
Reynolds
Roukema
Sanders
Schumer
Stark
Stokes
Towns
Waldholtz
Waxman
Yates
Young (FL)

□ 0312

Messrs. RUSH, JEFFERSON, and POMEROY changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mrs. SMITH of Washington, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, and Mr. GRAHAM, changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the last 3 lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1996''.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PORTER

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PORTER: Page 78, after line 6, insert the following new section:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO TURKEY

SEC. 564. Not more than $21,000,000 of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading ''ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND'' may be made available to the Government of Turkey.

□ 0315

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee has asked that I yield to him for the purpose of explaining where we are. I yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, if the Members of the House would give me their attention, I just wanted to give some idea of where we are and how fast we can move from this point.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] has an amendment that is going to be debated for as much time as it may take. The issue involves Turkey. It is a very passionate issue with respect to Mr. PORTER, and there is going to be a lot of debate on that. But after the Porter amendment, we then have eight additional amendments on which we do not expect a lot of controversy. In fact, we intend to accept probably six of the eight, and then try to amend the other two to an acceptable level. So I feel like if we can give close attention to the debate on this particular issue, we can finish it in a timely manner, and then move as expeditiously as we can to the other six or seven amendments, and hopefully we can flow through them in a matter of minutes and then get you home before daybreak.

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

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, those are the amendments that you have been noticed. I have two amendments that I would like to discuss with you, perhaps during the debate on this amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. That would be good.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be given 5 minutes from this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, the Porter-Smith-Wolf amendment is a straight cut in economic aid of $25 million for Turkey from the $46 million

provided in the bill, to $21 million. It does not affect military aid to Turkey whatsoever, and there remains $320 million in FMF loans in the bill that is not affected by the amendment.

The amendment contains no conditions, no provisos, no reports. It is a straight cut of $25 million.

Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the Turkish people, but millions of them are being denied their most basic human rights by their own Government. Turkey is a valued friend and ally of the United States. I offer the amendment in no way as hostility toward the Turkish nation. We want a closer relationship with Turkey based upon shared values. But I believe that the genocide going on in Turkey today against the Kurdish people and the ongoing and worsening human rights problems that are not being addressed by Turkey, are so severe that the Turkish democracy itself is being undermined and could well be lost.

Mr. Chairman, no true friend stands aside while his friend is violently abusing his family, and that is exactly what is happening as Turkey, our friend, is violently abusing the members of its country's family.

The United States must send a message to the Turkish people that their Government's policy of unbridled violence against the Kurdish minority, intransigence for the last 21 years in Cyprus where 35,000 troops continue to occupy a portion of that island, their preventing United States humanitarian aid from transiting Turkey to reach Armenia, and their ongoing torture, unlawful detention, and extrajudicial killings by their Government against their own people, must end.

Mr. Chairman, it is absolutely clear, and do not let anybody tell you otherwise, because it is not true, that nothing in Turkey is being done by the Government to change any of these wrongheaded policies.

Turkey continues to take a strictly military approach to the Kurdish situation. Government genocide is being committed against the Kurdish minority. Of approximately 15,000 people dead from the conflict, half of them have been killed in just the last 2 years; 3 million people have been internally displaced in Turkey as villages have been forcibly evacuated or destroyed. France Liberte Foundation puts the number of forcibly evacuated Kurdish villages at 2,500 villages. The former minister of human rights referred to the village evacuations in one province as state terrorism. Turkey has been widely criticized for its treatment of these 3 million refugees. Government forces continue to use excessive force against civilian noncombatants. They continued to use U.S. origin military equipment and actions during which human rights violations have taken place in direct violation of U.S. law.

Mr. Chairman, the Turkish police and military forces continue extrajudicial killings, unlawful detention, and torture, the numbers for which are all up during the last year. Authorities at all levels throughout the country continue to practice torture with impunity. Torture is systematic, widespread, and unpunished, even though it is illegal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PORTER was allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, in the rare case where torture claims are pursued, sentences are light. Convicted officers remain on the payroll while in prison and usually return to work when they are released; 1994 deaths in custody were the highest since 1982. Persons increasingly disappear while they are in police custody. Their tortured, mutilated bodies are usually found days, weeks or months later. In the first 3 months of this year, 77 people disappeared while allegedly in police custody, more than in all of last year.

Mr. Chairman, most disturbingly, the Government continues to harass, detain and prosecute writers, journalists, even elected parliamentarians who are critical of Government policies. One hundred sixty-six people are currently imprisoned under their sedition law.

Yashar Kemal, one of Turkey's most prominent writers, is today on trial for sedition under the so-called antiterror law. His crime is to criticize the Government's policy of terror against its Kurdish citizens, and he probably will be sent to prison.

Political organizations and media continue to face harassment and shutdowns. The Ciller government has indefinitely removed from consideration proposed Democratic reforms to the antiterror law. The state minister in charge of human rights, the first high ranking Government official to speak openly about torture, was relieved of his post earlier this year.

Turkey continues its intransigence regarding the occupation of Cyprus and the issue of transporting United States humanitarian assistance to Armenia. Thirty-five thousand Turkish troops remain in Cyprus, and negotiations are stalled. Turkey continues to block United States humanitarian assistance to Armenia.

Mr. Chairman, seven European countries in the face of these ongoing abuses have recently cut off all military assistance to Turkey, including France and Germany. The situation is that bad, and worsening, that these countries have cut off all military aid to this Government. An agreement between the European Union and Turkey for freer trade will not be taken up by the European Union for ratification because of ongoing Turkish human rights abuses.

Mr. Chairman, in this situation, it seems to me incumbent upon the United States to send a message to the Turkish Government that a violence only policy against its Kurdish minority is not acceptable; that it is not acceptable that they continue to prevent American assistance to Armenia; that it is not acceptable, Mr. Chairman, that they continue to torture and detain and execute without trial their own citizens, that it is not acceptable that they put people in prison for expressing their opinions about Government policy.

Turkey ought to be our close friend and ally, but we must have shared values, and we must send a message to this close friend and ally that their conduct simply does not meet international standards of any government on this Earth.

I commend the amendment to the Members.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. Chairman, U.S. foreign assistance is supposed to go to nations that share our values and who promote peace and security in ways consistent with American interests. It is becoming increasingly clear that the Republic of Turkey is not a helpful partner to the United States. Indeed, by its behavior, Turkey has been acting against American values and American interests. American taxpayers should not have to support many of the Turkish actions we deplore.

Opponents of the Porter amendment claim that United States assistance to Turkey provides strong American influence over Turkey. Yet that influence has not translated into better Turkish behavior. Ironically, supporters of the Porter amendment, like myself, also recognize that United States aid gives us influence over Turkey—and we believe it's about time we started using that influence to force Turkey to make the meaningful changes it has so far resisted.

Turkey is maintaining a blockade of its tiny, land-locked neighbor Armenia by preventing trade, transport and transshipment of humanitarian assistance to Armenia. This blockade is illegal—it is not sanctioned by the United Nations or any other international organization. Turkey is also supporting the blockade of Armenia by Azerbaijan. Turkey has extended military support to Azerbaijan, and continues to conduct military exercises and increase its forces on the border with Armenia. The Armenian Government has sought to be a good neighbor with Turkey. This despite a very troubled history between the two nations—particularly the genocide of the Armenian people at the hands of the Ottoman Turks, which Turkey continues to officially deny. But Turkey has not responded in kind. Instead, Turkey has tried to prevent Armenia from having greater contact with the West. In the mean time, Turkey continues to strive for improved relations with the West—through membership in the European Economic Community and as a major recipient of

United States economic and military aid.

It has been 20 years since Turkish troops first invaded the northern part of the Mediterranean island nation of Cyprus, leaving a trail of death, destruction and hundreds of thousands of refugees. In the two decades since this shocking breach of international law, Turkey has maintained and solidified its occupation of more than one-third of the territory of Cyprus with an estimated 35,000 troops. Turkey has continued this illegal occupation in complete defiance of the international community, spurning U.N. resolutions and the entreaties NATO countries, both here and in Europe, seeking a Turkish withdrawal.

Indeed, far from bowing to the international pressure, Turkey has gone in the other direction, having declared in 1983 the so-called ''Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus,'' recognized by no other country but Turkey. Recently, Turkey has increased the size of its occupation forces by adding 8,000 additional troops and new tanks and armored vehicles.

Turkey also curtails the civil rights of its minorities within its own borders. The mistreatment of the Kurdish people and the Christian community—including Armenian Christians in Turkey—is well-documented and has been eloquently described by Mr. PORTER and some of the other speakers.

Mr. Chairman, the message to Turkey must be that you cannot have it both ways. You cannot continue to benefit from the support of Western nations and call yourself a partner in peace and security, while flouting the basic principles of the Western democracies: respect for international law, respect for the sovereignty of your neighbors, and respect for the peoples within your own borders. Turkey has benefited from American largesse for many years, and the results have been disappointing. It is time to show that Turkey must clean up its act with regard to human rights if it wants to continue to receive United States support.

ENCOURAGE YOUR U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO CUT U.S. AID TO TURKEY

''I will be offering an amendment to cut some of these funds in order to send a clear message to Turkey that their ongoing genocide of the Kurds, and their treatment of their neighbors, Armenia and Cyprus, is absolutely unacceptable.''—Rep. John Edward Porter (R–IL), June 22, 1995.

The ANCA urges you to contact your U.S. Representative in support of Rep. Porter's amendment linking U.S. aid to Turkey to its blockade of Armenia, continued occupation of Cyprus, and escalating human rights violations, including widespread abuses against its Kurdish population.

Please call the Capitol Switchboard at (202) 225–3121 and ask to be connected to your Representative.

The House began debate on the foreign aid bill on Thursday, June 22nd. The vote on the Porter amendment is scheduled for Tuesday, June 27th. The entire House debate will be broadcast live on C–SPAN.

The last year the Congress withheld 10% of U.S. aid to Turkey because of concerns about human rights. The Turkish government responded by publicly rejecting any U.S. assistance which is linked to its record on human rights.

In February of this year, the State Department reported that the human rights situation in Turkey ''worsened significantly,'' during 1994. More recently, in May of 1995, the State Department confirmed that U.S. supplied weapons are being used in human rights violations by the Turkish government.

Human rights groups, including Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, have consistently identified Turkey as among the world's worst human rights abusers.

Turkey blockades U.S. humanitarian aid to Armenia, continues to occupy northern Cyprus, denies the identity of its Kurdish population, and places unfair restrictions on its Christian churches and communities.

THE PORTER AMENDMENT CUTTING U.S. AID TO TURKEY

Passing the Porter amendment will help to restore credibility to our foreign aid program by ensuring that recipients of U.S. aid adhere to basic international standards for human rights and humanitarian practices.

The U.S. State Department, in February of 1995, concluded that ''the human rights situation in Turkey worsened significantly in 1994.''

Human rights monitoring organizations have consistently documented extensive and widespread human rights abuses by the government of Turkey, including the use of torture.

Turkey is in violation of several international human rights agreements to which it is a party, such as the U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the European Convention on Human Rights.

Turkey continues to obstruct desperately needed U.S. humanitarian aid to Armenia.

Turkey continues to deny basic rights to 15 million Kurds and has used military force to deny them an identity.

Turkey continues its military occupation of Cyprus and has obstructed efforts to reach a just and lasting resolution on the island.

Turkey places unfair and prohibitive restrictions on Christian communities and churches.

MAINTAINING THE BAN ON U.S. AID TO AZERBAIJAN

Weakening the law restricting U.S. aid to Azerbaijan will represent a retreat from the principled position, adopted by the Congress in 1992, that Azerbaijan must make progress toward peace by lifting its blockades and abandoning a military solution to the Nagorno Karabagh conflict.

The Congress sends the wrong message by moving to weaken this restriction when, in the more than two years since the law was passed, the Azerbaijani government has not taken any steps to meet the clear conditions set forth in the Freedom Support Act.

Any attempt to lift the ban now will only encourage Azerbaijan to resist a political solution to the Karabagh conflict and keep their blockades in place.

A cease-fire has been in effect for over a year, but talks towards a settlement of the conflict have not yet been successful. Retreating from the conditions in the Freedom Support Act would seriously threaten a fragile peace and reward Azerbaijan for failing to comply with U.S. law.

The restriction on aid to the Azerbaijani government does not prevent the delivery of U.S. humanitarian aid to non-governmental organizations within Azerbaijan. To date, over $60 million in such assistance has been provided to meet humanitarian needs in Azerbaijan.

Azerbaijan fails to meet the democratic and human rights standards that U.S. taxpayers have the right to expect from recipients of foreign aid.

□ 0330

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

Mr. Chairman, our number one foreign policy priority should be to advance the national security interests of the United States. Turkey is clearly in our Nation's national security interest. Nothing more; nothing less.

Gen. John Shalikashvili, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, wrote this week in a letter to Chairman Callahan that:

> Now that Turkey occupies the new front line in the post-Cold War era, the strategic value to the United States of having a staunch and steadfast ally situated in a critical strategic location in the flanks and Middle East cannot be overstated. . . .

He added that:

> Turkey's continued participation in NATO as a strong ally of the U.S. remains vitally important as new security arrangements evolve in Europe.

He says:

> Imposing more restrictions on this valued ally will only hinder our attempts to encourage progress and bring about lasting change. . . . By withdrawing support for them and taking on the role of adversary, we lost access to key decision makers. Recent progress combined with Turkey's unquestioned strategic importance, should drive the United States to increase support to Turkey in order to achieve our objectives, not destroy bilateral relations.

This is the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff who is entrusted with maintaining the defense of our Nation. His concerns about our Turkey's strategic importance should be paramount in this debate.

Turkey's is vital for a number of critical reasons:

First of all, Turkey secures NATO's troubled southern flank. It maintains the second largest standing army in NATO.

It strengthens Western defenses against future turmoil should Russian reformers fail and aggressive Russian nationalism returns.

It is the only secular democracy with a free market economy that has a predominantly Moslem population. Strengthening this democratic ally is crucial to preventing the spread of terrorism associated with Islamic fundamentalism, and instability arising from repressive regimes.

Turkey is vital to the containment of Saddam Hussein. Without the use of NATO air bases in Turkey, where over 2,700 strike missions against Iraq were launched, we would not have been able to defeat Iraq without substantially more casualties and expense.

Turkey's help in closing Iraq's pipeline and honoring the embargo cost the Turkish economy around $20 billion in trade to cooperate with the United States in Desert Storm.

Turkey remains a close friend with Israel and a supporter of the Middle

East peace process. Turkey can help bridge the divide between Moslem and Western worlds.

Turkey's neighbors include Iran, Iraq, Syria, Russia, and the Balkans. And the stability in that very troubled sector of the world is vital to securing peace in one of the most volatile and dangerous sectors of geography.

Only yesterday, the Turkish Parliament approved a 6-month extension of Operation Provide Comfort, the international program which uses Turkish bases to deter Iraqi attacks against the Kurds of northern Iraq.

The State Department report on the situation in Turkey contends that Turkey has started human rights training for military, made public the Code of Conduct for the military, and is considering human rights and democracy proposals in the parliament. State Department states, ''We can and should expect progress.''

The State Department stated on June 14, 1995:

> Any cutoff in assistance would undermine Prime Minister Ciller's bold but vulnerable initiative to improve democracy and human rights in Turkey. This would damage the interest of the Kurds and other important groups in Turkey.

As former Secretary of State Alexander Haig stated in a column in yesterday's Washington Times:

> At this critical juncture, those who support cuts in assistance or in support for Turkey are willfully blind to U.S. strategic interests.
>
> In the absence of an effective U.S. Turkish partnership, the entire U.S. position in the Persian Gulf and the Middle East will be the biggest loser. The winners will be neither pro-Western nor those interested in human rights. It is high time that we recovered from strategic amnesia.

That from Alexander Haig.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that as well intentioned as this amendment may be, it fiddles dangerously with a U.S. strategic alliance with one of our NATO allies, and it should be rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight to support the Porter-Wolf-Smith amendment in moving to strike the $25 million in economic support funds to Turkey to express U.S. opposition to the intransigence of the Turkish government against its neighbors with acts of hostility, acts that historically have cast Turkey as a bad actor in the Near East.

When I say this, you know that as we hear reports, as we are privy to the news, Turkey has not been providing or promoting peace in the region. Beginning with its callous invasion of Cyprus 21 years ago, as we have heard, currently occupying that island with 35,000 Turkish troops speaks to their imperialistic stance that they have taken.

The Turkish army is constantly conducting military maneuvers near Armenia and has increased its forces on the Armenian border. The Turkish Army has extended military support to Azerbaijan in its conflict with the Armenians of Nagorno Karabagh.

Turkey continues to curtail and oppress the civil rights of its minorities. False charges of conspiring with the Kurdish movement are leveled against the Armenian church.

Turkey's genocide against its Kurdish minority, using U.S. origin weapons which have, as you have heard, resulted in the deaths of 15,000 Kurds, 2500 Kurdish villages that have been destroyed, Kurds forcibly evacuated, and three million Kurds made homeless refugees.

Turkey is no stranger to the crime of genocide. History will long note their genocide of Armenians, but they, to this day, continue to deny the fact of this atrocity some 80 years ago.

The Armenian genocide was a deliberate act to kill and to deport Armenians from Asia Minor. It takes its place in history with other acts of genocide such as Stalin's destruction of the kulaks, Hitler's calculated wrath on the Jews and gypsies, and Pol Pot's attempts to purge incorrect political thought in Cambodia by killing all of its people over the age of 15.

We do not have the ability, my colleagues, to go back and correct the acts of previous time or to right the wrongs of the past. I am sure, if we had that capacity, perhaps we could have prevented the deaths of millions of and murders of millions of men and women and children. But we can, however, do everything in our power to prevent such atrocities from occurring again, as they are occurring now.

Turkey's banning of books on the Armenian genocide and the imprisonment of its publishers is deplorable. Its persecution, its imprisonment of writers, of artists, of intellectuals, even members of their parliament, our counterparts, because they chose to dare to criticize Turkish policies against the Kurds, the Assyrians and Christians, this, this, my fellow colleagues, in what some of my colleagues have called the only Muslim democracy in the world. A democracy? I think not.

I think the greater question we must ask ourselves is why do we tolerate this bankrupt policy of Turkey? Simply because they are valued allies, I have heard. And because they played a critical role during the cold war. To be sure, we appreciate the use of their air bases and their listening posts on what was at that time the Soviet Union. But that is no longer. That is a heavy price for Americans to pay, for American taxpayers to pay when tanks, American tanks and American weapons, are used against innocent people and there is widespread torture and unlawful detention.

My colleagues, we have to send a strong message to Turkey, our so-called valued ally, that we can no longer tolerate this. Their human rights record leaves much to be desired. And this would send a clear and very salient message that we would like to see changes in their situation and provide for greater economic, political and social justice in that nation.

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

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the Porter amendment. If you listen to the debate on the Visclosky amendment and you were going to vote for it, you really have to vote for the Porter amendment.

Sure, Turkey has been our friends on things. But we really cannot close our eyes to what has taken place with the fundamental values that our country has. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] does not have with him now, but he had the pictures of the butchering, literally, the butchering of the Kurds and the ripping apart, and the body parts that are all over. He brought the pictures to the subcommittee meeting. You could not look at the pictures without getting sick.

Second, when I was in Nagorno Karabagh, all the weapons that the Azeris have used against the Armenians are supplied by the Turks. In the field was a Turkish tank that had been taken out. All the weapons had Turkish marks or American marks that we gave to the Turks because they are our NATO allies and then gave to the Azeris. You all know what took place on Cyprus. You all know what is going on there.

This is a moderate amendment. This is not a killer amendment. We stand for some fundamental values. I think to defeat the Porter amendment tonight would pretty much send words to the Turkish Government that they can do what they want to the Armenians. They can do what they want on Cyprus. They can butcher the Kurds, and the U.S. Congress will not speak out. I strongly urge a yea vote for the Porter amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, although I know you will be officially commended by the leadership of our committee, I want to add my thanks for the dignified and firm manner in which you have chaired over this process.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Porter amendment, and in doing so I want to acknowledge that Mr. PORTER is an internationally recognized champion of human rights, not only in Turkey but throughout the world. As we all know, he serves as co-chair with the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] of the Human Rights—I do not know if it is called caucus anymore in the House of Representatives.

He knows of what he speaks. He has studied this subject of Turkey long and thoroughly. He has visited there. He has documentation for the concerns that he has expressed, and he has provided a great deal of leadership to our committee and to this Congress on what is going on in that part of the world. I commend him for his leadership and for bringing this amendment to the floor.

Our chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], read a letter from General Shalikashvili which made a couple of points about our foreign policy interests in Turkey and Turkey being a strong ally, and that is true. However, I do not believe any of the reasons spelled out in General Shalikashvili's letter gives Turkey a license to brutally repress its people or us reason to ignore that fact.

My colleague, our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES] has documented some of the concerns that we have, and in the interest of time I will not go into them. However, I will comment that Turkey, as others may mention later, is in violation of several international human rights agreements to which it is a party, such as the Universal Declaration on Human Rights and the European Convention on Human Rights.

□ 0345

Last year the Congress withheld 10 percent of United States aid to Turkey because of concerns about human rights.

In February of this year, the State Department reported that the human rights situation in Turkey worsened significantly during 1994.

More recently, in May of 1995, the State Department confirmed that United States-supplied weapons are being used in human rights violations by the Turkish Government.

That is why it is very interesting to hear in the statement of one of our colleagues earlier that the State Department expects progress on human rights in Turkey, when as recently as May they have said that the situation has deteriorated. They have been saying this over and over, that they expect progress. In the meantime, we have to do something about it.

Human rights groups including Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch have consistently identified Turkey as one of the world's worst human rights abusers. Turkey blockades United States humanitarian aid to Armenia, continues to occupy northern Cyprus, denies the identity of its Kurdish population, and places unfair restrictions on its Christian churches and communities.

For years Congress has heard from the State Department about quiet diplomacy will lead to progress on Turkey's human rights record. Each year we have read letters and heard testimony on how Turkey will soon adopt sweeping reforms which will lead to broad-based democracy and respect for human rights. Indeed, we even heard that read to us again tonight. Sadly each year, we have been disappointed as the human rights environment in Turkey continues to deteriorate.

The Congress must take the lead in impressing upon Turkey that it abide by international standards for humanitarian practices and human rights. If Turkey fails to comply with the requirement, I believe it is our obligation to ensure that United States tax dollars do not subsidize the Turkish Government's abuses of its own citizens.

I said as I began, Mr. Chairman, that I would not use all my time, but I would like to take a moment again to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] for his leadership and once again the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] for his strong leadership on this committee.

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

Mr. Chairman, at least twice in the last 3 hours I have heard a reference to the Ottoman Empire. It is interesting to me that the nation of Turkey is being blamed for something that the Ottoman Empire, which does not exist today, may or may not have done 75 years ago.

The government of Turkey is not responsible for what happened in World War I. I do not think that this debate benefits by that being our center focus.

But let's talk about the Kurdish people, because we are being told that there is a systematic genocide of the Turkish people, but we are not being told about the PKK, which is a terrorist group that was founded by the KGB to disrupt one of our NATO allies. Yet even though the Soviet Union no longer exists, the PKK still does, killing tourists, disrupting the economy and trying to divide the nation.

I had an opportunity to visit Turkey recently and unfortunately also had the opportunity to see the result of one of the bombs in Istanbul that was designed to kill terrorists.

It did not accomplish its task. They found out that it was there and it was being towed away and it killed a tow truck driver rather than the tourists that it was aimed at.

But Turkey has a real threat to its national security. The PKK is intent on dividing the nation. Turkey has a right to defend its borders. It has a right to say if the PKK is going to use Iraq as a safe haven that it will go in and it will deal effectively with that terrorist attack that is coming across its border.

We also need to realize, Turkey is not anti-Kurdish. Roughly a quarter of the members of the parliament are Kurdish. But what about the 6 that were mentioned?

Let's quote a couple of the State Department because we heard some earlier quotes from the State Department. This is from June of this year:

''Currently as many as 25 percent of the members of the 450-seat parliament are Kurds.'' That does not sound like genocide of the Kurds to me.

As far as the 6 deputies, ''Six are in self-imposed exile in Europe and most of these have associated with the PKK.'' We need to take a realistic look at what is happening in that country and respect their ability to protect themselves.

As far as free expression and books being banned, Turkey has made progress. We are told, oh, things are getting worse. Things are getting better.

In 1991 the law was changed so that books can be printed in Kurdish. This is an example of a book printed in Kurdish since the law was changed.

The blockade. We passed a modification in the committee to prevent support going to nations that maintain the blockades, so that we are not allowing that. But, in addition, Turkey removed the air blockade. They are making steps forward.

Cyprus. I think it is very interesting that somehow we think that Turkey is the only party at fault in Cyprus. Do we have a proposal here to take everybody else involved and say, ''We're going to cut your funding by over half''?

I think it is a major mistake for this Congress to decide that Turkey is the only party at fault and, therefore, we are going to cut over half of their aid, we are not putting conditions certainly, we are just automatically saying $25 million of your $46 million in support is gone.

I think that that is very wrong. I think that things are improving in Turkey. But I also think we need to look at another very practical side. That is, our interests. Our interests are to maintain a strong relationship with a country that has worked very hard for us, has supported us, and it is not a one-way street.

As a NATO ally with the second largest ground force, they have been a significant factor. In Desert Storm, hundreds of Americans' lives were saved because we were able to use Turkey's air bases. One of the things that many of us do not realize is that Turkey has been the most effective participant in shutting off Iraq because the pipelines going through Turkey are closed and it has literally cost Turkey billions of dollars because of that sacrifice, because we have asked them to do so.

So we are sending them millions while they are losing billions in support of us. They are a friend that we can count on. There are two sides to the argument. I urge a strong ''no'' vote on the Porter amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Porter amendment which will hold Turkey accountable for the human rights abuses it has perpetrated over the past two decades.

According to the State Department, Turkey's human rights record ''worsened significantly in 1994.'' And they are using the military aid we send them to carry out these gross abuses.

Each year, American taxpayer dollars go to perpetrate a terrifying list of human rights abuses. Extra-judicial executions, tortures, missing persons, political imprisonment. The list goes on. It is time to put an end to this.

We have seen 21 years of Turkish occupation of Cyprus. Over two decades

since more than 200,000 Cypriots were driven from their homes in Cyprus and forced to live under foreign occupation. Turkey still has more than 35,000 troops on the island. And we still do not know what became of the 1,614 Cypriots and 5 American citizens missing since the Turkish invasion.

Turkey also continues to prevent United States humanitarian assistance from going to Armenia.

We must not tolerate these abuses that Turkey perpetrates. They have not shown significant signs of improvement, and we cannot let them roll the American taxpayers year after year. I urge my colleagues to make a statement that the United States will not tolerate this kind abuse. Please support the Porter amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, each Member when deciding how to vote on the Porter amendment is going to have to decide it on whether or not the human rights violations which have been now a matter of record, that the Turkish Government has perpetrated them all over the Middle East, and then decide, well, is it enough to hear the State Department's report on recent human rights violations? Is that enough for me, a Member of Congress, to reduce the aid to Turkey?

Maybe it is not enough. Maybe it is just episodic, maybe a few instances of brutality that we should overlook because of the long-term relationship that the United States has had with Turkey.

But then when one recounts that these are not just episodes but, rather, a campaign of brutality according to the State Department report, and then when you add to it the fact that in Cyprus, where only one nation attacked and stormed the shores of Cyprus, only one, and caused refugees and caused agony and caused other human rights violations, when you add that to the weighing-in of how you are finally going to cast your vote on the Porter amendment, and then you recall Armenia and you recall the patriarchate in Istanbul and the Kurds and one after the other, then you are going to be able to determine your vote not on just a scant report of recent violations but a government which has for decades, as someone else has referred to it, has for decades engaged in brutal conduct on its own citizens and on its neighbors.

The irony of it was, as the gentleman from California said, when the Cold War was at its height, we supplied weapons and economic aid to Turkey so that their weapons could be pointed toward the Soviet Union to keep them, to keep the Soviet Union, from ever being able to rush into the Middle East and fill the void of conflict that exists in that area of the world.

These weapons were pointed there. We said it was a matter of national security and NATO existence for us to make sure that the Turkish government was able to keep those weapons pointed at the Soviet Union.

What has happened since then? The Cold War ended, the Soviet Union collapsed, and these weapons were turned inwardly by the Turkish government toward their own citizens, toward Cyprus, facing west across the Aegean, and no longer can anyone in the State Department or in the Joint Chiefs of Staff aver that we need those guns pointed at the Soviet Union, which is useless. On the contrary, something must be done to turn those weapons away from the direction in which they are now pointed. That is the essence of the Porter amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we say the behavior of the Turkish government must be modified. This is a modest way in which to send that message and have the Congress play a small role in modifying that behavior. It does the United States no good at all to see the Cyprus situation, the Armenia situation, the Kurd situation continuously boil and continuously perpetuate itself in all the agony that exists in those parts of the world.

To say that Turkey helped us in the war against Iraq, well, so did Cyprus, so did a dozen other nations, so did 30 other nations supply materiel and airspace and all the other accouterments required for Desert Storm. So we cannot let bygones by bygones. It is a question of whether the past violations that we have outlined here in this debate are evidence of conduct, predilection toward future conduct of human rights violations and, therefore, adding instability to an area where we believe we ought to have stable government in order to protect our own national interests there.

Mr. Chairman, we need to support the Porter amendment and then urge the United States and the international community to solve the situation in Cyprus and Armenia and in the Kurdish part of Turkey and Iraq.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the Porter amendment.

Mr. Chairman, Turkey is indeed an ally of the United States, an important one. So is Greece. Frankly, from time to time, the governments of both countries have frustrated me.

I would say, also, that I opposed in committee the original intention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] to eliminate all aid to Turkey, because they are an important ally and I think we have to keep a focus on our own national interest, and I think our national interest requires a decent relationship with Turkey as well as the other countries in the region.

□ 0400

But I also think we have to remain true to our values, not just our interests.

And I think we expressed those values a year ago when the Congress asked for a report on the human rights situation in Turkey. We got it. It was not a very pleasant report.

And it seems to me that when we ask for a report on a subject as important as human rights and get one, we then ought to act on it. And if we are not prepared to act on it, then we ought not to ask for those reports in the first place because we are simply asking somebody to shuffle some paper to no good end.

And so it seems to me that the Porter amendment is a modest approach to try to send a signal that we do, indeed, care about human rights and we do expect that there is going to be an improvement and insist on an improvement in human rights in that country.

It is always a question of how far we go, how deeply we cut, how much of an amount we carve out in order to send that kind of a message. And I frankly do not know if the Porter amendment selects the right number or not. But I think it is a reasonable approach and it can be modified as we go through conference.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the worst thing of all that we could do would be to do nothing in this instance, because if we do that, I am afraid that the human rights abuses in Turkey will continue unabated. And I think the logical action that will flow from that is an eventual insistence by Congress that all aid be cut off and I do not think that would be healthy.

And so it seems to me that this is a modest approach and we ought to support it. It leaves Turkey with some $21 million in ESF and $320 million in SMF. I think that is a reasonable approach and so I would suggest that we support the Porter amendment.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my colleague from Illinois, Mr. PORTER, the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. WOLF, and the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. SMITH for offering this amendment.

We all recognize the importance of continuing United States security cooperation with Turkey. Turkey's importance as a Member of NATO and its role as a base for operation Provide Comfort and its support for U.N. sanctions against Iraq is noteworthy and fully appreciated by our own Government.

Nonetheless, along with many of my colleagues, I am deeply concerned about the human rights situation in Turkey, particularly the government of Turkey's action against the Kurds, against journalists and others which infringe upon the freedom of expression.

Our Committee on International Relations has received credible reports from human rights organizations of serious violations of international standards of human rights. Moreover, we remain deeply concerned about Turkey's continuing intransigence regarding its

ongoing occupation of Cypress by some 35,000 Turkish troops, not to mention the lack of information on the missing in action.

This amendment is targeted to cut only the economic support fund by some $25 million. It does not affect the funding of Turkey's foreign military financing program.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support the Porter-Wolf-Smith amendment. It sends a strong message to Turkey on the need to improve their human rights record.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by noting that in this Chamber, when there is a good cause to help people in a worthwhile endeavor, the name of the gentleman from Illinois, JOHN PORTER, is usually associated with it and tonight is no exception. I rise, therefore, in strong support of his amendment.

Through the years, we have on many occasions debated in this Chamber the question of American assistance to Turkey. I remember most of them, and frankly opposed most of them because Turkey was so critical to the United States during the cold war, because of its pivotal position in a dangerous place in the world.

But after all these years, and all of those votes, in the final analysis, we have no choice tonight. The cold war and its end has meant many things, but for this Chamber and the foreign policy of this country it certainly means this: A new freedom to look at friends and adversaries alike honestly, no longer needing to compromise for the Nation's security important national principles.

This much can be said of the United States in the post-cold-war period. There is no reason to compromise. Our highest principles cannot be bought simply because of security reasons.

Tonight, we need to take a firm and final stand on human rights in Turkey because, in fact, Turkey is two nations. It has an evolving democracy, to be sure. But it is also unmistakably involved in a genocidal campaign against hundreds of thousands of its own people; not simply abusing some of their rights, but villages that I have seen with my own eyes razed. Buildings taken to the ground, thousands of people who have disappeared from their homes. It is, to be certain, an ally of longstanding of the United States, but for nearly 3 decades engaged in an occupation of Cypress, standing harm's way against a fellow NATO ally.

It is, of course, a Nation that was helpful to the United States in the Persian Gulf war. But yet it unbelievably blockades humanitarian assistance to the Armenian people, one of the most desperate of nations on earth trying to struggle to create a new nation for itself. And yet our own country, despite this friendship cannot get assistance to Armenia because of a Turkish blockade.

Tonight, Mr. Chairman, the United States has an opportunity to follow the leadership of our European allies who have already taken a stand by ending their own assistance. And yet, Mr. PORTER does not ask that we do end assistance. He makes the incredibly modest proposal, leaving military assistance aside, for 50 percent basis, we reduce economic assistance.

Mr. Chairman, one day it will be asked where were you America when the villages of the Kurdish people were razed and their people were abused? Where were you? What did you do and what stand did you take? As it will be asked three decades later America, where were you when Cypress continued to be occupied? As it will be asked, where were you America when the Armenian people suffered, a new Nation was being created, but your own aid was being blockaded?

Tonight by standing with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], you can answer all 3 of these questions. That we stood as friends of Turkey to be sure, because it is better in friendship to be honest, to ask Turkey to correct its own behavior. That is worthy of a friendship with the United States. I strongly urge adoption of the Porter amendment.

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

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to add my commendations to my colleague from Illinois, Congressman PORTER, for sponsoring this important amendment. It is designed to hold the Turkish Government accountable for their human rights abuses and prevent U.S. taxpayer dollars from funding such violations.

This amendment is particularly timely, as the Turkish Government continues to suppress religious expression within its borders. Turkey has signed a number of international agreements guaranteeing freedom of religion, including the Treaty of Lausanne, a 1968 protocol between Greece and Turkey, the European Convention for Human Rights and several agreements issued by the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. In spite of these guarantees, the Turkish Government has systematically repressed the religious freedom of the Greek community and other ethnic minorities in Turkey.

Particularly disturbing to me is Turkey's failure to take strong action in the wake of several recent terrorist attacks against ecumenical patriarch Bartholomew I. The patriarch is the spiritual leader of the Eastern Orthodox Christian Church, representing over 250 million Orthodox Christians worldwide, including over 5 million residing in the United States.

On May 28, 1994, a provocation was staged by Muslim militants in Istanbul, Turkey, against the patriarch. Three bombs were placed in the attic of the building where the patriarch lives and were found shortly before they were set to explode. While the episode is ominous, it is only one in a series of provocations against the Patriarchate and the Greek Orthodox Christian Community in Turkey.

Other examples include the following: On March 30, 1994, unknown perpetrators threw a molotov bomb inside the back courtyard of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. In July 1993, the Christian Orthodox cemetery in Yenikoy was attacked by vandals and desecrated. Finally, there has been a concerted effort to convert the Church of Hagia (Saint) Sophia into a mosque.

In light of these events, I have introduced separate legislation in this Congress urging the Turkish Government to ensure the proper protection of the Patriarchate and all Orthodoox faithful residing in Turkey.

Also, of course, Turkey continues its illegal occupation of northern Cyprus—one recognized by no other government on Earth. Altogether this represents two decades of unanswered questions, two decades of division, two decades of human rights violations and two decades of cultural destruction.

Turkey continues to station more than 30,000 troops on the Island of Cyprus and also maintains 65,000 settlers there. In fact, the amount of U.S. aid we send to Turkey each year is roughly equal to the amount needed to maintain the 30,000-plus troops illegally occupying Cyprus. A coincidence? I think not.

A ''no'' vote, Mr. Chairman, on the Porter amendment endorses the human rights violation. A ''yes'' vote will send a strong message to Turkey that their policies of oppression will not be tolerated. So please, I ask my colleagues, vote ''yes''.

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

Mr. Chairman, some 6 or 7 or 8 years ago, I had the opportunity of going to Bulgaria. Before I went to Bulgaria, I spent some time with the Turkish ambassador and a number of Turkish parliamentarians. They were very concerned because the Bulgarians had circled a number of towns on the Bulgarian-Turkish border. One of them was Kurdzhali.

They had surrounded towns and forced Turkish Bulgarians to change their names. They had made it illegal to use the Turkish language. They had, in fact, tried as a Bulgarian Government to eliminate the Turkish culture in Bulgaria.

I went to Sofia, the capital of Bulgaria, and spoke to those officials, then the communist leaders of that nation. And then I got on a bus and traveled approximately 3½ to 4 hours south to Kurdzhali. Then Assistant Secretary of State Dick Shifter was with me and some other Members of this body were with me and we went door-to-door in that town and talked to people and by happenstance we found some people

that confirmed in fact that is what had happened.

The Bulgarian TV was with us and we made statements. The Bulgarian Government was surprised that we found confirmation of the allegations the Turkish Government had made.

So I rise today on behalf of the Porter amendment as someone who has in my role in the Helsinki Commission been an advocate of human rights for Turks. But when we ask for human rights, we must also be prepared to accommodate human rights.

And that sadly is not happening in Turkey. I commend the speech of our colleague, Mr. TORRICELLI. I thought he said it just right. Turkey is our friend. Turkey is an important ally. I do not delude myself, however that, Turkey has allied itself with us for our interests. They did it for their interests.

□ 0415

They had benefited by the protection of the NATO alliance and the alliance with the United States, and they have been an important ally of ours.

It is, frankly, a more complicated world in which we now live. When it was us and them, it was easy to point fingers at the Warsaw Pact nations and say they are awful, they are violating human rights, they are not allowing people to emigrate, and we were all united on that because after that, that was then, and we were us.

It is, as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] said, more difficult to look a friend in the eye and say, ''Friend, you're not acting properly, you're not complying with the rules of the Helsinki Final Act of the Uniform Declaration of Human Rights, and you are abusing your Kurdish citizens.''

In fact, my colleagues, non-Kurds in Turkey, if they happen to be in prison, have their human rights violated egregiously.

I have met on countless times with the Ambassador from Turkey in private because it was not my desire to confront Turkey in a public way. But frankly, my colleagues, I do not believe the Prime Minister, Madam Ciller, is in control of the actions of the Turkish military as we see thousands upon thousands upon thousands of refugees created, warring on their own citizens.

Yes, the PKK is a problem. They are terrorists, and the Turkish Government has a responsibility to its people and to its nation to confront that terrorism. But we must stand and say that that confrontation and dealing with terrorism should not be and must not be an excuse or rationalization for the continued undermining of the human rights of the Kurdish citizens and other citizens in Turkey. The Porter-Smith-Wolf amendment speaks to this issue.

I said on the amendment that we adopted of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY], also a complicated amendment, that America plays a very special place in the world. We speak with a loud voice. Let us tonight again speak with a voice on behalf of those who are weak and who have no voice.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Porter-Wolf-Smith amendment which would cut ESF assistance by $25 million, leaving Turkey with $21 million in that account.

Mr. Chairman, without question a stable and democratic Turkey is the best partner we could hope to have in that frightfully unstable region. Turkey has been a loyal friend who supported us in the Gulf War and continues to pay the price for standing up to Saddam Hussein. The economic costs of the Iraq embargo and lack of authority in northern Iraq have fueled terrorism and violence which has claimed the lives of more than 6,000 people since 1991.

Mr. Chairman, in recent years, aid levels to Turkey have decreased steadily, and Turkey's grants have already been converted to loans. Last year, Turkey received $46 million in ESF assistance. Additionally, 10 percent of Turkey's $363 million military assistance earmark was conditioned on the findings of a human rights report by the Departments of State and Defense. In response, Turkish leaders rejected the conditioned 10 percent and anti-American, particularly anti-Congress, rhetoric abounded in the Turkish press and Parliament.

The time has come for Congress and the President to reexamine available options to best support an important ally while remaining true to our human rights commitments. Striking such a balance is important. While we want to support Turkey's pro-Western, democratic oriented government, we cannot abandon what we continue to see in terms of human rights abuses and those who face oppression.

The State Department and Defense Department report on allegations of abuses by Turkey's armed forces confirmed OSCE and NGO data that Turkey's leaders have failed to improve human rights conditions. More than 2,000 Kurdish villages have been evacuated, creating 2 million internal refugees. Death squads operate unhindered and hundreds of civilians have disappeared or become victims of unsolved murders. Turkey's pending entry into an EU Customs Union, clearly linked to human rights improvements, has barely spurred cosmetic reforms to address laws which restrict free expression. While Turkey deserves our assistance in combating terrorism supported from abroad, the government's response to terror has only made the problem worse. Volatile combinations of violence and propaganda polarize Turkey's citizens and destabilize the political system, raising the possibility of a military coup.

Mr. Chairman, last Friday, a letter from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Shalikashvili, reiterating Turkey's strategic importance, was circulated with a ''Dear Colleague'' asking us to oppose the Porter amendment. I believe it is noteworthy that General Shalikashvili, who led international efforts to help Kurds after the gulf war, has personally engaged himself in a dialogue on human rights issues with his Turkish counterparts. This dialogue reaffirms the important linkage of human rights with security interests, but also raises some questions in my mind. First, has the human right situation in Turkey deteriorated to such a critical point that it must be raised at the highest military levels? Second, did such discussions contribute to the conclusions of the recent State Department and DOD report indicating that U.S. equipment has been used to commit rights abuses? And finally, what role does the Turkish military have in politics if, and I quote the letter, ''the Turkish military leadership is backing progress on human rights and is ready to make a concerted effort to see democratization legislation pass?''

Mr. Chairman, Turkey's present leaders seem unable to find a peaceful, political solution to the Kurdish problem. Nationalist policies promoted through military action are widely supported among the Turkish media, public, and almost all political parties. This is not surprising when one considers that those who advocate political solutions, including free expression and cultural rights for Kurds, are viewed as ''separatists'' and face significant jail time. Championing political, nonmilitary solutions to the Kurdish crisis would take an immense act of courage. While realization of such policies would certainly test the mettle of Turkish democracy, we must assure Turkey that we, her friends, would stand by her, for we all must collectively place our faith in the ability of our democratic institutions and values to overcome divisive issues.

Mr. Chairman, let us not forget the critical parliamentary elections in Turkey next fall. Many believe this election will be an historic last chance for the present political system and constitution. If a newly elected group of Turkish leaders is unable to decisively move toward peaceful resolution of the Kurdish impasse, many related crises will be exacerbated. Islamic fundamentalist and nationalist parties increasingly cut into support for Turkey's centrist, secular parties. Should the centrist parties lose control, Turkey will likely turn away from the West and could face increased internal conflict. That outcome would be devastating to the interests of both our countries and would pose serious threats to regional stability. In this context, Mr. Chairman, I would urge worldwide election monitoring institutions to set their sights on this important contest, where the potential for irregularities, especially in southeast Turkey, will be significant.

Mr. Chairman, keeping these issues in mind, aid to Turkey poses serious

questions. When we fail to raise the human rights issues, we seemingly condone and support Turkey's militaristic campaign against its own citizens. I would remind my colleagues and our friends in Turkey of a traditional Turkish saying: ''Words between friends are often the most bitter.'' A decision to condition aid to Turkey should not be viewed as a rejection of our friendship. I believe further demonstration of our concerns over deteriorating human rights conditions are warranted, not only to confirm our support for human rights and for those who support human rights in Turkey, but also for the interests of political stability in a crucial ally. I believe the porter amendment to cut Turkey's ESF funding from $46 to $21 million is an appropriate demonstration of our concern, and I call on my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House International Relations Committee and of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, the latter of which Mr. PORTER is cochair with Mr. LANTOS, I have stated repeatedly in committee and on the House floor that we must condemn human rights abuses whenever and wherever they occur. I say to my colleagues, ''You can't pick and choose,'' and for those, yes, Turkey has been an ally, and my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] clearly pointed out, however, the dichotomies in that relationship. But I reject those who suggest that that relationship at any price has to be maintained. There are some things that are not for sale.

The gentleman from Illinois is to be commended for pointing out the abuses perpetrated by Turkey in recent years. Yes, there are times when we must be firm even with our allies. And the time is now for us to be firm with our NATO ally, Turkey. So, it is right that we condemn the human rights violations committed by Turkey within and beyond its borders. And it is right that we pursue the mild sanctions proposed in this amendment.

I ask my colleagues, should we be providing any assistance whatsoever to a country which responds to its critics in the press by stopping the presses and shutting up writers—even the Nation's leading author—by throwing them in jail without due process?

Should we be providing any armaments whatsoever to a government which according to our State Department turns around and uses those armaments to repress ethnic minorities such as the Kurds?

Should we be providing any assistance whatsoever to a country which for 21 years has forcibly and illegally occupied with 35,000 troops the tiny island nation of Cyprus? The Turkish occupation of Cyprus has dashed the dreams and destroyed the hopes of thousands of families in Cyprus. And it continues to this very day.

And how about the missing in Cyprus? Over 1,000 Cypriots and several Americans missing after the Turkish invasion 21 years ago? Should we forget those people? Should we forget our fellow Americans who are among the missing?

And should we be providing any assistance whatsoever to a country which has been blocking U.S. humanitarian assistance from reaching the great people of Armenia? Armenian children have had to do without schooling, and hospitals have been unable to care for the sick and the dying. There is no justification for this type of behavior, and American taxpayers should not be asked to reward or appease these types of actions.

So, it would seem to me that maybe we should not even be providing a penny of U.S. aid to a country which behaves so punitively toward its own people and towards it neighbors.

And yet, despite the troubling activities outlined above, the United States nevertheless provides aid to Turkey to the tune of $375 million per year. This amendment does not seek to drastically change that aid relationship. Instead, it simply seeks to reduce that total by $25 million. This is a reasonable amendment. And it is a responsible approach. I join Mr. PORTER in support of his amendment to modestly reduce aid to Turkey. I urge Members to support the amendment. Vote ''yes.''

Soon the daybreak will probably come upon the Capitol and bring with it the promise of a new day. I would urge my colleagues that the beacon of light that has shined throughout the night from this Capitol to the rest of the world become a promise of a new day for human rights in Turkey, in Armenia, in Cyprus, and we can do that by voting for this amendment.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the Porter amendment, cutting back economic support fund assistance to Turkey, is a good amendment and deserves the support of the House.

It is time to put an end to the bureaucratic inertia and mindset that believes that once a country receives U.S. economic assistance, we have to give millions more every year from then on.

Turkey does have economic problems, but most of its problems are those that only they can solve.

Forty percent of Turkey's manufacturing is under state control. With numbers like that, it is no wonder that the economy lags. Turkey's continued occupation of parts of the Island of Cyprus is unacceptable, as is the human rights situation there.

Most of all, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the Porter amendment would send a strong message to Turkey that the time has come to work out its differences with Greece and to create a lasting peace in the eastern Mediterranean.

Such a reconciliation and the ending of tensions could do more for Turkish prosperity and stability than any conceivable level of American economic assistance.

That message needs to be sent, and will be sent, if the House adopts the Porter amendment. I urge everyone to vote for this amendment.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, we all know that Turkey was a front-line state in the cold war on the border of the Soviet Union, and we know that Turkey still has a very important strategic location. Certainly it is in America's interests to remain on good terms with allies of strategic importance. But our foreign policy is not just about military strategy. Our foreign policy at root is about our values, and how best we can promote those values, and how best we can encourage our allies to embrace our values.

☐ 0430

It certainly is not consistent with the values that America has or America seeks around the world to have Turkey blocking the transit of United States humanitarian aid to Armenia. It is not consistent with American values to have Turkey intransigent for decades regarding Cyprus, its invasion, its occupation of Cyprus by 35,000 Turkish troops.

It is not consistent with American values that Turkey continues its genocide against its Kurdish minority, using United States-made weapons, which has resulted in 15,000 deaths, 2,500 Kurdish villages destroyed or forcibly evacuated, and 3 million Kurds made homeless refugees. It is not consistent with American values that Turkey oppresses the human rights of its own citizens.

The State Department of the United States in its own evaluation said, ''Despite the government's pledge in 1993 to end torture and to establish a state of law based on respect for human rights, torture and excessive use of force by security personnel persisted throughout 1994.'' The State Department report goes onto say, ''The human rights situation worsened significantly in 1994. The police and security forces often employed torture during periods of incommunicado detention and interrogation, and the security forces continued to use excessive force against noncombatants.''

The State Department says, ''Various agencies of the government continue to harass, intimidate, indict, and imprison human rights monitors, journalists, lawyers and professors, for ideas which they expressed in public forums. Disappearances and mystery murder cases continued at a high rate in the southeast.'' It says, ''. . . the

government infrequently prosecutes police or security officers for extrajudicial killings, torture, and other abuses. In the cases which produce a conviction, lenient sentences were usually given. The resulting climate of impunity that has been created probably remains the single largest obstacle to reducing unlawful killing, torture, and other human rights abuses.''

Finally, the State Department says, ''Human rights monitors hesitate to estimate the number of persons in custody who might reasonably be considered political prisoners. They estimate only that thousands have been detained.''

These are not the values that America should be promoting throughout the world. We should support the Porter amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of the Porter-Smith-Wolf amendment.

Mr. Chairman, over the last several weeks, I have stood side by side with members of the large and vibrant Greek, Cypriot, and Armenian-American communities that I am privileged to represent.

I heard first-hand about the injustices perpetrated against their homelands by Turkish Governments of the past, and about the terrible human rights violations that continue to this day.

Sadly, there isn't anything we can do to undo the suffering of the past.

But we in Congress have every obligation to use our clout with Turkey—particularly the power of our pocketbook—to stop the suffering of the present.

We should join with France and other European countries which have cut their aid in response to Turkey's massive human rights abuses.

Turkey is paying a moral price for its abuses and now we must make it pay a financial price as well.

For over 2 years Turkey has maintained its illegal occupation on Cyprus, in violation of innumerable U.N. resolutions.

This amendment, cutting $25 million in economic assistance, sends a strong signal that the United States will no longer tolerate Turkey blocking a solution to the conflict on Cyprus.

We will no longer tolerate abuses against Kurdish civilians, particularly with American-made weapons.

We will no longer tolerate the mistreatment of Christians in Turkey and the harassment of Orthodox clergymen.

We will also no longer tolerate the stranglehold of the Armenian blockade.

For over 2 years, Turkey has blockaded the small, land-locked country of Armenia, denying that country the most basic humanitarian assistance—food, medicine, and clothing.

To make matters worse, much of this humanitarian assistance has been U.S. aid.

Turkey is using United States money to help keep United States aid from reaching a third country.

Allowing our ally Turkey to deny United States humanitarian assistance to people in need discredits our Nation's foreign policy and sets a terrible precedent for abuse by other nations.

Support human rights.

Support simple human dignity.

Support a credible U.S. foreign policy.

Support the Porter-Smith-Wolf amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, as I have listened to various speakers talk about pockets of communities of Greeks, pockets of communities of Americans, pockets of communities of Armenians, pockets of communities of other ethnic groups, I have not heard anyone say they are here to speak for the pocket of Turks in America. And, strangely, they have not, because for historical reasons, the Turks did not immigrate to America, so they have no voice to stand before the Congress of the United States to say anything kind or good about the Turks of the world.

So I come before you, my colleagues, as a voice for the Turks, because I lived in that country. Not because I asked to go there, but because your Government, my Government, sent me there as a youngster, as a young soldier.

To the gentlewoman from California and for the others who have said the Turks have attacked the Christians, and my good friend the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], I must tell you that 28 years ago in a small village called Sinop, I worshipped my all-mighty God and Jesus Christ without fear. Last year my 20-year-old daughter spent a week with a Turkish family in Istanbul, and, yes, she went to an Armenian Christian wedding. She did not understand the words, but she understood the Christian symbolism of marriage. And when the wedding was over, she tells me that she went outside, and in the same block as the Christian Armenian church, there was a Jewish synagogue in the same block, and in the same block was a Moslem mosque.

So if I were a Turkish citizen today, I would ask my Government in these words of friendship from the American Congress, why has the Congress of the United States declared war? Because I sat in this very Hall when we passed a resolution declaring war on Iraq for invading Kuwait, and I heard the same words.

It is not an easy neighborhood that the Republic of Turkey lives in. The Turks gave the women in that country the right to vote before we did in this great land of ours called the United States of America. And today a woman is head of government, and nowhere else in that region of the world has a woman headed their government. They have free elections in Turkey. And, yes, there are Kurds in the parliament, and I have met them and talked to them, and they are under death threats. But not from Turks, but from the PKK.

So I ask you, why are we doing this? My good friend from New Jersey and others have said let us send them a message. What message are you sending Iraq and Iran, next-door neighbors? What message are you sending Bulgaria? What message are you sending Syria?

So, my colleague and friends, why would any country on this Earth want to be an ally of our great country, when this body stands and attacks the people? Why would a mother in Turkey want her son to go to Korea when our Government asks? Why would a mother in Turkey want her young son to stand at the battle lines of freedom and democracy?

If I were a Turk, I would ask my Government to break its friendship with a country that talks about mine the way this body has tonight. There will be no other voice who has lived in Turkey. There are no Turks that gather in any of the 435 congressional districts in this body. There are no Turks in my district. There are no Armenians in my district. There are very few Greeks, if any, in my district. But why is that important? I thought we came here as Americans. I thought we came to this body to do what was good for the United States of America.

So I urge Members to defeat the Porter amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight in support of the Porter-Smith-Wolf amendment. I believe that Congress must take a strong stand relative to Turkey, because of its blatant refusal to abide by the international norms of conduct toward its neighbors and its own citizens.

First, Turkey practices gunboat diplomacy, recently authorizing the use of military force against Greece if Greece exercises its internationally recognized right to patrol its coastal waters up to the distance off the coast prescribed in the international law of the sea.

Second, Turkey continues to violate the rights of its citizens, and was behind only China in the number of pages devoted to a single country in the 1994 State Department Human Rights Report.

Third, Turkey has also been widely criticized for violating United States law when they used United States weapons against its Kurdish minority. Three million Kurds are now rendered homeless.

Finally, Turkey continues its 21 year military occupation of Northern Cyprus with its 35,000 troops.

I strongly believe that the most effective policy the United States can pursue is to convince Turkey of the seriousness of our support for the principles of human rights by imposing

strict conditions on the granting of United States aid.

I close by urging my colleagues to support this amendment. The use of foreign aid money must be held to strict standards. In light of Turkey's failure to comply with international standards for human rights and humanitarian practices, it is our obligation to ensure that United States tax dollars do not subsidize the Turkish government's abuses against its own citizens and its neighbors.

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

Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot said early this morning about the situation in Turkey, and I think it is very easy for us to sit in the warmth of this building and the security of our great country and talk about what another nation should do. But I think it would be helpful to remember that Turkey is surrounded by Iran on its southern Border, and Iraq and Syria, all terrorist nations. It has been said many times this evening and this morning that the PKK is a terrorist organization, operating out of Iraq, and the Turkish Government has taken many steps to try to remove that terrorism from its country. As a result, we also know and reports have shown without dispute that the PKK has committed acts of terrorism and has committed many killings of Turkish people throughout the country of Turkey. And today Turkey finds itself in the unenviable position and task of trying to reconcile human rights, to protect its democracy, while defending itself in a very unstable part of the world and against a well-organized and well-financed terrorist organization.

So I think it has been said many times this morning that Turkey is a vital military ally of the United States, going back to the Korean war, through the cold war, through the Persian Gulf War. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] said earlier today that Turkey received more from being an ally to the United States than it gave, but I would like to remind this body that as a result of the Iraqi war, Turkey lost over $20 billion because of the embargo on the Turkish-Iraqi pipeline, and the fact that it lost its trade with Iran, its second largest trading partner.

□ 0445

So, its support of the United States has come at a dear cost to Turkey. The Clinton administration asked for $100 million in economic aid. The committee reduced that to $46 million, and now the Porter amendment wants to reduce it down to $21 million. I think it is sending a wrong message to a vital ally to reduce funding when they live in such an unstable area of the world surrounded by terrorist nations, a terrorist organization operating within the country, and I think the Turkish people and the Turkish Government has shown that it is committed to improving its human rights activities and I would urge a vote against the Porter amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, we are trying to determine how many speakers there are on each side and we have no idea where they are or where they are coming from or which side they are on. Can the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] give us an idea of how many Members over there wish to be heard?

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I see nine.

Mr. CALLAHAN. How many on this side? I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I think it is very much in the interest of everybody not to resurrect the rancorousness of earlier in the evening by getting into an argument about limitation. So I hope we can avoid a formal limitation. I would also hope, and I know some Members are still interested in talking on this amendment frankly I think on both sides. We underestimated the number of Members who did want to talk. So I guess I would simply ask Members for restraint in continuing on this amendment, and ask Members to hold their remarks as short as possible and if they do not absolutely feel obligated to speak, ask if they would consider not doing so, simply because we still have seven amendments remaining after this. We have one more which we expect will take some time, and we would like to finish this thing before 7 in the morning.

Mr. CALLAHAN. I agree, and I have no intention of offering a limitation. I was just trying to make an inquiry in deference to all of those who wish to speak, to give them an opportunity, but to recognize that we have heard just about every aspect of this.

It is my understanding that on this side, and we welcome listening to it again, we do not have any problem with that, but I think our own side of the aisle we are pretty well down to just me closing it out. If we could encourage the gentleman's side to be as brief as they possibly could, let us get through and give them the opportunity and give some of them the opportunity they want to revise and extend their remarks, and we will put it in the RECORD tomorrow. But if we could get through this in a timely fashion I would very much appreciate it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Porter amendment, commend our friend from Illinois for offering it along with his cosponsors.

Mr. Chairman, one of the previous speakers who spoke in opposition to the Porter amendment said we should focus on the question of whether it is appropriate and good for the United States. What is appropriate and good for the United States is to practice as well as preach principles of respect for human rights, and support for peaceful resolution of disputes among States as the cornerstones of our foreign policy, except in cases, except in cases where a vital national interest of our own would dictate otherwise.

The record is replete with examples in which Turkey has violated and is violating these principles dear to our own foreign policy. We need only look to the constant refusal of Turkey to permit independent monitoring of human rights conditions within that country by international organizations. We need only look to the shabby and often persecution that takes place of Christians within Turkey. We need only look with respect to the behavior of the Turkish Government toward the Kurds. We need only look toward the continuation of the ruthless blockade of Armenia, and finally, we need only look to the continued illegal occupation of the island of Cyprus with the active support of Turkey.

The record is replete with examples of Turkey's disregard for the principles that we say inform our foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, I would submit that the country whose principles ought to be measured in the Porter amendment is not Turkey. The country whose principles are to be measured in the Porter amendment is the United States. The principles we measure are whether we talk about what we believe in, or whether we act upon that in which we believe.

I know that there have been arguments advanced as to ways in which continuing this level of support for Turkey serves the strategic best interests of the United States. For years we heard that a policy which did not ruffle the feathers of Turkey was important as a check against Soviet aggression. That rationale evaporated with the existence of the Soviet state in 1991.

Those who explicitly or implicitly argue it argue with respect to a world that no longer exists.

There is the argument that is made that Turkey's continuing importance as a military force, as a positive military force in that region requires a continued level of support. Frankly, that issue was taken off the table when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] drafted his amendment, because his amendment does not reduce military assistance from the United States to Turkey. To the extent that the military force must remain a positive one, the Porter amendment does not jeopardize or undercut that military support.

Finally, there are those who say that the continued cohesion of NATO depends upon a relationship between the United States and Turkey which does not reduce or otherwise threaten United States aid to Turkey.

My colleagues, I would submit that it is important in this post-cold-war era that NATO evolve beyond being a force that stands against a negative presence in Europe, and must evolve into a positive force that stands for some positive

principles. First among those principles ought to be the active practice, the active practice of the use of international law and peaceful means to determine disputes among nations.

Turkey does not practice such a process.

The Porter amendment is carefully tailored. It is modest in scope. It is well thought out. Although it is modest in scope and particular in detail, it represents a dramatic departure from the status quo politics which have plagued our insufficient reaction to the atrocities on Cyprus, the atrocities in Armenia, the atrocity committed against the Christians in Turkey, against the Kurds, and the general dismal record of Turkey on human rights.

Let us not only send a message to Turkey tonight, let us send a message to our own citizens, Mr. Chairman, tonight that in the United States we are finally ready to practice what we preach.

Support the Porter amendment.

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

(Ms. ESHOO asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Porter-Wolf-Smith amendment and urge my colleagues to do so as well. The hour is very, very late, but the moment is right. This amendment, which does amend the Foreign Aid Appropriations Act, reduces nonmilitary assistance to Turkey. I think that with many of the things that have been said throughout this evening that that is an important point to underscore. It reduces nonmilitary assistance to Turkey, to encourage that country to improve its human rights record.

I will not go through it; so many other Members have. It is not a record that the American people can point to with pride and say we want to indeed send our tax dollars to them.

This amendment is intended to draw attention to Turkey's brutal blockade of Armenia, its systematic oppression of citizens in Cyprus, and the Kurds, and restrictions on free expression in Turkey. Armenia is suffering under a two-sided blockade supported to the west by Turkey and to the east by Azerbaijan.

I am not going to continue my comments but ask that they be revised and extended for the RECORD, Mr. Chairman. The hour is late.

There is a last comment that I would like to make, and that is that one of our colleagues this evening spoke about the Ottoman Empire. And it was they that imposed the genocide upon the Armenian people and that this government should not be held responsible.

The Government of Turkey should follow the Government of Germany that acknowledged what a previous government did; to this day they still pay for that. The present Government of Turkey has never acknowledged that they annihilated 1½ million people. I think that this is an important distinction to make, and I think that that is inherent in the amendment that is before us.

I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, especially the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], and the original cosponsors of this for the work they have done and thank the chairman as well for his dignity and patience this evening.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise this morning to support the Porter-Wolf-Smith amendment. I think it is a good idea. You know, a lot of people wonder what exactly foreign policy is all about. Some of them, I think in America have the mistaken notion that foreign policy is just a matter of us playing Santa Claus to the rest of the world. It is not the way it is supposed to be. Foreign policy is supposed to be a vehicle which reflects what we believe in and what we stand for.

Well, it seems to me that we stand for human rights. But we have a problem in Turkey: 15,000 deaths, 2,500 Kurdish villages destroyed or forcibly evacuated, and 3 million Kurds made homeless refugees.

We have another problem. We believe in a free press as part of democracy. But Turkey has persecuted and imprisoned writers and journalists. When there has been public criticism, Turkey has responded with repression.

So we have a legitimate problem, we have a legitimate reason to take Turkey to task on this issue.

The first thing some opponents would say is, well wait a minute, Turkey is our ally. And I think our colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI], put it very well. Sometimes we have to speak with our allies, pull them aside. This amendment says, I think, and even sends, I think, a modest message. Let me emphasize we are not talking about military aid. I acknowledge that Turkey has threats from the PKK, from Iraq and Iran, but this is not military aid.

We are giving $320 million in military loans to Turkey in this budget. This is a mere $25 million in economic aid as a means of saying to our ally, wait a minute, we think you are doing some things that are not consistent with what we as Americans believe in.

I just want to communicate to the American people what we stand for and why we have a foreign policy. This is an excellent opportunity to do it. It enables us to say we stand for human rights, we want to see a free press, we are against repression, and even when our allies do it, we are willing to take them to task on it.

□ 0500

I do not think this measure threatens the security of Turkey, but enables us to stand up. I have said on this floor on a couple of occasions, as a member of the Committee on International Relations, that we have to lead, that we should be engaged in the world, that we should have foreign aid, but I do not believe we should have a passive foreign policy. Making these kinds of decisions, saying to our allies, ''We think you're wrong,'' standing up for the principles we believe in, reflects the kind of leadership that I think all Americans can understand, and reflects the kind of foreign policy that all Americans can understand.

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

Mr. Chairman, my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] said before that everything that has to be said has been said but not everyone has said it. I will not take the full 5 minutes, but I want to add my voice very strongly in support of the Porter amendment.

I have had the pleasure for the past several years of working very closely with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] on the Cyprus issue. I think, of course, that is a very, very important as of yet unresolved issue. Last year my bill, cosponsored by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], passed Congress and was signed into law by the President calling for a full investigation of the missing Cyprus, including six American citizens.

Turkey has been an ally of the United States for many years but has turned away, turned a blind eye, turned a deaf ear whenever we have asked for an accounting of the missing in Cyprus and an accounting of our American citizens. That is totally unacceptable.

Our colleagues have mentioned how Turkey invaded Cyprus back in 1973, has divided the island, has refused as far as I have seen any kind of reasonable attempts at mediation, and I certainly think that 22 years now is far, far too long.

I think it really behooves us to say to Turkey, or to any ally, or to anyone that is a recipient of United States foreign aid, that there is a certain modicum of behavior which we expect, and if you do not adhere to that, to that decent way, then we are going to act accordingly.

When we look at Cyprus and the way Turkey has behaved, at the way they have behaved toward the Armenians, at the way they have reacted toward the Kurds, it really makes one stop and pause. I think we have seen here this evening and this morning an outpouring of colleagues on both sides of the aisle expressing a grave reservation at the way Turkey has acted.

It is a NATO ally, it has American weapons. We are not happy with how they have used them, but the Porter amendment does not really address that. It talks about nonmilitary aid. I think it certainly makes sense to support this amendment.

I urge my colleagues to support it and am glad that we have such bipartisan support.

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

words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I know the hour is late or, if you want, the hour is early. Yet the principle that this amendment is espousing is something that I actually compliment my Republican colleagues on the Committee on Rules for making a number of these type amendments in order on this bill, in many ways better than the first 2 years that I was in Congress in the 103d Congress, to really give us an opportunity in this bill to, both by words but also by deeds, send a message in our foreign policy.

We have already taken action on this bill that has clearly sent signals around the world about American foreign policy: that yes, we have national security interests and obviously, as the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations mentioned, and I think there would be unanimity for support of that, that that is our No. 1 interest but that is not our only interest. There are other interests that come into play and we can send messages to try to influence. Because if that is only what we are interested in, then really what are we and who are we as a country?

Mr. Chairman, we previously have taken action in terms of the Cuban nuclear powerplant, in terms of the Visclosky amendment on Armenia. Now we have an opportunity to take action regarding Turkey, action that really sends a message because of some of the specific human rights violations that Turkey has engaged in that are irrefutable, that are 100 percent proven on a factual basis by independent agencies, and also really specifically respond to the conditions in Cyprus, where it has been pointed out American citizens are still missing in Cyprus, an area and an activity. How—if we do not pass this amendment—are we supposed to let Turkey know that there is a fundamental problem with the occupation of the island?

As has been pointed out but needs to really be emphasized, there is no question, I do not believe there is one Member in this Chamber who would argue with Turkey's critical part of the NATO alliance. But again I urge my colleagues to look at the numbers in the amendment and look at the numbers in the bill.

This amendment does not address the $320 million in military FMF loans to Turkey. That is not what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] is addressing. What it does address is the ESF loans or ESF aid of $25 million. That is clearly an area where by our actions—in the action that hopefully we will be taking in a short time—we will send a very clear and unequivocal message to Turkey that their actions in the invasion of Cyprus, the continued occupation, the oppression, the torture, the missing Americans that are still missing regarding that invasion, that those people and those actions are not unheeded and are not ignored by the Members of this Congress. By our actions and by our deeds, we will have an ability to change that and change the course, as we have done in a number of instances already, and as I believe we will do in a continuing effort.

I really see this as a bright day and really bright 2 days of the U.S. Congress in terms of our actions on this bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I thank the Chair for his attentiveness and those of the House. I will try not to rehash what has been talked about too much, but I wanted to focus on something that my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH], just mentioned. That is a fact that, as they say, we do have a dog in this hunt.

Back in 1974 during the invasion of Cyprus, five American citizens were captured. One of them was a 17-year-old young man from Detroit, MI, Andrew Kassapis. A year ago, on the 20th anniversary of the invasion in Cyprus, I had a chance to meet his father outside. He is still filled with the hurt and the wonderment of what has ever occurred to his son. Yet we have got to remember, this 17-year-old boy who if he is now alive would be 38 years old, was with his family in Cyprus. Andrew was taken from his family, with his American passport in hand, he was reported to have been taken alive and seen alive in a Turkish prison some weeks later. Among some of the 1,614 Greek Cypriots who were taken and who are still unaccounted for were an infant, two 3-year-olds, one 7-year-old, a 9-year-old, an 11-year-old, and a 14-year-old.

Throughout this debate in the late night and early morning hours, the word ''modest'' has been said many times. Indeed, the Porter amendment is very modest, when you take a look at all of the elements that come into question in Turkey's abuse of civil rights and you take a look at what has occurred, in particular the invasion of Cyprus.

Mr. Chairman, this invasion and these abductions could not have occurred with American arms and a conscious American decision not to stop this invasion as we did 10 years prior. Over $8 billion of American taxpayer dollars have gone since then, since those American citizens were taken. Again, we are not talking about military aid. We are talking about a message on only the economic aid front.

Twenty-one years ago when the Turkish troops using American arms illegally invaded, ethnically cleansed, and occupied the northern third of Cyprus, in that process 6,000 Greek Cypriots were killed, ethnically cleansed 200,000 Greek Cypriots from their ancestral homes and captured those 5 Americans and 1,614 Greek Cypriots who are still missing today.

Today over 35,000 Turkish troops illegally occupy the northern third of Cyprus. This illegal occupation of Cyprus is in violation of over 67 United Nations resolutions and over 30 congressional expressions of opposition. Today America is paying for that ethnic cleansing. Each year the United States continues to send hundreds of millions of dollars in cash to the government of Turkey. However, these funds are fungible. Coincidentally, they are equal to the cost of maintaining the Turkish military units in Cyprus. Additionally, the nearly half billion dollars of military equipment the United States gives to Turkey in foreign aid each year replaces on mainland Turkey the massive amounts of arms that Turkey deploys on Cyprus to block the ethnically cleansed area.

We also must talk just very briefly about the enclaved, the American-supported conditions on Cyprus. Again we are asking for a modest message to be sent.

Those enclaved people have prohibitions against leaving their village without official permission. They have a requirement that any talk with outsiders must occur in the presence of their police; a requirement that all mail in and out be read by the regime; the prohibition of the possession of a telephone; the requirement of reporting to their police once a week for males 18 to 50 years of age; the prohibition of educational facilities beyond elementary school and the replacement of elementary school teachers; the prohibition of elementary school's teaching of that ethnic group's history or religion and the confiscation of such books.

I just want to say there is harassment, there is beating, there is rape, there is murder, there is desecration of churches. We are asking for a modest step to be taken. I ask that the people of this House support the Porter amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Porter-Wolf-Smith amendment. This amendment does not in any way affect the $320 million in military aid to Turkey but does cut $25 million in economic aid. It does that in order to express U.S. opposition to several Turkish policies, especially the occupation of Cyprus.

I will be short, Mr. Chairman, but a May 30, 1994 report by U.N. Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali has termed Cyprus one of the world's most highly militarized areas in terms of ratio between the number of troops and the civilian population. Twenty years ago, Mr. Chairman, Turkish troops invaded the northern part of the island nation of Cyprus, leaving death in its wake and since has not only occupied that nation with 35,000 troops but has over time increased the occupation some 8,000 troops. Again, that was marked and noted by U.N. Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali as a particular violation. I think that is

reason enough to support this amendment, reason enough to send that message to Turkey in cutting that $25 million in economic aid.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois to condition United States aid to Turkey.

Mr. Chairman, it is important to understand why we bring this amendment to the floor today.

Yes, Turkey is an ally of the United States.

Yes, Turkey is a member of NATO.

And yes, Turkey is a country that receives United States aid.

But Turkey is also a country that uses our dollars to knowingly and willingly block United States humanitarian assistance;

It is also a country that uses our dollars to keep its troops stationed in Cyprus.

And it is also a country that not only uses our dollars to routinely violate human rights but last year, it actually threw six members of its own parliament into jail for speaking out on behalf of human rights.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that unless Turkey changes its ways—it no longer deserves to receive even a dime of United States aid.

It is utterly inconceivable to me that a country who is an ally of ours, who is a member of NATO, and who accepts U.S. aid, would think it has the right to block U.S. humanitarian assistance to people in need.

But that is exactly what Turkey is doing today in Armenia.

Over the past 6 years, full-scale war in Nagorno-Karabakh—which borders Turkey—has left tens of thousands of people killed and wounded, over 1 million people homeless, and countless villages disabled and destroyed. As a result, thousands of people are starving and dying today in Armenia. As a nation, we have taken steps to provide humanitarian relief to save lives. But unfortunely, the most direct route for that aid is through Turkey. And to this day, Turkey continues to block those relief efforts. As a result of this blockade the cost to supply aid to Armenia today is three times higher than what it would be without the blockade.

So not only is Turkey taking our money and using it to block aid but by keeping this blockade in place, it is costing us three times as much money to pursue our own foreign policy interests.

That is money that could be used to heal, to feed, or to warm thousands of suffering people.

And we can't let this situation continue.

As a nation, we have been far too lenient with the Government of Turkey.

Just look at the situation in Cyprus.

Twenty-one years ago, Turkish troops invaded the island of Cyprus.

As a result of that invasion thousands of people were killed, over 200,000 people were expelled from their homes, and today over 1,600 remain missing—including 5 Americans.

But instead of helping us locate the missing, Turkey today continues to keep 35,000 troops in Cyprus.

A barbed wire fence actually cuts across the island, separating Greek Cypriots on one side from their families and friends on the other.

Turkey has been so unwilling to negotiate even U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali has spoken out against them.

Just 2 weeks ago, he called northern Cyprus ''one of the most highly militarized areas in the world.''

And most disturbing of all when you look at the amount of U.S. dollars flowing into Turkey today it is nearly identical to the amount of money Turkey spends to keep those troops housed in Cyprus.

So in effect American taxpayers are paying to keep Turkish troops housed in Cyprus.

Mr. Chairman, this situation is outrageous.

At a time when we were asking senior citizens and students and working families to sacrifice because of the deficit we have no business paying to keep Turkish troops housed in Cyprus.

Mr. Chairman, until Turkey begins to remove its troops from Cyprus, until it lifts its blockade of Armenia, until it respects the rights of its Kurdish minorities, and until it lives up to internationally recognized standards of human rights then we have no business sending aid to Turkey.

I believe the Porter amendment will send the right message and move us in the right direction.

I urge my colleagues to support it.

□ 0515

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

Mr. Chairman, I will only take a couple of minutes. I think we all agree, now everything has been said and I believe everybody has said it.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out the same things that the other people who have opposed this amendment have pointed out. That one-fourth of the Turkish parliament is Kurdish; that Turkey is the only really functioning Moslem democracy in the world; that they maintain a secular state; that they have recognized Israel from the time of its inception; that they have been an absolutely necessary ally for the United States during the 50 years of the cold war.

I do not subscribe to the belief that now the cold war is over, we can forget who our friends were during the cold war or that we can forget who the friends are that we will need if we have another one. I do not think we should forget Turkey's great sacrifices in maintaining the economic boycott against Iraq. I do not think we should forget Turkey's contribution to the gulf war.

We should not forget the importance of the Turkish bases to any future operations that we might have. I think this is the wrong thing to do and I oppose the amendment. To the author of the amendment, I will say that I think you have got a good chance to win with this because I believe you have had about 218 speakers.

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

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this will close out the debate, but let me start off by saying that this particular amendment is a true deliberative process. This is what the Congress of the United States is all about.

This is not about oil companies coming and lobbying us because they need something. This is not because someone wants something for their own district. This is because of passion.

And let me tell my colleagues that the passion in the eyes of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and the true belief that the gentleman has, concern about the human rights violations in that section of the world, is remarkable.

I have seen the passion in the eyes of the gentleman's wife, Kathryn, who has been over there and has seen some of these atrocities. And I am not standing here, and on one in this House stands here and says we want to condone the atrocities. That is not the issue.

The issue here is whether or not we are going to continue to support Turkey as Turkey has supported us. It is not a question of whether or not Greece is a better supporter than Turkey, because they are both great allies. It is a question of whether or not, in this complicated world of foreign policy, we are going to make a decision here tonight not necessarily wanting to do what the President of the United States wants us to do.

He wants us to kill the Porter amendment. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has written a letter to us which was read on the floor tonight by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations telling us to disregard human rights at this particular time. This is not the issue. Do not disregard the human rights violations. Do not discontinue your efforts, Mr. PORTER, in seeing that this issue some day is resolved.

Let us do it the way we have started doing it. What we all have started. When they came before our committee, I chastised the Turkish representatives. I chastised the administration for not being more adamant in making certain that Turkey was not violating human rights.

But now we are down to the point where we have committed, and so many of my colleagues came to me before on aid to Russia to build houses for Russian soldiers and argued, ''The President of the United States promised this. We have a commitment to Russia. We have got to give him this

money or else we will embarrass the President of the United States.''

And now the President has guaranteed Turkey that we are going to fulfill the rest of this commitment. And incidentally we have already told Turkey: This is the last time that we are going to permit you to buy all of the aircraft and military supplies you want. But do not come back. This is the last year.

We have insisted in the report language the very things that you argued. That we are dissatisfied with what we hear. Mr. Chairman, I am at such a disadvantage. I have never been to Greece. I have never been to Turkey. I have never been to Cyprus. I have never been to Iran. So I am at a disadvantage, because I have not seen firsthand what my colleagues are talking about. But I know from the passion in my colleagues' eyes that they are sincere.

But the question here is more a military question than a human rights question. Because we are saying to Turkey, in report language, ''We do not like what we have been told, please straighten your act up. We are not going to continue this after this year.''

We are going to fulfill our commitment, just as we did to the Russians and let them build houses for their retiring military officers. We are going to fulfill the commitment. We are going to allow the President of the United States to have an effective capability to establish foreign policy.

And we are going to live up to the chief executive officer of this country by giving him the right to have an effective, constitutional guaranteed ability to run international affairs.

So the question here tonight is whether or not for this one year we are going to continue our commitment to Turkey and whether or not we are going to show our appreciation to Turkey for the very valiant ally they have been to us in times of need.

When 2,700 sorties flew out of Turkey during the Persian Gulf war, let me tell my colleagues, we were very appreciative of them. So we do not need them today. We are not at war in the gulf. So let us turn our back on Turkey.

Let us not argue whether Turkey is a greater ally than Greece or Greece is a greater ally than Turkey. Let us fulfill the commitment. Let us follow the wishes of the Commander in Chief of our military. Let us follow the wishes of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Let us follow the wishes of the Speaker of the House and the leadership.

Let us follow the wishes of the chairman of our Committee on Appropriations. Let us follow the wishes of the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], and let us vote this up or down with the understanding that it has nothing to do with condoning any civil rights violation or humanitarian violation anywhere in the world, but it is whether or not we are going to fulfill a commitment that the Commander in Chief has made and whether or not we are going to tell Turkey, ''We do not need you anymore; the war in the gulf is over.''

So let us vote this bill. I am going to ask for a recorded vote. And let us vote this bill up or down, then go through the last eight amendments that we have and go home and try to get some rest.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this amendment.

This spring I visited Turkey with the Chairman of the National Security Committee. We met with key Turkish and NATO military commanders, who briefed us on Turkey's recent actions in the region.

Aside from the critical support Turkey offered for Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm, providing bases from which some 2,700 sorties were flown against Iraq, Turkey currently extends vital support for operation provide comfort in Iraq, and deny flight and sharp guard in the former Yugoslavia.

Moreover, Turkey remains key to Western efforts to pursue stability throughout Central Asia. Through its support for secular rule and free markets, Turkey provides a much-needed counterbalance to Iranian influence in these newly independent nations.

We should also be mindful that Turkey, a neighbor of Iran, Iraq, and Syria, has been a supporter of the Mideast peace process.

The gentleman criticizes Turkey for human rights problems. These concerns are indeed important. However, Turkey is moving to address this issue.

In my judgment, this amendment is not an appropriate mechanism for influencing a valued ally. I urge its defeat.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer my support for the Porter amendment to H.R. 1868, the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act. This amendment would cut economic assistance to the Government of Turkey particularly because that Government has failed to improve its dismal human rights record.

I support the amendment because Turkey continues to prevent United States humanitarian aid from flowing freely to the Republic of Armenia. Armenia is a progressive country whose bold experiments with democracy and market economics must not be jeopardized by those who seek its demise. America would be taking the right approach by restricting aid to Turkey if that country continues to block humanitarian aid shipments to Armenia. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Porter amendment.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 247, noes 155, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 443]

AYES—247

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Baker (CA)
Baldacci
Barcia
Bartlett
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blute
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Davis
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Engel
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Forbes
Ford
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hefner
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Holden
Horn
Hoyer
Hunter
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E.B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
LaHood
Largent
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McHale
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Nadler
Neal
Neumann
Ney
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Saxton
Scarborough
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Studds
Stupak
Talent
Tate
Thompson
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Tucker
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Williams
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—155

Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Beilenson
Bereuter
Berman
Bliley
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Chambliss
Chrysler
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Cooley
Cox
Cremeans
Cubin
Danner
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Dornan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Fields (TX)

Foley
Fowler
Frisa
Ganske
Geren
Gillmor
Gingrich
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Heineman
Herger
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Houghton
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Jones
Kasich
King
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Lantos
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Livingston
Longley
Lucas
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McHugh
McIntosh
Mica
Miller (FL)
Montgomery
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Pickett
Quinn
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Rose
Sabo
Salmon
Sanford
Sawyer
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Shadegg
Shaw
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Spence
Stump
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thornberry
Thornton
Tiahrt
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Bateman

NOT VOTING—32

Burr
Chapman
Coleman
Collins (MI)
Ewing
Foglietta
Gunderson
Hoke
Johnson, Sam
LaFalce
Latham
Martinez
McDade
McNulty
Meyers
Mfume
Moakley
Rangel
Reynolds
Roukema
Sanders
Schumer
Solomon
Stark
Stockman
Stokes
Thomas
Towns
Waxman
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

☐ 0544

Mr. BASS and Mr. ZELIFF changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

☐ 0545

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. KAPTUR: page 78, after line 6, insert the following new section:

LIMITATION OF FUNDS FOR NORTH AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

SEC. 564. No funds appropriated in this Act under the heading ''North American Development Bank'' may be obligated or expended unless it is made known to the Federal entity or official to which funds are appropriated under this Act that the Government of Mexico has contributed a share of the paid-in portion of the capital stock for fiscal year 1996 equivalent to that appropriated by the United States.

Ms. KAPTUR (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 gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, quite simply, this amendment would allow the expenditure of the United States 1996 contribution to the North American Development Bank which was created under NAFTA in the amount of $56.25 million only after the United States is notified that Mexico has also made its contribution, which is what the authorizing legislation in the agreement actually calls for. This amendment imposes no new requirements on either the United States or on Mexico.

Let me mention to my colleagues that this is the first time that the Congress of the United States will actually be appropriating money to an instrumentality that has been created under NAFTA. Again, this installment will be in the amount of $56.25 million.

This amendment would benefit the citizens of both Mexico and the United States by reaffirming the duties of both countries to meet their existing legal obligations to the North American Development Bank, which will finance environmental projects benefiting both sides of the border, as well as about 10 percent of the funds will be used to accommodate displaced workers in this country.

Let me restate also, this amendment imposes no new requirements on either our country or on Mexico. It simply gives the legislature of Mexico an incentive to pass the necessary legislation promptly and ensure that the Untied States alone will not bear the burden of financing environmental infrastructure and related projects relating to NAFTA.

Let me also mention to my colleagues that currently the U.S. $56.25 million 1995 contribution, passed as part of the NAFTA implementing legislation, is sitting untouched at the New York Federal Reserve because the NADBank is really not up and running yet. Mexico also has already $56.2 million from last year being held in an account at the Banco de Mexico in Mexico City. In other words, the NADBank already has over $112.5 million ready and waiting at its fingertips, and waiting to disburse this year's appropriation until Mexico makes its contribution will have no effect on the bank's ability to carry out its mandate. Given Mexico's recent financial crisis and our Government's commitment, without my support, incidentally, of over $20 billion to rescue Mexico from the brink of financial disaster, we have good reason to be concerned about whether Mexico will contribute its share. Earlier this year after Mexico allowed its reserves to dwindle to just over $6 billion and had accumulated over $140 billion of external debt, our administration, without a vote of this Congress, agreed to put up $20 billion of loans and loan guarantees to Mexico. Mexico has already drawn down $10 billion of that, and of that $10 billion which we have already sent to Mexico, the Mexican Government should be able to come up with the $56.25 million to keep the promise it made under NAFTA to fund the NADBank.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, we will be happy to accept the gentlewoman's amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to thank the gentleman for his gentlemanly deportment throughout the consideration of the bill through committee and on the floor.

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to commend the gentlewoman from Ohio for the introduction of her amendment. I know that she had large concern in the beginning because this bank, while it is not related directly to the NAFTA proposition, she was led to believe, perhaps others believed, that this binational bank, would, in fact, be providing money for Mexico. The U.S. portion of this bank, the money that the gentlewoman has cited here, will stay in the U.S. account, and it will be used on the American side to provide for infrastructure along our 2,000-mile border. Already there are a number of projects that are in design process to begin to build water programs, sewer cleanup, toxic cleanup, various infrastructure programs.

As the gentlewoman mentioned, 10 percent of the funds of the bank will be used for domestic use of workers and communities who will need adjustment if there are job losses related to NAFTA. So the bank is, I should correct the gentlewoman, the bank is in process. They are headquartered in San Antonio. They have staff building up, and they are simply awaiting the go-ahead for projects to begin. I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee for agreeing and accepting this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to reiterate what my colleague from California just stated, and that is this is an unusual portion of this bill in that this portion of the allotment of this bill is designed to help American projects on our side of the border, water system projects, road projects, bridge projects, whatever is necessary, environmental projects, that are extremely important for our commitment in trying to improve the situation along the Mexican border.

I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama, Chairman CALLAHAN, for working with us very closely on this, and the gentlewoman from Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, for helping us on this.

I wonder if I could ask the gentlewoman from Ohio a question about the amendment. I had a concern and discussed this with the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES] earlier. Would this allow for incremental contributions, or would we have to wait to contribute any money to this fund until they met the $56 million commitment?

Or if they committed $40 or $50 million, could we then contribute the same amount, without having to wait for them to reach the maximum amount, if that situation were to occur?

Ms. KAPTUR. If the gentleman will yield, the intent of this amendment is to provide equity between both countries, and their share would have to equal ours. So if they contributed $20 million, we would contribute $20 million. If they contributed nothing, we would contribute nothing. The idea is we both march down the aisle together.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the work of the gentlewoman from Ohio on this amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, we have about seven of these amendments. I assumed if both sides accept them, we could take them for granted. I appreciate your comments, but I would like to get on with the other seven amendments. If we are going to talk 30 minutes on all seven, we will be here until noon.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RICHARDSON

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICHARDSON: Page 78, after line 6, insert the following new section:

LIMITATION ON FUNDS FOR BURMA

SEC. 564. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for International Narcotics Control or Crop Substitution Assistance for the Government of Burma.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, today and this evening and this morning we have talked about human rights violators around the world. Well, this amendment deals with the heavyweight champion of all human rights violators, and that is the Government of Burma, Myanmar. What this amendment does is prohibit counternarcotics assistance to that country, both on human rights grounds and on narcotics grounds.

Mr. Chairman, what we have here is an amendment that is supported by the chairman of the subcommittee, by the minority, by the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, who is doing very valuable antinarcotics work throughout the world and especially in the Burma area.

Mr. Chairman, I would be also honored to have the coauthor of this amendment, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER], join me. I would like to yield to him for any initiatives.

The purpose of this amendment is to prohibit counternarcotics funds for the Government of Burma.

My intention is to prohibit the administration from using this legislation to fund its short-sighted new drug policy initiatives toward Burma that were proposed last by drug czar Lee Brown.

The purpose of this amendment is to nullify the administration efforts to start a crop substitution program with Burma, to increase funding for UNDCP for their cooperation, and to fund NFO's activities in Burma.

I want to clarify to my colleagues that the Richardson-Rohrabacher amendment does not obstruct the ongoing efforts of Chairman GILMAN of the International Relations Committee to find alternative approaches to combating the enormous drug trade in Burma.

Furthermore, this amendment has no effect on the minimal presence of Drug Enforcement Agency [DEA] representatives already in Burma's Capital of Rangoon.

There is a very simple logic to this amendment: We have condemned Burma for years for human rights abuses and child labor violations—they have made no effort to reform—we should not reward this repressive regime with American tax dollars now.

My most recent trip to Burma last month was extremely disappointing on account of the Burmese regime's retrenchment on human rights and democratization efforts.

Burma's ruling military junta, the State Law and Order Restoration Council [SLORC], has established itself as the heavyweight champion of repressive governments by violating human rights and detaining the leader of Burma's democratic movement Aung San Suu Kyi for the past 6 years.

This courageous woman is in house arrest without any prospect of being released.

Recent efforts to obtain visas by the authors of this amendment have been denied or granted only after preconditions were met.

Leading opposition members of the National League for Democracy were arrested after I met with them last month.

Perhaps the most egregious of all human rights violations comes in the form of Dr. Michael Aris, Aung San Suu Kyi's husband has been denied access to his imprisoned wife.

Shortly after admitting the Red Cross to inspect prisons in Burma, the International Committee for the Red Cross has abandoned efforts to work with the SLORC leadership last week after the SLORC imposed unacceptable conditions on Red Cross operations.

Dealing with the heroin crisis is an important issue before Congress and I can sympathize with Members who have fought noble battles to rid American streets of the drug menace.

New Mexico is not immune to this disease; I have seen the devastating effects of heroin abuse on Indian Pueblos and the impoverished Hispanic communities in my own district. But these problems do not mean that American dollars should go to reward a repressive regime with counternarcotics assistance.

The narcotics issue is a small component of an overall United States policy shift necessary to combat the repressive Burmese regime. The Richardson-Rohrabacher amendment is a means to a greater objective of promoting democracy in a country that has a vital strategic interest in Southeast Asia.

I urge Members to consider the resulting relationship forged by a counternarcotics partnership between the United States and a military junta that expels respected international organizations like the Red Cross while constructing infrastructure projects with child labor.

The end of the cold war offers the United States a window of opportunity to encourage nations to foster democracy and open their economies to free trade. The SLORC has made it clear to myself and other Members that they are not willing to play by these rules.

Efforts to combat the international drug trade should not blur our ability to discipline a regime that has not made a serious attempt on its own.

Like Burma's dismal human rights record, its unilateral efforts to counter the narcotics threat are not impressive as they have had no major impact on the thriving Burmese drug economy. The SLORC has yet to introduce meaningful eradication or drug enforcement measures in the ethnic strongholds of the Shan State where the bulk of Burma's drug trade is based.

Instead, the SLORC concentrates on quelling border area insurgencies that result from actions designed to crush democratic efforts and does not take counternarcotics as a priority in these regions.

By prohibiting counternarcotics funding to the Government of Burma the Richardson-Rohrabacher amendment will send a signal to the SLORC that the United States wants meaningful reform.

I commend the distinguished gentleman from New York, BEN GILMAN, the chairman of the International Relations Committee for his efforts to pursue solutions to this problem.

I understand he has requested a GAO report to explore the possibilities of counternarcotics assistance with local governing authorities and I am supportive of that initiative.

I want to make it clear for the record that the language of the Richardson-Rohrabacher amendment does not preclude any direct or indirect counternarcotics assistance funding to regional ethnic groups in Burma if the GAO determines that such assistance can be provided directly to the regional ethnic groups in Burma and not through the SLORC.

I hope Mr. GILMAN can appreciate my concern for unintended funding of SLORC activities with money intended for counternarcotic operations.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my colleague from New Mexico very much for his leadership on this issue. There is a concern about what is going on in Burma right now, because the message that we send is being heard on the other side of the world, and literally hundreds of thousands of people's lives are at stake.

What we have in Burma is a misinterpretation by the SLORC regime, which is one of the most brutal and oppressive regimes on this planet. It is a misinterpretation of some of the actions of this Congress, that in some way we are not as committed to democracy in that country as we all are in this body.

This message today that we are sending with this amendment is that the United States is on the side of democracy, and we will not tolerate the brutality and the military offensives that are being conducted by the Government of Burma against its own people. As we sit tonight, or should I say this morning, on the other side of the world

the Burmese military is about to conduct another offensive against one of its ethnic peoples, the Kareni people, who are a very small group of people that are at risk of being wiped out by a military offensive by this very brutal regime. By what we are doing today with this amendment, we send a message to the regime we are for democracy, and do not terrorize your own people.

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

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

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment. In the essence of time, I would like to revise and extend my remarks, which is a way we can get things in the RECORD without taking up a lot of extra time.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit funds in this act from being used for narcotics control or crop substitution assistance in Burma.

Two-thirds of the heroin seized on the streets of the United States comes from Burma. It seems to me it is in our interest to cooperate with that government, however distasteful it may be, to reduce heroin production that threatens the lives of American citizens. Cutting off all contact with Burma may only end up hurting our own citizens. In addition, the administration opposes this amendment.

Currently the United States has been involved in multilateral assistance through the U.N. International Drug Control Program, as well as projects with nongovernmental organizations in minority-controlled areas. I know the administration is considering a small program to attack heroin traffickers in Burma and to encourage opium farmers to produce other crops, but no decisions have been made on the scope of such a program.

I agree with the gentleman from New Mexico that the Burmese Government is regressive, and that human rights are routinely violated. However, I'm not sure this amendment is the right way to deal with that problem.

On the other hand, I think I know where the votes are, and I know the gentleman's intentions are sincere. Therefore, I am prepared to accept the amendment on this side.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend my colleague from New Mexico for his leadership on this amendment and for his vigilance in watching the situation in Burma, and his travels and all his efforts on behalf of human rights in that part of the world. It is actually an area that has been largely ignored. I commend the gentleman for his outstanding efforts in this area.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

We all support a vigorous effort to eradicate drug production and trafficking.

But there are two serious problems with subsidizing brutal, illegitimate governments, no matter how pure our motives.

First, it legitimizes these dictators. A law enforcement partnership with the United States gives any regime more international prestige. It also gives their people a heightened sense of despair. These are the effects of our antiimmigration deal with Fidel Castro. These are the effects of our many concessions to the Beijing regime. The costs to human rights of any partnership with murderers are never trivial.

Second, this kind of deal is not likely to work. If the SLORC ["slork"] cared one bit about stopping drugs, they would have stopped the drugs. This poisoning of our children has been going on with the full knowledge and consent—and quite possibly the participation—of the SLORC.

Governments that kill our children do not deserve carrots. They deserve sticks. The solution to drugs coming from Burma, like the solution from most problems caused or exacerbated by the SLORC is international ostracism, and the restoration of the free and democratically elected government—not more foreign aid.

I urge a "yes" vote on the Richardson amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in full support of this amendment. This amendment is necessary not only because of the profits from drugs, but because of the children who buy them and sometimes die from them. We know that there is a big drug problem in the Asia-Pacific region. There is even a big drug problem on my island of Guam. This amendment sends a message that this country will not tolerate drugs. This amendment will show that this country will not sit down while a country we help will transform the money we give to them into drugs. This amendment will show that this country will take a strong stand on drugs. This amendment is just one small step to making a big problem disappear. We may need a marathon of steps to follow, but this represents a good beginning. This amendment will make the streets safer for our children here and in the Asia-Pacific region. This is why we have to thank Mr. RICHARDSON and Mr. ROHRABACHER for combining to make this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 359, noes 38, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 444]

AYES—359

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Collins (IL)
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Doggett
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schiff
Schroeder
Scott
Seastrand
Serrano
Shadegg
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Studds
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Tucker
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky

Volkmer
Waldholtz
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—38

Allard
Archer
Ballenger
Bunning
Buyer
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Deal
DeLay
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Ewing
Fields (TX)
Gillmor
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hastert
Hunter
Johnson (CT)
Jones
Laughlin
Lewis (KY)
Livingston
Manzullo
Myers
Norwood
Oxley
Roberts
Schaefer
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Stump
Taylor (NC)
Vucanovich
Walker

NOT VOTING—37

Browder
Burr
Chapman
Coleman
Collins (MI)
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Fattah
Foglietta
Frank (MA)
Gunderson
Hefley
Istook
Johnson, Sam
LaFalce
Latham
Martinez
McDade
McNulty
Meyers
Mfume
Moakley
Reynolds
Roukema
Sanders
Schumer
Solomon
Stark
Stockman
Stokes
Tauzin
Towns
Waxman
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

□ 0615

Mr. EHLERS changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. FRISA and Mr. SMITH of Michigan changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am still trying to keep a semblance of comity and understanding around here.

Forget it. Forget it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will be in order.

Mr. OBEY. Forget it, Mr. Chairman. Do whatever you want.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SOUDER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SOUDER: Page 78, after line 6, insert the following:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO MEXICO

SEC. 564. (a) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be obligated or expended for the Government of Mexico, except if it is made known to the Federal entity or official to which funds are appropriated under this Act that—

(1) the Government of Mexico is taking actions to reduce the amount of illegal drugs entering the United States from Mexico by at least 10 percent of the level of such illegal drugs from the previous year, as determined by the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy; and

(2) the Government of Mexico—

(A) is taking effective actions to apply vigorously all law enforcement resources to investigate, track, capture, incarcerate, and prosecute illegal drug kingpins and their accomplices, individuals responsible for, or otherwise involved in, corruption, and individuals involved in money-laundering; and

(B) is pursuing international anti-drug trafficking initiatives.

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

Let's calm down just a second. Let's take the advice of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]. He is trying to work it out. He is not a part of any delaying tactic. He rose in all sincerity after I talked with him and said there is a possibility that we can just run through these last 4 amendments, 3 of which are accepted amendments.

Let's try to work it out and keep calm. Maybe we can do it, maybe we can't. If we can, we can. If we can't, we can't. But I appreciate the gentleman's effort to try to add some degree of sensibility to this debate and to this bill and to try to get finished with it today. I applaud the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, we have about four or five Members of the House that have been here on the floor, and I have watched these Members. They have amendments that they feel very strongly about. They have worked with the committee, both the ranking member on the minority side and the chairman of the committee on this side. They have worked hard all night working out agreements. They have agreements, they have an opportunity to complete their work which they have spent the night working on. If we can just give them the courtesy of allowing them to proceed in accordance with the agreements they have worked so hard on tonight, we can finish our night's business.

It seems to me the kind of courtesy we ought to extend to those of our colleagues who spent this evening working as hard as they did together. I would encourage the body to accommodate those Members.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I simply stood to inquire about the order of the amendments since it had been my understanding that we were first moving to the Burton amendment. I am opposed to the Burton amendment. I am not looking to do it any favors, but I thought that the Burton amendment was going to be going first and I would like to know why it is not.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to that if the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER] has no objection. We will go that way. This is the order that someone wrote for me. I was not keeping order on how they go. If the gentleman would rather have the Burton amendment, I have no objection to that if the gentleman has no objection.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment at this time.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana: Page 78, after line 6, insert the following new section:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO INDIA

SEC. 564. None of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Development Assistance Fund'' may be made available to the Government of India or non-governmental organizations and private voluntary organizations operating within India.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the hour is early. Everybody is tired. We have discussed human rights violations around the world. I think everybody knows my position on the human rights violations that have been occurring in India, in Punjab, in Kashmir and Nagaland.

I will not prolong the debate. I understand we have an agreement for a much lower amount of reduction in aid to India than I wanted. I wanted a cut of $70 million. We have gone down to $5 million, but I will accept that because of the late hour and because all I want to do is send a signal to India that we want them to try to change their policies toward the people who are suffering these human rights violations over there.

With that, because we have an agreement and understanding, I close my remarks.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CALLAHAN TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CALLAHAN to the amendment offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana: In the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment, strike ''None of the funds'' and insert ''Not more than $65,000,000 of the funds.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has zeroed the amount. This amendment cuts India by $5 million. I now concur in the amendment. I hope that the minority side will also do that.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, as one Member, I agree with the amendment and agree to accept it, but there are many Members on this side that do not agree with it and intend to oppose it.

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

I will be brief. The hour is very early, as my colleague has said. This is not about money. This is about symbolism.

India is trying to be our friend. Compared to what, you say? Compared to China. The Secretary of Defense told me the other night that India was fast

becoming more strategically important to us than China. India has 900 million people. China has 1.2 billion people. India has a free press, it has an elected parliament, it has a judiciary, it has a court system. Bectel, General Electric, and Enron corporations have a $3 billion contract on the table right now, Enron, Bectel, GE, $3 billion contract right now, very touchy, with the Indian Government to build a power station to generate all the electricity for Bombay. It is to be owned by the American companies.

Mr. Chairman, it could be $1 million and we would put this new relationship that we are now developing with India in jeopardy. I have been there twice this year. I was there when Secretary Brown was there. Motorola, AT&T. I was there when the 777 airplane from Boeing was being demonstrated for Air India.

I know my friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], is close to people as the Sikhs have had problems in India, but read the ''Dear Colleague'' letter that a very broad bipartisan group of us signed saying, Let us not slap India in the face with $70 or $7 or $5 or $1 million. Let us continue to work to make them our friends.

The Prime Minister is opening up the country to foreign investment. There are 1.4 million American Indian citizens in this country. You want to hear from them by noon today? They are intelligent, they are committed, they are professional, they are in every community in this country.

They do not care whether it is $1 million or $70 million. They do not want to see this Government of ours slap their native country in this way.

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

Mr. ROSE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEREUTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, I strongly ask Members, do not cut the aid to India. It is not in the best interest of the United States to do this.

We are opening up relationships with India as never before in every front. We have a positive relationship. This is not in our interest to slash this aid. I urge Members to vote against the Burton amendment.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. I will tell why, Mr. Chairman.

There is a place called Kashmir. What is happening in Kashmir today is one of the great moral tragedies on the face of this earth. Mr. Chairman, Kashmir is plagued by violence. There have been more than 20,000 people that have been killed there. Tensions are on the rise again. Holy places of worship by the Moslems have been burned to the ground recently. On Saturday, June 3, the Indian Parliament once again extended the New Delhi rule over Kashmir and they revoked the elections that were going to be held. It is one horror story after another. The rape of women, the butchery of the civilians of Kashmir. It is one of the great tragedies of our time. I think it is about time we sent a very clear message to India.

There are 700,000 Indian troops in Kashmir today. They are stationed no further from this wall or that wall, throughout the country. You cannot move on the streets without seeing an Indian soldier with their finger on the trigger of a gun. People do not go out at night.

This is a good amendment. I commend my colleague from Indiana for offering it. I hope my colleagues will at least show some sense of sensitivity. Amnesty International, all the human rights groups are kept out. Only recently have they allowed the Red Cross to finally come in. This is an important amendment. I hope my colleagues will support my friends from Indiana.

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

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] for adding these comments because I, too, want to rise in support of the Burton amendment.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE] may be right that they are open to trade and India is open to good relations with America, but let me tell you what they are not open to: Amnesty International, the international media.

Much of what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] said tonight about the carnage in Kashmir or for that matter in the Punjab may be new to many Members of this institution. That is because the media of this country and the world cannot even get in to see the carnage. People have been killed by the thousands. They have littered the streets of Kashmir. The least we can do is support the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] and send this extremely modest message.

I join with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] in urging support of the Burton amendment.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in strong opposition to the Burton amendment.

I think the gentleman from North Carolina is quite right. This is symbolism. Whether you cut 5 or 70, it does not matter. We should not be cutting it at all.

The United States and India, two, the longest democracy and the largest democracy, have too many confluent interests to allow such an ill-conceived amendment to be adopted.

Has there been trouble? Yes, there has. Has the government of India taken great strides to alleviate the difficulties? Yes, it has.

The government has very recently decided to allow the controversial Terrorist and Disruptive Activities Act to terminate on May 23, 1995 despite continued terrorist violence in Jammu and Kashmir.

India's National Human Rights Commission works vigorously to protect rights. Assistant Secretary of State, Robin Raphel, said on February 9 of this year the commission has surprised the skeptics and begun to establish itself as an effective advocate for human rights.

Just a few weeks ago the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights, Ayala Lasso, visited Punjab and Kashmir. In a press conference after this visit, Lasso praised the advances India has made in human rights and lauded the unparalleled access he had been granted.

In my opinion the Burton amendment seeks to damage United States-Indian relations at precisely the moment they are showing such dynamism. More United States investment has come to India in the last year than in the entire history of United States-Indian relations. In addition, India buys more of its goods from the United States then from any other country.

The U.S. Department of Commerce has named India as one of the 10 big emerging markets and estimates business opportunities worth at least $100 billion in the next 5 years in the infrastructure sector alone.

□ 0630

I think that this amendment overlooks the great strides that India is making in its efforts to protect human rights and it would have an extremely negative impact on the flourishing United States-Indian relations. It is bad for U.S. business and overlooks the great strides that India is making.

Have there been difficulties? Yes, there have. We should not penalize a country when they are trying to correct those difficulties. I think we should vote ''no'' on the amendment.

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

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments and I think it is important to respond. Last year when the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] tried to do this, there was a great deal of discussion about the refusal of India to allow international organizations in to check what is happening in Kashmir.

Reuters today reports:

> India, in a move towards greater transparency in strife-torn Kashmir, agreed Thursday to allow the International Committee of the Red Cross access to the detainees in the region. The Red Cross said in a memorandum of understanding was signed between the committee and the Indian government allowing it access to all persons arrested and detained in relation with the current situation in Jammu and Kashmir.

This is a democracy. This is a country which has had a peaceful transition of power from the government to the opposition, both nationally and in many states very recently. I think this is not taking the situation in India in perspective.

There are terrible problems in Kashmir. Many people have died. But this is not the right approach. While we are loosening up the Pressler amendment allowing all kinds of assistance, nonmilitary assistance to go into Pakistan, to now come in and slap India like this puts us into a position which we will rue the day that we accept. I urge the amendment be defeated.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I think there may be some confusion. What is the amendment before the Committee at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. The Callahan amendment to the Burton amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. So it is the Callahan amendment that is being debated. The Callahan amendment reduces it only $5 million, whereas Mr. BURTON zeroed it out. The amendment before the Committee is whether or not Members want to adopt the $5 million substitute or the $5 million amendment to the Burton amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, it may be the world's largest democracy, but there is a gross abuse of rights that is going on there and I cannot imagine that we as the Congress would not want to stand up with our money and say something about it; the outrageous abuses that have occurred against the Sikhs and against the Moslems and indeed against the Christians.

I like the original amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] to zero it out. We ought to stand up and make a statement for heaven sakes. It is our money. Why should we be supporting the kinds of abuses that are going on there. Torturing people routinely in certain parts of the country; locking them up because they expressed their opinion only and then they do not see the light of day. I mean it is outrageous.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has courageously stood on this floor for years and advocated this position and I would like to support the gentleman's amendment and just say to all of my colleagues that I think that there are some serious problems here. If they are the world's largest democracy, then they ought to stand up and respect human rights. I support the Burton amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], which I take it has now been amended or is from the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN]. And I really want to stress that this is the wrong amendment at the wrong time.

If we were before the House a few years ago, then some of these allegations that are being brought up today might have been appropriate, but they are certainly not appropriate now. India has made a lot of progress on many of the human rights issues and if you look specifically at some of the points that were made today, I would like to individually try to refute them.

Unlike many other nations where human rights have been as issue, India has honestly confronted its problems in this area and taken protective steps to address them. Last week under the auspices of our Congressional Caucus on India, which I cochair along with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM], we had a visit from the chairman of India's National Commission on Human Rights. This is a new commission in business now for about a year or two. And I wish that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] and some of the other critics of India had been there to hear the presentation of Mr. Misra, who was a former chief justice of India's Supreme Court.

He pointed out how the commission now has the power to summon witnesses, collect evidence and to recommend prosecution of officials accused of human rights violations. The commission has been active in every State of India. Not a single recommendation by the commission has been rejected by government officials.

On May 23 of this year, the Terrorist and Disruptive Activities Prevention Act, this is the infamous act that some people have mentioned today that in the past has allowed for judicial procedures to be usurped, it has lapsed. It has not been reenacted and there are no plans to renew it.

And the main reason it was allowed to lapse was largely because of the urging of this new human rights commission. And this was despite the continuing terrorist violence in Jammu and Kashmir, much of it arising from Islamic fundamentalist forces outside of India's borders.

I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL] mentioned that the Indian Human Rights Commission has won praise from our own State Department. Before the Subcommittee on Asia the Assistant Secretary of State, Robin Raphel, was quoted and came before the subcommittee and said that they were surprised, the State Department, that the skeptics that had talked about this commission and said it was never going to accomplish anything were wrong and that the commission had established itself as an effective advocate for human rights.

It was mentioned that a few weeks ago the U.N. high commissioner for human rights, he visited Punjab and Kashmir. And after his visit he praised the advances India has made in human rights. He lauded the unparalleled access that has been granted to investigate allegations concerning human rights violations.

Some mention has been made about Asia Watch, Amnesty International, and the International Red Cross. During his visit to the United States this month, Mr. Misra, the chairman of India's National Human Rights Commission, met with representatives of these three groups and he indicated there will be progress on these organizations sending representatives to India within the year.

Now, I think that the gentlemen have suggested that the amendment would put pressure on the Government of India to improve its record on human rights. In fact, I think this amendment, if it were to become law, would have just the opposite effect. It would greatly reduce our ability to positively influence the Indian Government, not only in terms of human rights but on a wide range of economic and security issues.

Punitive measures like this one would only serve to isolate the Indian Government, give aid and comfort to political forces in India who oppose closer ties with the United States. I think it is extremely unfair that at this point when so much progress has been made and when so many of us have worked with the Indian Government representatives to try to turn things around and this human rights commission has started and had success, it would be really a tremendous disservice to pass this amendment.

Regardless of weather it is $70 million or $5 million, it is the symbolic effect of it that is going to have a negative impact on our relations.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I hope everybody will pay attention to this. This is very important. The Indian Government has promised for years to allow Amnesty International and other human rights groups, the International Red Cross, into Punjab and Kashmir and they have never fulfilled that obligation.

I talked to the Indian Ambassador in my office and said, ''Can I take a congressional delegation over there and take TV cameras so we could talk to the people?'' He said, ''Yes, we will work that out.'' Three years later, he never called me back. They do not want us in there.

Let me give my colleagues some facts. In 1995, Indian troops in Kashmir burned to the ground the centuries-old old walnut wood mosque along with hundreds of homes around it. You might say that is not very bad.

Let me tell you what Asia Watch says. Asia Watch, a human rights group, said that virtually everyone detained in Punjab is tortured. Everyone arrested is tortured. Amnesty International: Torture in Punjab and Kashmir and injury is widespread and in some cases systematic, resulting in scores of deaths in police custody.

State Department, you talk about the State Department, the State Department Human Rights Report this year said over 41,000 cash bounties were paid to police in Punjab for extrajudicial killings of Sikhs between

1991 and 1993. That was 41,000 people. Murdered.

Extrajudicial murders of Sikh youth are a common occurrence. Between 1986 and 1994, 6,017 unidentified Sikh victims of Indian police were cremated in the district of Amritsar alone. There are 13 districts in Punjab. It has been estimated that security forces have had over 25,000 unidentified Sikhs cremated or dumped in the rivers.

They just drained about a three-block area, a three-block area of canals, and they found 12 bodies with their arms tied together and their feet tied together and tortured. And they have hundreds of miles of these canals and in one two-block area they found 12 bodies at the bottom of the canal when they drained it.

In January 1993, paramilitary forces in Kashmir burned to death at least 65 Kashmiri civilians in the town of Sofar. Soldiers immediately set fire to five separate areas of the town and dragged shopkeepers out of their shops and shot them in the streets. The torching of entire Kashmiri villages by Indian forces is a common tactic. I can go on and on and on.

They gang rape women. I want the gentlewomen to listen to this. They gang rape Moslem women in Kashmir because it is something that violates their religious beliefs so the men will not have anything to do with them. Women commit suicide and leave the country and their families because of these things that are going on.

All I am asking for is a $5 million cut to send a signal to them. Do my colleagues think that is too much? They are getting $152 million anyhow. All I am asking for is a signal to them.

For God's sake, I brought pictures down here of people that have been disemboweled and tortured by the Indian Government. I have done this for years. We have passed amendments in the past and they have started to see the light.

The TADA laws are starting to change, but there are still a lot of other black laws that will allow them to take people out of their homes in the middle of the night, never to be seen again, no judicial proceedings, and we continue to support them with our taxpayers' dollars.

All I am asking, all I am asking is that we send them a signal. Go ahead and give them the $152 million, but let the rest of the world know that we at least care about Punjab and Kashmir. We are talking about Moslems, we are talking about Sikhs and we are talking about Christians in Nagaland.

This goes beyond just one ethnic group or one religious group. It goes into a lot of them. They have 1.1 million troops in Kashmir and Punjab imposing martial law and they have been doing it for years. This is not me talking. Read Amnesty International. Read the International Red Cross. All these human rights groups say these things.

All I am asking my colleagues to do is to vote for the substitute amendment, which I thought we had an agreement on tonight. I was asking for a $70 million cut and I said, ''Okay, just to send a signal I will go along with a $5 million cut.'' I thought we had an agreement. I thought the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE] and I had an agreement and all of a sudden this place erupts into a big debate. Well, we had the debate.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who is speaking has spent the last several years, and I have been supportive because there have been a number of persons who are residents in my district who have come from India who have been victimized in so many ways.

We have seen the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] come to this well year after year to talk about the human rights violations which have been not only proven, but in most instances proven by institutions and agencies that we have a great deal of faith in.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BURTON was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FLAKE. If the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has been willing, and that is commendable on his part, to agree to the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] that strikes a portion but does not strike in total the amount of funds that are made available for India, I think we as a body ought to agree to that.

It is not a question that India has not made some progress, but it is a question of at what price do we, as we stand in this well, talk about the contracts that are available for India; talk about changes that are being made as of this moment that could have been made over the last 3 or 4 years that have not been made?

I tend to think that once again we can have an empty process; more sounding brass and tinkling cymbal. I urge my colleagues to support the Callahan amendment. If the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is in agreement with it, I think this body would do itself well. It would send a proper signal to India. We have been standing together over the last 3 years on this amendment. I think it is the right thing to do.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, let me just say that we just cut $25 million on the Porter amendment and we did that in a country, in my view, that does not even come close to the human rights violations that we are talking about here. Let us just send a signal to them. Let the world know we care.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how many of the Members here on the floor have ever been to the Punjab or have spent any time in Amritsar as I have done and been to the Golden Temple, gone to the border of Kashmir.

□ 0645

I do not know how many Members have spent any time in India itself. I spent months in India, not under any grant or anything of the kind. I went on my own, I traveled the length and breath of India for months in the Gandhi centenary year. I am not sure that that necessarily gives me any greater insight than any other Member might have at this point, but I do not think it made me any the less sympathetic or wise about what was going on in India and the many countries that I was able to visit in my travels. I can think of two, when I was asked, and I would say the same thing today, two that I felt were the friendliest to the United States were the friendliest to me. The two countries for which I have the greatest affection and still feel deep affection because of the friendships I made there, and that continues today, and that was Egypt and India. I well recall the times in Egypt when people were asking when is the United States coming back, why did they leave us? The same in India.

So I stand here today in support of the Callahan amendment, speaking, I believe, as a friend of India of more than two decades standing.

No one can go and have an acquaintanceship with any member of the Sikh religion. Religion has been mentioned here tonight. The Sikh people are among the only ones that I have ever been acquainted with that actually live their religion. I say to my colleagues, ''If you go to a Sikh temple and seek shelter, it will be given to you without question. If you go to a Sikh temple, you will be fed without question. They do not require of anyone that they demonstrate any kind of good will or special purpose in being there. They know that you are a human being, and I have discovered that among the Sikh people all around the world.''

The question there then is not whether we are for India or against India, and I have the greatest respect for the presentation of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE] because his record on human rights with respect to Tibet and other areas is unmatched, but how is it possible for us to make an argument?

And the reason I am here in support—how is it possible for me to make an argument against our participation with China which I consider obscene? Child labor, prison labor, all for the money that we think we can make out of the country. We should not have the most-favored-nation status there.

How can I stand up? How can any of us who have that position stand there,

and then, when we see our friends, and I consider, and I say again with resolution, our friends in India involving themselves in this aberration of torture and murder in the Punjab and Kashmir and not make this gesture, and I will call it that, and I do not think that is an empty term to say it is a gesture.

So what I am saying here: I believe, as a friend of India and a friend of the Punjab most particularly, I admit to bias and prejudice in particular with the Sikh people in the Punjab. But that does not make my commitment any the less, and I do not think it should make it for any of the rest of us any the less with our friends in India, the great democracy in southeast Asia, something we are never going to see in the mainland of China, probably in the legislative lifetime of most of us in this Chamber, sad to say. I wish it was otherwise.

This is important to do, as the leading democracy in the world right now, to say that it is not just a question of dollars and cents, and it is not just a question of trying to deal with past friendships and say, ''Let's ignore what is going on right now.'' If we are going to be true to what is the best in India, and we will find people in India that have this same point of view: They want their government to do the right thing just as we want to do the right thing with our Government. I ask my colleagues then to support the Callahan amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana has made these comments over and over year after year in committee and on the floor of this House yet ignores the progress that India has made, as Chairman BEREUTER noted, the progress that India has made in human rights. Allegations of human rights violations in Kashmir caused India to form the Independent National Human Rights Commission. Thus far 174 security-force personnel have been punished for their involvement in human rights violations. Assistant Secretary of State for south Asia, Robin Raffel, in some testimony in Congress this year said that the Indians in HRC, an independent body, has real teeth that have made a difference. International efforts to monitor the situation in Punjab, as well as in Kashmir, continue. The International Committee of the Red Cross has been in to Kashmir. Last year Members of the U.S. Congress have gone there. From some of the largest American newspapers, the New York Times, the Post, the Los Angeles Times have been into Kashmir and have viewed the progress there. Prime Minister Rao announced that the Terrorist and Disruptive Prevention Act will be allowed to lapse, has lapsed this year, effectively answering the amendments as referenced to TADA. This is just one more area in which Mr. BURTON'S amendment has been rendered out of date.

It makes no sense, Mr. Chairman, to stigmatize a nation which has taken so many positive steps towards improving human rights conditions. India and the United States have too many interests. India is an emerging nation, the two largest democracies in the world. They have too many common interests to allow such an ill-conceived amendment to be adopted.

The issue for India, the issue in this amendment, is not one of United States foreign assistance. Last year, the total development assistance allocated for India's 900 million people was slightly less than $40 million.

The money is not the issue. What will damage and retard our relationship, our human rights relationship, our democracy relationship, our democratic relationship, our trade relationship with India is the stigma that this amendment will attempt to impose on India.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the 5 minutes. I just happen to have to comment that I have had a lot of relationships in the last 2 or 3 years with India because of the terrorism question and because they have had similar problems to many of those we have been concerned about, about radical Moslems and the problems of the international networks that are involved in this, and over that experience and the relationship I have grown to understand some of the problems that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has talked about. I understand there has been a history, but I also understand, as several have mentioned here, and the previous speaker just did, there have been enormous strides, and I am convinced that this is so, that have been taken by the Indian Government to correct those problems, and for us today to come and make this symbolic gesture, and that is, as several people have said today, is indeed what we would be doing by this vote that slaps India at this time when they are making that progress and when we are increasing our relationships with them in trade and with a war against terrorism and in so many other ways is just plain wrong.

As the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], my friend, said a few moments ago who chairs the subcommittee in the Committee on International Relations on this subject, this is simply the wrong thing to do now, and I urge a ''no'' vote on the Burton amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I join with the previous speaker, as well as the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], and say very strongly, as strongly as I can as the immediate former chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia from this side, that this amendment and the amendment to it would be a tragic mistake at this time. India is a very important country, a democratizing country, a very large democracy, and a country that has been very, very responsive to all of the suggestions that we have been making over the years. If adopted, this amendment will do great harm to that relationship which is growing stronger and stronger between our two nations and between the trade relationship that has been developing, and even more importantly, this amendment, because its maker has rushed to the floor to do the kind of traditional Indian bashing that we have seen here year after year after year, this amendment is fatally flawed and will do harm not just to millions of children in India, but to millions of children around the world. This amendment is drafted in such a way that it will cut off not just the development aid to India, but all United States development assistance to any nongovernment organization that is presently in India whether they are in India or not. The development assistance will be cut off to Catholic relief services all over the world and to Save the Children all over the world and the work that these organizations are too important for us to ignore, work that nobody else is doing in so many corners of the world.

If the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] wants to go to India, I invite him to do so. To blame the Ambassador for not bringing him there is utter nonsense. I say to my colleagues, I've been there. You get on a plane and you go. I've been to Kashmir. You get on a plane and you go, and you see with your own two eyes instead of looking at the horror pictures that people bring you because I see those pictures in my office, too, and let me tell you both sides have brought me the same pictures of the same corpses and blamed each other for them. You have to make some sense out of this, and you don't do it by those who have vested interests in this issues.

Yes, India has problems and historically has had problems, religious deep-seated problems, that have existed throughout the ages. But progress is being made by a government that is responsive, that is democratizing more and more each day. We have never seen this kind of response from a major government being responsive and responsible to the suggestions that we have made.

I say to my colleagues, You have asked for the Red Cross to come in. They are going in. You asked for a human rights commission. There is a human rights commission. I urge my colleagues. This is no compromise that you see before you. We have worked out a compromise before on this $5 million, this symbolic $5 million, and this was not supposed to come up.

Now suddenly, after we fulfill our obligation of the agreement that we supposedly made, Republicans and Democrats alike with the maker of this amendment, and we fulfilled our part, suddenly of a new partner is sought to

make a new agreement with to bring up $70 million and then to knock it down to $5 million as if this was an act of major generosity. This is flimflam. It is in the interests of the United States of America to make sure that this amendment and the amendment to it is defeated, not just for India, but for Catholic Relief Services, and Save the Children, and all of the good work that those organizations do as well worldwide.

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

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I first wish to commend the gentleman from Indiana for offering the basic amendment, however, as he has said, I think too that perhaps in the spirit of compromise that the Callahan amendment should be adopted at this time. However I had hoped that we would be able to spend a little more time on what is occurring in the country of India because even though there have been improvements in India's relation with the people of Kashmir and Punjab, it is still not there, and I think that we need to send that signal.

I, too, like the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE], consider India a very friendly nation, one that we will continue to improve our relationship with, one that we will hopefully continue to see human rights violations eliminated completely, that people will not be persecuted because of their religious beliefs, as has been done in the past and continues today.

I believe that it is imperative, and I would just like to ask the gentleman from Alabama on his substitute amendment because of what has been mentioned by the previous speaker:

''Under your amendment we have a total of a $5 million cut is all; is that correct?''

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

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. That is correct.

Mr. VOLKMER. That does not deprive the charity organizations from providing assistance for the children, for the people that need it in India; does it?

Mr. CALLAHAN. That is correct.

Mr. VOLKMER. And that assistance will continue.

Mr. CALLAHAN. That is correct.

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

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

□ 0700

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, let me read to you from the amendment.

Mr. VOLKMER. Which amendment?

Mr. ACKERMAN. If the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] will give me a copy of his amendment, I will read both. Mr. CALLAHAN's amendment affects the amount and not the other language, is that correct?

Mr. CALLAHAN. It affects just the amount.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Let me read you the language that exists through both amendments. No development assistance fund, and he changes that in the number, may be made available to the government of India or nongovernmental organizations and private voluntary organizations operating within India.

Very simple: If they are operating within India, they get no money. That is what this says. It is a fatal flaw in the drafting of this, which will be responsible for killing children all over the world.

Mr. VOLKMER. If the gentleman from Alabama would agree that we could modify his amendment to clarify that it only affects the total amount of U.S. aid that will be going to India, I think it would be beneficial. I would yield to the gentleman from Alabama, if he wishes to make such a modification.

Mr. CALLAHAN. I would have no objection, but I think out of deference to the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. BURTON] we talked only about the monetary portion of it.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection.

Mr. CALLAHAN. The gentleman from Indiana has no problem. If he has no problem, I have no problem.

Mr. VOLKMER. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. VOLKMER. I was just trying to help move this thing along. If the gentleman wishes to object, he has that right.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. objection is heard.

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

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, as the author of the original amendment, it is my intention to send a signal to India. These things that the gentleman from New York is raising right now, I have no problem with changing them. The gentleman is objecting right now because he simply wants to kill any attempt to send a signal to India. It is obvious what he is trying to do.

So I say again to my colleague, I am amenable to that kind of amendment. I think it is something that would still send a signal to India and solve the problem.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Burton amendment. India has come too far in its human rights situation to be turned back by this amendment, no matter how much it has been scaled down. The symbolism does the damage.

Since securing independence only a short time ago, India has made great strides to develop a vibrant democratic system. The chief argument of the proponents of this amendment is that India should be punished because its government is guilty of human rights abuses. If the complete absence of human rights abuses was a test for securing foreign assistance, then a majority of the countries which this bill benefits would not be eligible. The real issue should be whether a nation is making a good-faith effort to address such problems.

Mr. Chairman, I am not arguing that India is perfect or does not need to improve the treatment of its citizens. Rather, I submit that I share the goals of my colleagues who want to encourage India—and all nations—to fully realize their potential as free nations. I believe we can best achieve this goal by offering assistance to the Indian Government, by working in partnership to help this young democratic nation with so much potential, but so many burdens, to develop into a strong democracy which stands as an example to the entire region.

In the past year, India has made great strides toward improving its human rights record. I think the United States can be proud of our role in encouraging this achievement. U.S. assistance to India is one of the success stories of our foreign assistance program. India is a strong democracy in a region in need of a positive force to encourage the growth of democracy. I urge my colleagues to vote to continue our current commonsense policy toward India. I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will not take 5 minutes, but just a minute. I do have Sikhs in my district, and many of them have suffered some of the atrocities that the gentleman from Indiana has spoken about.

I would like to associate myself with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] and his comments that he has made, because they are true. It is true that some groups have gone into Punjab and Kashmir, but they are not allowed on a regular basis. When they have gone it, you have heard the results that Mr. BURTON has read and Mr. BONIOR has talked about. These are farmers. They own most of the land, and they are having violations. I have heard there is punishment and slaps in the face. Well, punish me with $152 million, and that is not a slap in the face.

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment to the original amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOLKMER as a substitute to the amendment offered by Mr.

BURTON of Indiana: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment, insert the following:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO INDIA

SEC. 564. Not to exceed $65,000,000 appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Development Assistance Fund'' may be made available to the Government of India.

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

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the substitute for the amendment. I do not think the original sponsor of the original amendment objects.

Mr. VOLKMER. This says it is only the $65 million. That is it. Now, in other words, it is a cut of $5 million. That is it.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ACKERMAN. I believe I must ask the Chair for a parliamentary inquiry, rather than the gentleman in the well.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri must yield for that purpose.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, did I understand the gentleman to say this is an amendment to the amendment to the amendment? If so, I believe that would not be in order at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a substitute for the Burton amendment.

Mr. ACKERMAN. May we see a copy of it?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will make copies available.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will first put the question on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], as amended.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to rule XXIII, the Chair may reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the underlying Burton amendment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 284, noes 118, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 445]

AYES—284

Abercrombie
Allard
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Flake
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Franks (CT)
Frisa
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Geren
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Kolbe
LaFalce
Largent
Laughlin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Longley
Lucas
Luther
Manzullo
Martini
Mascara
McCarthy
McCrery
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
Metcalf
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Neal
Neumann
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Sabo
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shays
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry
Thornton
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Tucker
Vento
Volkmer
Waldholtz
Wamp
Ward
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wolf
Wyden
Zeliff

NOES—118

Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Barr
Bateman
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Boucher
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Clayton
Clyburn
Collins (IL)
Conyers
Coyne
DeFazio
Dellums
Deutsch
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Durbin
Ehlers
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Fattah
Filner
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Funderburk
Furse
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gillmor
Green
Gutierrez
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Horn
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kildee
Knollenberg
LaHood
Lantos
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lightfoot
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mica
Mineta
Mink
Morella
Nadler
Nethercutt
Ney
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Peterson (FL)
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sawyer
Scott
Shaw
Shuster
Skaggs
Souder
Spence
Studds
Taylor (NC)
Thompson
Thurman
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Waters
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—32

Archer
Becerra
Chapman
Coleman
Collins (MI)
Foglietta
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Harman
Hefley
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Latham
Martinez
McDade
McNulty
Meyers
Mfume
Moakley
Reynolds
Roukema
Sanders
Schumer
Solomon
Stark
Stokes
Tauzin
Towns
Waxman
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

□ 0726

Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DOGGETT, Mrs. FOWLER, Mrs. KELLY, Ms. WATERS, and Messrs. STUDDS, PETERSON of Florida, and MATSUI changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. GILMAN, OBEY, EMERSON, and SHADEGG changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 1 minute.

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

Mr. LINDER. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can only do that by unanimous consent.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, why is it by unanimous consent at this stage?

The CHAIRMAN. It is right here in the manual. A pro forma amendment may be offered after a substitute has been adopted and before the vote on the amendment, as amended, by unanimous consent only.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I could not hear the ruling because of the uproar.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, we could not hear the ruling.

The CHAIRMAN. A pro forma amendment may be offered after a substitute has been adopted and before the vote on the amendment, as amended, by unanimous consent only. That answers the gentleman's question.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee be allowed to speak.

Mr. LINDER. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], as amended.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 210, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 446]

AYES—191

Abercrombie
Allard
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Camp
Canady
Chenoweth
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehrlich
Ensign
Everett
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Franks (CT)
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hancock
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hoke
Hostettler
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Kaptur
Kennelly
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klug
Kolbe
Largent
Latham
Laughlin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
Longley
Manzullo
Martini
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
Metcalf
Miller (CA)
Minge
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Myers
Myrick
Neumann
Nussle
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (MN)
Pombo
Porter
Poshard
Quillen
Radanovich
Ramstad
Reed
Riggs
Rivers
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Salmon
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schroeder
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Volkmer
Waldholtz
Walker
Wamp
Watt (NC)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Wyden
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—210

Ackerman
Andrews
Archer
Baesler
Baldacci
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bishop
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Burr
Calvert
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Collins (IL)
Conyers
Cooley
Coyne
Cramer
Cremeans
Danner
Davis
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Evans
Ewing
Fattah
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flanagan
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kim
Klink
Knollenberg
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Norwood
Obey
Oxley
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Petri
Pickett
Pomeroy
Portman
Pryce
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Richardson
Roberts
Roemer
Rose
Roth
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanford
Sawyer
Schiff
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Souder
Studds
Stupak
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Tucker
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Walsh
Ward
Waters
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn

NOT VOTING—33

Becerra
Chapman
Coleman
Collins (MI)
DeFazio
Foglietta
Goodling
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Harman
Hefley
Hutchinson
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Martinez
McNulty
Meyers
Mfume
Moakley
Reynolds
Roukema
Sanders
Schumer
Solomon
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Tauzin
Towns
Waxman
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

□ 0736

Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. EWING changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment, as amended, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROEMER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROEMER: Page 78, after line 6, insert the following new section:

LIMITATION ON FUNDS FOR RUSSIA

SEC. 564. Of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Assistance for the New Independent States of the Former Soviet Union'', not more than $150,000,000 may be made available for Russia.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to start out by thanking the Chair for his fairness presiding all through the night on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], who have been exceedingly patient with an open rule.

Mr. Chairman, we are now debating all night, into the morning. We are competing with ''Good Morning America,'' the ''Today Show,'' ''Sesame Street'' for some of our children that we did not see last night. We are debating some very serious issues.

We are talking about two things. We are talking about cutting, in a fair way, some funds in this budget. We are talking about America and what America stands for.

About 15 hours ago we debated what that flag behind our Chairman stood for. We heard different people articulate what that means to veterans who have died overseas. We heard people talk about their experience marching in civil rights parades. Now we hear about people overseas and what that American flag means to them. It means fairness. It means democracy. It means justice.

What my amendment would achieve is justice in terms of cuts in foreign aid to Russia and in terms of a fair outcome for an unjust war that the Russians started in Chechnya. My amendment would cut $30 million from Russia.

Some people might clamor, ''Oh, that's too much. We've already cut some aid for Russia. That's too much to cut.''

Mr. Chairman, $30 million. I ask for Members' support. That is not too much to send a signal to Russia that they have conducted themselves in a brutal and inhumane way in attacking the people and the country of Chechnya.

How much do we give Russia in aid? In the NIS account under New Independent States, $580 million. Under the DOD funds for the Nunn-Lugar to this date, $612 million. IMF loans, we just extended them a $6.2 billion loan. Space Station will give them $400 million. Then we will extend money to them under OPIC and World Banks.

Is $30 million too much to ask if we are going to cut $25 million from Turkey for human rights? No. Is $30 million too much to send a signal to the people of Russia that we will not subsidize a war with American money?

That is in effect what we are doing. We are sending hundreds of millions of dollars over there. The Russians are spending $2 billion to attack Chechnya. We are subsidizing that with these hundreds of millions of dollars.

I think our relationship with Russia is critical. I did not support the Hefley amendment to cut $296 million. We need to engage with the Russians. We need to see an orderly transition. We do not want to spend hundreds of billions of dollars increasing our defense expenditures, but to send them a message for a $30 million cut I think is fair.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, is not about what is wrong in Russia. It is about what is right in America, that we stand up for peace, that we stand up for justice, and the United States should send the Russians a signal.

As the American people wake up across this country, let's show them we have worked through the night. We are going to cut some foreign aid, we are going to do it justly, and we are going to try to end an inhumane war in Chechnya.

I urge my colleagues to support this fair amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROEMER

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, 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. ROEMER: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment, insert the following:

LIMITATION ON FUNDS FOR RUSSIA

SEC. 564. Of the funds appropriated in the Act under the heading ''Assistance for the New Independent States of the Former Soviet Union'', not more than $195,000,000 may be made available for Russia.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] all pointed out yesterday, if this were pre-1990, or if 1990 had not happened and the Communists were still in control in Russia, we would be spending about $200 billion more on our defense budget. So the question here is not whether we are for or against the war in Chechnya. We are against it.

I would point out that the people of Russia have indicated that they are outraged over their Government's action in Chechnya. They have given Mr. Yeltsin single-digit ratings in the polls. The Russian media has roundly attacked the actions of the Russian Government for Chechnya.

□ 0745

So have sectors of the military, including General Lebyan, who is one of the most popular figures in the Russian military establishment who called upon the government to enter negotiations with the Chechnyans. So has most of the Russian parliament.

We have talks underway between Russia and Chechnya. The Russian Government started talks with them and Prime Minister Chernomyrdin on June 25 that Russia would seek only a political solution.

I would suggest to you that that indicates that it is not just Members of Congress who are opposed to Russian action in Chechnya. So are the vast majority of people who have spoken out in Russia itself. Now people want to send a signal to the Russian Government that they want that war to stop. I do not think there is any harm in that. But I think it needs to be a measured response or else we will, in fact, hurt the very reformers who are tying to see to it that they end that war, the very reformers who are also trying to bring a market system and a system of democracy to that country which has not been anywhere near close in a thousand years or more.

So this amendment simply limits the amount that we would provide to Russia to $195 million, and it is an effort to send a signal without doing damage to the very forces in Russia who are on our side on democratization, on moving to market forces and ending the war. To me it gives us an opportunity to do things that both sides want, and I would urge you in the spirit of sending a measured signal to that country to accept the substitute amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am one of the lone voices on our side of the aisle who believes that there are times for open rules and that there are times for closed rules, and I think have just exhibited one of those times when maybe we should have had a closed rule.

You know, everybody has their views on foreign policy, and most of them have expressed themselves in the last several hours, many of them, several times.

Now, I will tell that you in my opinion, the subcommittee headed up by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] did a tremendous job in producing a very difficult bill. They took this bill down by almost $2 billion under what was appropriated last year and almost $3 billion under what the President asked for.

It was not easy to produce this bill. The bill comes out as a foreign aid appropriations bill perhaps for the first time in 20 years under an open rule.

On one amendment after another, the House has worked its will. And that is good. That is democracy. That is just exactly what the gentleman from Indiana indicated is represented by the flag behind me, except for the fact that not everybody has all of the facts at their fingertips on every subject that we have discussed. The emotionalism of the moment gets in the way. Individual groups get about various aggravating factors that have nothing whatsoever to do with the bill.

Others might be upset about something that happened on another bill. People vote or call for votes even when it disrupts the business of the evening. As a result not every decision we have made in the last 2 days has been in the best interest of a cohesive U.S. foreign policy. But we are going to have to move this bill and the administration is going to have to live with it. It is going to go to the Senate, and they in turn will work their will.

All of that is background for my belief that this amendment by the gentleman from Indiana, is founded on the best of intentions, as were most of the amendments that have been debated here today. But it does cut too far and it is not good foreign policy. And that is why I support the substitute from the gentleman from Wisconsin.

You can take it out on the Russians, and I agree with everything the gentleman from Indiana has said about the Chechnyan horror. The Russians have gone too far. They have massacred innocent men, women, and children. There is no doubt about it. But we have still got to remember that good foreign policy is not made by overreacting to every issue that grates on our emotions.

Foreign policy is a network of ideas, of concepts that have to come together and work in the best national interest of this country and of peace and freedom in the world. And if we are going to get cohesive, sensible policy, then we cannot just pick out one thing that grates on us and react to it.

So I would tell my colleagues that the fact that Russia has joined the NATO Partnership for Peace, the fact that they are working for an end of the conflict in Tadzhikistan, the fact that they are withdrawing troops in Moldavia, the fact that they are reaching an agreement with Ukraine on the division of the Black Sea fleet and basing of that fleet, the fact that they are moving toward a settlement in Georgia, the fact that they have agreed to a peacekeeping force in Azerbaijan that will operate under OSCE supervision, the fact that they have withdrawn their troops from the Baltic States, that they have ended their targeting of nuclear weapons against the United States, that the cold war is over, that free media is flourishing in Russia today, that elections for President and the Parliament are progressing on schedule, that democracy is taking root in an area that has not never been known in its entire history: All of

those things are also things that you should consider when you consider whether or not we should cut aid to the Russian people from the United States.

I would urge you ladies and gentlemen, stop getting carried away with the emotionalism of one issue that is brought up on the floor to sweep us off our feet and start realizing that foreign policy is more complicated than any one single issue. As well-intentioned as the gentleman from Indiana is with his amendment, I urge you to adopt the substitute from the gentleman from Wisconsin. It is a fair and just statement about the outrages that exist in Chechnya.

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

Mr. Chairman, you know, I guess it comes as no surprise I am not the smartest man in the House. I am not the most effective man in the House. I am not the most handsome man in the House, and I suppose if my epitaph had to be written today, the epitaph would have to mention, if I did anything in the United States House of Representatives, it was fight aid to Russia.

Last year when I was on the floor of this House of Representatives complaining about a foolish program of building houses for Russian soldiers, I do not think I saw the gentleman from Indiana standing up opposing that. And for the gentleman to stand on the floor of the House tonight and to indicate that I have not cut aid to Russia and that only he is here to cut aid to Russia is sort of an insult.

In 1994, the level of aid to Russia was $2.1 billion. In 1995, it was $842 million. The President came and said, SONNY, we need $788 million, and I said, no, Mr. President, we are only going to give you $595 million. So I have cut aid to Russia to nearly 25 percent of what it was two years ago. So let us not confuse this issue of CALLAHAN standing here supporting aid to Russia.

I am supporting a responsible piece of legislation that has bipartisan support.

I started out at $150 million and then we compromised with others in the House in order to reach a consensus that we could bring to this floor. So let us not confuse this with the fact that we are not already cutting aid to Russia.

I think, Mr. Chairman, we should adopt the Obey substitute. I think it is responsible, and I think we should adopt it now, and I think we should move on with the other three amendments.

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

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I would just say that as I started my remarks on opening up, that I complimented the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] for his hard work on this bill. He has been very fair and open and I did not intend any kind of insult to the gentleman from Alabama by offering this amendment.

I think he has done as fair a job as he could in putting this bill together. However, there are many things where we give aid to the Russians that do not fall under the gentleman's purview and jurisdiction.

And I mentioned some of those, the DOD funds and Nunn-Lugar, over $612 million. You mentioned the NIS account, $580 million; IMF loan, space station. My amendment does not touch Nunn-Lugar. My amendment does not touch space station. My amendment does not touch U.S. assistance through trade investment agencies and OPIC.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment tries to say that instead of just saying to the Russians with a $5 million cut out of $1 billion, when you add up all the programs, ''Please do not do it again,'' and wink at the Russians, my amendment says, ''You will not do it again.'' This is $30 million as opposed to $5 million. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] has done an exceedingly fair job on this bill.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I greatly respect the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] and his concern about human rights. I think that human rights is a basic value on both sides of the aisle and it has to remain a basic value of this House.

But I think we need to understand that one of the reasons that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] made the major reductions that he did in his mark was because of the general concern in the House about the war in Chechnya. If it had not been for that war, we would have fought for a much higher number.

We felt that the number provided by the gentleman already sends a significant signal to anybody who has one ear open. But nonetheless, in order to assist all Members of the House so that they can specifically record themselves as wanting to send another message, we are supporting a further modest reduction in aid to Russia. We simply have a question about numbers and we have a question about whether if you go too deep, you do not harm the very forces in Russia who are the most on our side.

Mr. Chairman, I want to respect everyone's sincerity, but I would strongly urge the House to support this amendment. It will send a measured signal, but it will not send a dangerous signal and that is what we are trying to do.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, just to close let me say also if the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] or anybody else would like to read the language of the bill, we address the Chechnyan situation and we are just as distressed as the gentleman or anybody else.

Thus, in the language of the bill, in the report language, we do point out our discontent with what is happening there and we encourage them to change their direction. So we have addressed Chechnya.

We have addressed the reduction with 25 percent of what we were 2 years ago, and I would urge the adoption of the Obey substitute.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the Committee on International Relations and I am among those who vote to cut, not to send a signal, but to save money.

I believe in a lean and trim foreign aid policy because it is cheaper to make the peace than it is to fight the war. But we have also got a $4.8 trillion debt on our hands and according to the generational forecast that is printed in the budget, because of this debt by the time every child born after 1993 goes to work, he or she will pay between 84 and 94 percent of his or her income in State, local, and Federal taxes.

That is one of the reasons why I believe in a foreign aid policy. I am going to vote in favor of the foreign aid bill regardless of the form, but I am cutting not to send a signal to the foreign countries, but to save money.

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

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

□ 0800

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman if we totaled up everything that the American taxpayers shelled out in taxes since we first had the cold war begin until the Berlin Wall fell down or was knocked down, I would like to ask the gentleman:

''How much do you think that would amount to per family in this country in taxes?''

Mr. MANZULLO. I was not a Member of Congress then.

Mr. OBEY. Neither was I, but the answer is $80,000 per family. That is what the average American family has shelled out over the last 45 years to win the cold war.

It seems to me that what we are talking about tonight is the necessity to invest a tiny pittance in comparison to that number to try to secure a peace——

Mr. MANZULLO. Reclaiming my time——

Mr. OBEY. That, if it is lost, will cost us far more.

Mr. MANZULLO. Reclaiming my time, I have no objection with it. I am just stating words have been said on the floor here that many of us are voting to cut because we do not understand foreign policy, that it is more complicated than we think it is.

I am on the committee, and I have studied it. Maybe I do not understand it as well as many of the members here do, but I have an obligation to those kids born after 1993 who are facing a 48- to 49-percent income tax rate in this country, my children and the children of the people we represent, that we

have to take every opportunity there is to make a cut, and there are many of us that are voting not to send a signal to Russia, not to send a signal to India, but simply to say we want to save money and we use this as an opportunity to do so.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say very briefly we are asking, and I think the gentleman from Wisconsin put it in pretty good perspective, we are asking the average American to allow us to spend $2 this year. We are saying, ''We believe, if you'll let us spend $2, we have a better chance of your children living in a world in which Russia is a democracy.''

And, yes, it has problems, and, yes, there are things we do not like, and, yes, it may even fail. But we believe those $2 is a better gamble of not having to go to a draft, not having to risk a nuclear war, not having to do a lot of other things. That is what it comes down to, $2 per American.

I would simply ask all of my colleagues to vote for the substitute offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the 5 minutes, but I want to follow the Speaker and urge Members on both sides of the aisle to vote for the Obey substitute.

I have the greatest respect for my friend from Indiana. But I believe that what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is suggesting is a better approach.

Russia is in the balance today. No one is happy with what happened in Chechnya. Everyone hopes for future progress. This is an embryonic democracy that is trying to become a democracy, and, if we take this language of a cut as suggested by my friend from Indiana, we stand the chance of injuring the ability of this democracy to take root and to take hold and to save us billions and billions of dollars in the future.

I urge Members on both sides of the aisle in a bipartisan manner to vote for the Obey substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

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

Mr. Chairman, now we have been at this a long time, apparently for 200 years or better. Now I just think it is a sad day when we start talking about embryonic democracies, when we start talking about how we can justify what is going on in Chechnya and say that we are not going to do what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] is asking.

Now I do not know about the message, whether it will be clear or whether it will not be clear, but I know what will be clear from our point of view if we back up this amendment that is being offered.

How can we take a look at what is going on? I do not know. Maybe it is because we have the electronic media that bring us these pictures, that brings us the immediacy, if my colleagues will. We do not have the luxury, I guess, if that is the right word, of contemplating these atrocities at a distance of time. It is not brought by a clipper ship, or it is not taken by Pony Express, or that we literally have distanced ourselves.

But I do not think any message is going to be delivered unless this kind of message, delivered from this Congress, because we are the ones that can make that difference. I do not know what Mr. Yeltsin's position is at the moment because I am not quite sure whether he can stand or sit. I do not know what is going on as far as the Russian Parliament is, whether it is going to stand or fall this week, but I do know one thing. I know that what I have heard about, how the Chechnyans are viewed by the Russians. If we think we have got racism in this country to deal with, and we do, well, let me tell my colleagues it pales in comparison to the way the Russians regard the Chechnyans. There is no human dimension operating where they are concerned. As far as the Chechnyans are concerned, they would just as soon wipe them all out.

Now, if we want to participate in that, in the name of democracy we can go ahead and do that. But I am telling my colleagues it diminishes us, it diminishes us as a people, it diminishes us as a democracy. One thing we have always stood for, or tried to at least in our rhetorical stances, and I do not use the word rhetorical in some pejorative sense. One thing we stood for historically along the way is when the little person is being done in by the big person we stand with them.

I was asked at one point why did I ever get into politics. I said, ''Sunday school; I think it is one of the few times I've ever been able to get anybody to stand back and wonder what did he say.'' It was Sunday school. That is what I learned, and I learned that that is what Americans do, and that is what Americans stand for and stand up for.

The Russians want to destroy these people. When I say the Russians I am talking about the leadership there. I do not think the Russian people want to be involved in this, and I think a lot of them will take a signal, if that is what we are talking about here today, what kind of signal gets sent. They would take a signal that we understand that, and so, while I applaud the motives of the previous two speakers, I think that, if we genuinely mean to stand for those things that have been discussed from the very first moments of our second day of deliberation here with respect to that flag, that we are going to back up the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

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

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I would just conclude by saying that I have the greatest respect for the Speaker and the minority leader, but, if we are going to show a fledgling democracy how a great democracy acts, then we should send a strong signal.

What is the greater threat to internal Russia right now? Is it the war in Chechnya, or is it $30 million out of a billion that we are sending them?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I think the greatest threat to Russian democracy right now is this enterprise they are engaged in, in Chechnya.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 17-minute vote.

Pursuant to rule XXIII, the Chair may reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the underlying amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 348, noes 67, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 447]

AYES—348

Ackerman	Brown (CA)	Davis
Allard	Brown (FL)	de la Garza
Archer	Brown (OH)	Deal
Armey	Brownback	DeFazio
Bachus	Bryant (TX)	DeLauro
Baker (CA)	Bunn	DeLay
Baker (LA)	Burr	Dellums
Baldacci	Buyer	Deutsch
Ballenger	Callahan	Dickey
Barcia	Calvert	Dicks
Barr	Camp	Dingell
Barrett (NE)	Canady	Dixon
Barrett (WI)	Cardin	Doggett
Bartlett	Castle	Dooley
Barton	Chambliss	Doolittle
Bass	Christensen	Doyle
Bateman	Chrysler	Dreier
Becerra	Clay	Dunn
Beilenson	Clayton	Edwards
Bentsen	Clement	Ehlers
Bereuter	Clinger	Ehrlich
Berman	Clyburn	Emerson
Bevill	Coble	Engel
Bilbray	Coburn	English
Bilirakis	Coleman	Eshoo
Bishop	Collins (GA)	Evans
Bliley	Collins (IL)	Everett
Blute	Combest	Ewing
Boehlert	Condit	Fawell
Boehner	Conyers	Fazio
Bonilla	Cooley	Fields (TX)
Bonior	Costello	Filner
Bono	Coyne	Flake
Borski	Cramer	Flanagan
Boucher	Cremeans	Foley
Brewster	Cunningham	Forbes
Browder	Danner	Ford

Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hutchinson
Hyde
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McKeon
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Rogers
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Zeliff

NOES—67

Abercrombie
Andrews
Baesler
Bryant (TN)
Bunning
Burton
Chabot
Chenoweth
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Diaz-Balart
Dornan
Duncan
Durbin
Ensign
Farr
Fattah
Funderburk
Geren
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hayworth
Hilleary
Hoke
Hunter
Inglis
Jacobs
Jefferson
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lofgren
Longley
McIntosh
McKinney
Metcalf
Miller (CA)
Neumann
Ney
Pallone
Quillen
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Scarborough
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shuster
Smith (WA)
Souder
Stockman
Tate
Taylor (MS)
Tiahrt
Traficant
Tucker
Volkmer
Wamp
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—20

Chapman
Collins (MI)
Fields (LA)
Foglietta
Gunderson
Hefley
Martinez
McInnis
McNulty
Meyers
Moakley
Reynolds
Sanders
Schumer
Solomon
Stokes
Towns
Waxman
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

□ 0826

Messrs. QUILLEN, LONGLEY, ROYCE, and SANFORD changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mrs. MEEK of Florida and Mr. CHRISTENSEN changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above-recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER], as amended.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 401, noes 2, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 448]

AYES—401

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Combest
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—2

Johnson (CT)
Lofgren

NOT VOTING—31

Bartlett
Barton
Brewster
Chapman
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Fields (LA)
Foglietta
Gephardt
Gunderson
Hefley

Johnson (SD)	Parker	Stokes
Kaptur	Reynolds	Waxman
Martinez	Sanders	Weldon (PA)
McCrery	Schumer	Young (AK)
McNulty	Skelton	Young (FL)
Meyers	Solomon	
Moakley	Stockman	

□ 0836

Mr. HALL of Texas changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 0840

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SOUDER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SOUDER: Page 78, after line 6, insert the following:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO MEXICO

SEC. 564. (a) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be obligated or expended for the Government of Mexico, except if it is made known to the Federal entity or official to which funds are appropriated under this Act that—

(1) the Government of Mexico is taking actions to reduce the amount of illegal drugs entering the United States from Mexico by at least 10 percent of the level of such illegal drugs from the previous year, as determined by the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy; and

(2) the Government of Mexico—

(A) is taking effective actions to apply vigorously all law enforcement resources to investigate, track, capture, incarcerate, and prosecute illegal drug kingpins and their accomplices, individuals responsible for, or otherwise involved in, corruption, and individuals involved in money-laundering; and

(B) is pursuing international anti-drug trafficking initiatives.

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment on behalf of myself, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. ZELIFF], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG], the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BLUTE], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTLER], and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP].

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SOUDER

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified with the modification at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to the amendment offered by Mr. SOUDER numbered 81: Beginning on line 9 strike, ''by at least'' and all through the word ''year'' on line 10.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the modification?

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment, as modified, is as follows:

Amendment, as modified, offered by Mr. SOUDER: Page 78, after line 6, insert the following:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO MEXICO

SEC. 564. (a) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be obligated or expended for the Government of Mexico, except if it is made known to the Federal entity or official to which funds are appropriated under this Act that—

(1) the Government of Mexico is taking actions to reduce the amount of illegal drugs entering the United States from Mexico, as determined by the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy; and

(2) the Government of Mexico—

(A) is taking effective actions to apply vigorously all law enforcement resources to investigate, track, capture, incarcerate, and prosecute illegal drug kingpins and their accomplices, individuals responsible for, or otherwise involved in, corruption, and individuals involved in money-laundering; and

(B) is pursuing international anti-drug trafficking initiatives.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, for the last 2 days the Government Reform Subcommittee with jurisdiction on national security and justice, chaired by the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. ZELIFF], has held hearings on the drug interdiction efforts. This amendment, sponsored by Members from both parties, many of whom serve on the subcommittee, has risen directly from those hearings. I want to especially commend Chairman ZELIFF for his leadership in trying to raise awareness of our Nation's drug crisis that again appears to be rising to even higher than the 1989 levels.

Our amendment is simple. It would stop foreign aid to Mexico unless Mexico reduces the amount of drugs entering the United States as determined by the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

Mexico is taking action to crack down on drug kingpins and individuals involved in money laundering and corruption. Mexico is pursuing international drug trafficking initiatives.

More drugs now come into America from Mexico than from any other country in the world. That is the major reason why we need this. Our Southwest border has provided an unimpeded drug passageway. Consider the following: The State Department estimates that 80 percent of the marijuana in this country comes through Mexico; 60 percent to 70 percent of the cocaine in this country comes through Mexico; and 22 percent of the heroin in this country comes through Mexico.

At the same time, the border seizure rate for illegal drugs is estimated to be in the 5-percent to 15-percent range, according to the CRS. Put another way, we catch fewer drug traffickers than shoplifters within our own borders. This is not due to any lack of effort on the part of our own law enforcement officers. They are simply overwhelmed.

The flow of illicit drugs from Mexico traditionally has not been effectively addressed by the Government of Mexico, despite President Zedillo's apparent enthusiasm for combating drug trafficking. President Zedillo is to be commended for his words of commitment toward the eradication of drug trafficking across our shared border. However, the level of corruption existing within the Mexican Government infrastructure makes me skeptical that such well-intended verbiage will become a reality.

We must not forget that Americans will be left with business as usual if his words do not become a reality, and Mexican drug trafficking will lead to the continued deaths of our children and destruction of our families.

I hope with all my heart that President Zedillo is successful in pursuing reforms, but if he is not, he will have a hard time telling my constituents in Indiana that we let NAFTA pass with no conditions, that we let President Clinton bail out the Mexican economy with no conditions, and now for a third time we are giving Mexico another break with no strings attached. I think my colleagues would also have a hard time explaining this to their constituents in their home States.

I have accepted the change in my amendment because I believe that in order to accelerate things here the most important thing here is to make a statement that we can agree on, and we can get into the RECORD. I also believe because of the wording of the amendment it would be very difficult to establish what the base would have been where he took the 10-percent funds since I do not know the actual amount of illegal drugs coming in. The phrase ''by at least 10 percent of the level of such illegal drugs from the previous year,'' actually modifies the phrase ''is taking action to reduce.'' So I believe that was an acceptable change in order to get this amendment favorably accepted.

CORRUPTION IN THE MEXICAN GOVERNMENT

''Profoundly corrupt'' is how the customs chief in the Reagan and Bush administration recalls the Mexican government of the 1980's. ''And it got worse and worse.''—USA Today, April 4, 1995.

Mexican President Ernesto Zedillo acknowledged, ''There is evidence that some individuals in the government could have served the interests of drug traffickers.'' In a sharp departure from a tradition of denial about high-level involvement in narcotics peddling, the President said illegal drug operations had penetrated ''institutions, power structures and local economies.''—The Houston Post, March 26, 1995.

According to Eduardo Valle Espinoza, a former attorney general's official, at least half of Mexico's 31 Federal police chiefs and 31 Federal attorney general's delegates receive illegal payoffs from drug traffickers * * * they pass that money along to their superiors as part of ''a pyramid of corruption.'' Moreover, police chief posts are so lucrative that some applicants offer $1 million or $2 million just to

be hired.—The Dallas Morning News, March 19, 1995.

Once subsidiaries of the Colombians, Mexico's cartels are becoming full-fledged partners, using some $30 billion in annual revenue to pollute the political system through a familiar combination of bribery and terror.—The Boston Globe, March 19, 1995.

Last year, the corruption was even more blatant. Police credentials signed by the State Attorney General of Baja, California, turned up in the hands of members of the Arellano Felixes. They allegedly were sold out of the attorney general's office for $8,000 to $10,000.—The Boston Globe, March 19, 1995.

The State Department's recently released annual report on international drug trafficking talks matter-of-factly about the influence of narcotics dealers on the Mexican government, saying that efforts were under way to ''eliminate official corruption within law enforcement and the judiciary.''—The Washington Post, March 12, 1995.

Most observers now agree that Mexico is awash in drug money, apparently enough to hasten the peso's decline as some of it moved out of the country recently. Raul Benitez Manaut, a drug trafficking specialist in Mexico City, estimated that as much as half of all hotel tourist revenue last year came from traffickers who laundered millions of dollars simply by having officials create fictitious guests.—The Boston Globe, March 19, 1995.

HORROR STORIES: MEXICO—DRUGS

President Zedillo quoted as saying, ''I also think we have to put order in our own house. We have severe problems in the attorney general's office, historical problems''; Time: ''Of corruption?'' Zedillo: ''Yes.''—Time, June 19, 1995.

''This city [Tijuana] is the main battlefield in a ferocious war for the border that has raged across Mexico, spilling south to Venezuela and north to San Francisco * * *. The combatants are two major Mexican drug cartels—one based in Tijuana, the other in the northwestern state of Sinaloa. More than 200 people have been killed in their battles during the last 5 years, many of them anonymous gunslingers and drug-runners.''—LA Times, June 16, 1995.

A list of ''excellent cadavers'' in the war: ''The former state attorney of Sinaloa, murdered while jogging in a Mexico City park. The head of the Sinaloa human rights commission, slain on orders of a Federal police commander. A roman Catholic cardinal, mowed down in a Guadalajara airport shootout. A Federal police commander, killed by fellow officers guarding a Tijuana drug lord. The Tijuana police chief, ambushed on a highway. And most recently, the former state attorney general of Jalisco, shot has he left home to teach a law class.''—LA Times, June 16, 1995.

A quote from a Mexican investigator: ''There are powerful obstacles within the State police forces, people allied with the narcotics. The Federal police are another obstacle. And the third enemy is the bad guys themselves. So you are fighting three fronts. It goes beyond the police. Organized crime has the support and participation of politicians. It happened in Colombia. And it is happening in Mexico.''—LA Times, June 16, 1995.

Cocaine arrives from Columbia, through the desert city of Mexicali, where smuggling specialists, ''Who function as subcontractors for the different cartels, send groups of loaded vehicles through the Calexico port of entry to the Los Angeles area, often warehousing the cocaine in Riverside and San Bernardino counties.'' This Imperial Valley corridor accounted for almost one-half of the cocaine seized along the southwestern border during the past three years.''—LA Times, June 16, 1995.

''We have reliable information that every load of cocaine that comes into Mexicali is guarded by Mexican federal police,'' said a high ranking United States law enforcement agent, who asked not be to identified.—LA Times, June 16, 1995.

The corruptive influence reaches across the border. A continuing probe of U.S. border inspectors has resulted in charges against two Calexico inspectors for waving across tons of smuggled cocaine in exchange for bribes. Just last month, a grand juror from the Imperial Valley was convicted in San Diego Federal court of leaking sensitive information to traffickers—the first case of grand jury tampering in the history of the Southern District of the U.S. District Court.—LA Times, June 16, 1995.

A massive indictment involving southern California currency exchanges in April—the sting revealed how traffickers infiltrated the thriving cross-border industry to move and launder their millions. The suspects included the owner of a chain of currency businesses in Los Angles, Orange, and San Diego counties and a prominent accountant who the U.S. DEA says it linked to the Arellanos—LA Times. June 16, 1995.

On taking advantage of NAFTA: Gangsters also have acquired trucking companies and sought consultants with expertise in NAFTA, ''someone knowledgeable who could counsel them on how to take advantage of NAFTA to move their product,'' said Craig Chretien, special agent in charge of the DEA in San Diego—LA Times. June 16, 1995.

Summary of the article above, the struggle between rival gangs and drug families has pushed across the border, and is too far out of control for the Mexican police to handle. One official was quoted: ''We are fighting a monster. We have just begun to cut off a few tentacles, but we are not close to killing it.''—LA Times. June 16, 1995.

''As a result of the financial capacity of these drug-trafficking organizations, the tendency to infiltrate the government and financial structures will continue. The power of the drug-trafficking organizations could lead to situations of ungovernability, using whatever political or economic space in which institutions show weakness or inattention; the advance of drug-trafficking promotes impunity and uncertainty in the institutions, justifies violence and increases intimidation of the authorities''—(taken from a report from Mexico's National Institute for Combating Drugs).—LA Times. June 15, 1995.

Mexico has become a ''narco-democracy''—a term to reflect the apparent contradiction of a nation governed by elected officials and a democratic constitution falling under the influence of ruthless international drug cartels.—LA Times. June 15, 1995.

''The bosses of Mexico's handful of major cartels remain at large, raking up what Constatine estimates at $7 billion in annual profits as they consolidate their presence north of the border.''—LA Times. June 15, 1995.

''Notable murders blamed on ''narco-politics,'' such as the slaying of Presidential candidate Luis Donaldo Colosio last year and that of the Roman Catholic cardinal of Guadalajara the year before, have gone unsolved. Mexican and United States authorities are investigating ruling party leaders suspected of collusion with drug lords in these and other crimes.''—LA Times. June 15, 1995.

''Drug corruption pervades law enforcement. Federal and State police serve as soldiers of the underworld. They commit murders, guard drug lords and, as was graphically illustrated in the mystery surrounding a giant cocaine shipment that landed in the state of Zacatecas last year, escort huge loads of drugs toward the United States. Mexican Federal officers protect smuggling operations in hub cities such as Mexicali, according to United States Law enforcement.''—LA Times. June 15, 1995.

''There has been a history of, and there continue to be problems with, the groups of Mexican Federal police assigned to high-profile areas of trafficking, such as the border. They get percentages of drug profits; they get compromised. It has been tough. There is an unacceptable level of corruption.'' Craig Chretien.—LA Times. June 15, 1995.

''A U.N. commission on transnational crime recently said gangs have used the battered economy as a Laundromat for their illicit profits. They convert their dollar revenues into cheap pesos and buy movable assets, such as luxury cars, in Mexico. Then they sell them abroad for ''clean'' dollar profits. U.N. sources estimated that the cartels laundered tens of thousands millions of dollars in Mexico this year''.—LA Times. June 15, 1995.

MEXICO: AMERICA'S #1 DRUG TRANSIT POINT!

More drugs come into America from Mexico than from any other country in the world.

Our Southwest border has provided an unimpeded drug passageway. Consider the following: 80 percent of the marijuana in this country comes through Mexico; 60–70 percent of the cocaine in this country comes through Mexico; and 22 percent of the heroin in this country comes through Mexico.—(estimates from the State Department)

We catch fewer drug traffickers than shoplifters within our own borders. The border seizure rate for illegal drugs is estimated to be a mere 5 to 15 percent. This isn't due to any lack of effort on the part of our own law enforcement officers, they are simply overwhelmed.—(estimates from CRS)

The United States receives more illegal—than legal—imports from Mexico each year. According to some estimates, Americans spend at least $50 billion per year on illegal drug purchases versus $32.5 billion per year on legal imports.—(estimates from CRS)

It's time to put drug traffickers out of their jobs and behind bars. But in order to do so, we must hold the Mexican Government accountable for its part in the war on drugs. This is exactly what the Souder-Zeliff amendment would do.

THREE STRIKES AND WE'RE OUT!

Strike One: The 103d Congress gave Mexico its first break by allowing the passage of NAFTA with no strings attached. We opened the door to increased trade to Mexico—and increased drug trafficking with it. Decreased border examinations have let more drugs enter our country via the Mexican border.

Strike Two: President Clinton's $47.5 billion bailout gave Mexico its second big break with no strings attached. The Mexican Government

made a poor judgment when it devalued the peso, and now American taxpayers are picking up the tab.

Strike Three? If we don't get tough with Mexico now, and pass the Souder-Zeliff amendment, we will hand Mexico its third break with no strings attached.

But this time it won't be the Mexican government receiving the big break, it will be the drug smugglers, lords, and kingpins. I'll have a hard time telling my constituents that we have let this happen, and I think you will too.

Vote for the Souder-Zeliff Amendment—Don't Let America Strike Out.

RELENTLESS GOVERNMENT CORRUPTION

While President Zedillo is to be applauded for advocating a tough policy on drugs, previous administrations have endorsed similar initiatives without results.

The level of corruption in the Mexican Government has rendered futile their best efforts—pervasive corruption doesn't stop at the snap of a finger.

When a newspaper in Mexico's own capital city writes that every police agency ''from the smallest town to the Federal judicial police is contaminated by the narco-traffickers,'' I think there is still a problem.

Officials are often offered the choice of ''silver or lead''—money or a bullet—allowing traffickers to build their powerful empires.

Despite President Zedillo's good intentions, President John Adams was right:

Americans deserve better than to passively wait and see if the promises made by one administration in this narco-democracy become a reality. We cannot wait while one more life is lost to the drug trade.

The drug problem in this country is not only an issue of demand—it is also an issue of supply. We must use whatever leverage we have to stem the flow of drugs into this country—we owe our children nothing less.

Columbians fly merchandise to central and south America in converted 727's capable of carrying up to 10 tons. Mexicans ship it in small shipments by truck, trains, and small ships. ''At every key transit point, bribed Mexican officials are on hand to help.''—LA Times. June 15, 1995.

Mexican drug lords now spend as much as $500 million a year on bribery. They spend nearly $1,000 in payoffs for each kilogram of cocaine. The Mexican Federal attorney general's annual budget is about $200 million—less than half of the presumed cartels' kickbacks.—LA Times. June 15, 1995.

Aug 6, 1994. Soon after a shipment of cocaine estimated at $200 million was seized by Mexican officials, a separate police force hijacked it. They unloaded about ¾ of the shipment into trucks, before allowing it to proceed to the state capital.—LA Times. June 15, 1995.

''In this operation, it's left absolutely clear the connection that exists between high officials of the attorney general's office and the narcotics gangs operating in Zacatecas.''—Top U.S. Justice officials concluded that the drug theft was covered up.—LA Times. June 15, 1995.

On corruption: ''There are few officers whom they can depend on. In there, they give an order and the bad guys know about it before the officers. It turns out that the one who receives the order is the traitor.''—LA Times. June 15, 1995.

Ruiz Massieu, 44, is considered to be the symbol of cynicism and corruption to rival any of the PRI's six decades in power. He has been charged with covering up for the man accused of ordering his brother's assassination, and being investigated for possible ties to drug traffickers after $10 million was discovered in bank accounts in his name.—LA Times. June 15, 1995.

Drug trafficking is a $30 billion-a-year business in Mexico.—Dallas Morning News. June 6, 1995.

''Observers believe that many businesses in Mexico that are seeking United States investment may actually belong to drug traffickers, or to businessmen who are in league with drug traffickers. 'It's becoming impossible to know whether they're holding hands with the Devil down there'.''—Dallas News. June 6, 1995.

Recent revelations about more direct and flagrant links between drug lords and political elites in Latin America suggest significant changes in the traditional ways of doing drug business: Leaks from American officials, together with investigations and arrests in Mexico and Columbia, show that the drug lords are modernizing, becoming businessmen instead of simply rich, high-rolling, quick-burnout delinquents.—LA Times. May 23, 1995.

Faced with a growing threat from narcotics traffickers, President Ernesto Zedillo has ordered the Mexican military to take a greater role in the antidrug fight, including the use of air force jets to intercept planes loaded with cocaine.—The New York Times. May 23, 1995.

Expenditures for this fight against drug trafficking has risen to $38 million from $27 million.—New York Times. May 23, 1995.

Mexican officials agreed to crack down after Clinton's $52 billion international rescue package, most notably by giving the U.S. more information on drug trafficking.—New York Times. May 23, 1995.

For the U.S., the tentacles of drug-based corruption are thwarting the war against cocaine traffickers, but, for others, President Zedillo's commitment to that war is credible and may even turn the tide.—San Diego Union Tribune: May 15, 1995.

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

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have examined the amendment. The amendment is acceptable to this side of the aisle.

Mr. SOUDER. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. SOUDER. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

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

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman for making the amendment. I think it is right on the mark and sends the appropriate message.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman from Indiana's amendment. Very simply, Mr. Chairman, this amendment would hold funds from Mexico until they can prove that they decrease the drug flow to our country by 10 percent. I remind my colleagues that 80 percent of the marijuana, 70 percent of the cocaine, and 20 percent of the heroin traffic to the United States comes through Mexico. I firmly believe that we need to take huge steps in refocusing our efforts on stemming the tide of drugs that are killing this Nation. The Souder amendment is an extremely effective first step in that effort. Drugs are killing our Nation, Mr. Chairman, and I fear that we in this Congress have forgotten that. As Drug Enforcement Administration Constantine said, they are a timebomb about to go off. It's time our Nation wakes up and realizes this.

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs, and Criminal Justice, I have held four high-level oversight hearings on the President's national drug strategy—what we have learned is devastating.

Over the course of our four hearings, we have heard from Nancy Reagan, former cabinet members, prevention groups, and drug czar Lee Brown. We have also heard testimony from the heads of the Drug Enforcement Agency, U.S. Customs, and the Coast Guard, President Clinton's interdiction coordinator, and GAO investigators. They revealed that they have just completed a major study of the Clinton administration's drug strategy in source countries.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to share with the House what we have learned:

First, the head of DEA, Administrator Constantine, admitted that our exploding drug use in this country—that was falling until 3 years ago—and the international drug cartels should be seen as our No. 1 national security threat. He ranked it above ballistic missiles for the impact on our Nation. Yet he also admitted that it is not given that ranking by his own administration's National Security Council. He spoke from the heart and called his threat, and I quote, a ''timebomb.''

Second, the President's interdiction coordinator, Admiral Kramek, admitted that his office, which is supposed to coordinate the whole Nation's drug interdiction effort, has just six people—and that his efforts have seen cuts for 3 straight years.

Fourth we received admissions from the DEA, the President's interdiction coordinator, and the head of U.S. Customs that President Clinton's drug strategy is nor fulfillng expectations.

Fourth, and Mr. Chairman, GAO today dropped a bomb in our committee. After investigating the Clinton drug strategy in the source countries, including extensive interviews in Columbia and Mexico, they released a study that shows that the Clinton anti-drug strategy in the source countries is very badly managed, poorly coordinated among agencies, holds low priority in key embassies, including the United States embassy in Mexico—even though 70 percent of the cocaine coming to the United States comes from Mexico, and that the Clinton administration's drug strategy in source countries has serious accountability problems. That study and testimony is available from GAO for anyone who asks.

What does this all mean, Mr. Chairman? It means that what we have is a secret epidemic creeping back into American culture, and we have a failed drug policy by this administration. There is much to be done to correct this, Mr. Chairman, and the Souder amendment is not the answer—but it is a definite step toward cutting the flow of drugs from Mexico. We must do everything we can to stop the drugs at their source. The majority of cocaine comes

into our country from Mexico, and that is where we must start.

They will feel it where it hurts, Mr. Chairman—in the wallet. We cannot afford to continue to ignore this epidemic and sweep it under the rug. The time is now to begin the war on drugs once again. I urge my colleagues in the strongest possible terms to vote for the Souder amendment, and show Mexico that we are serious about cleaning up the scourge of drugs from America's streets.

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

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

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is acceptable to the minority as well.

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

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

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman for his very fine amendment. Things are deteriorating along the borders and getting worse, not better. We definitely need to give Mexico this wakeup call.

Mr. SOUDER. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say to the gentleman that I share many of the sentiments expressed by him. I did not support NAFTA because I frankly have very little faith in the willingness of the elite who run Mexico to really provide sufficient reforms for their economy or to sufficiently crack down on drugs, and I am very skeptical that even with the good intentions announced by the new Government that we will see much progress. But I do want to say that we need to face a far more fundamental problem when it comes to drugs. It is easy to blame other countries whose income is very low and therefore whose farmers find an easy way to make money by producing drugs for export to the United States. But if we are going to be credible in objecting to that practice, then it seems to me we have to face up to a reality about our own country.

□ 0845

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] and I in 2 successive years have both been chewed on by people in this House who are very well-meaning, but who insist that we continue to spend very large amounts of money in the drug interdiction program and in the program in this bill to wipe out the production of drugs in other countries.

I must tell you, while I hate to say it, that in my judgment, while that money is well-intentioned, almost all of it in my view is wasted. We have been told by officials of our own Government in previous administrations who ran some of those programs that in fact they stop less than 2 percent of the drugs that come into this country.

I would respectfully ask each and every Member of this House, the next time we have a foreign assistance bill up, before you pressure the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] or anybody else on the subcommittee to again raise that amount, you take a look behind the numbers. This goes for people on both sides of the aisle. Because last year, you remember, a number of Members on this side of the aisle tried to bring down the rule because we reduced that program to save money.

The fact is that the recommendation to cut it was the right recommendation because that program is virtually a total waste. It seems to me we would be much better off to use that money for drug education, drug enforcement and law enforcement programs right here in this country than we would be to waste it in this bill.

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

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

Mr. PASTOR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell my colleagues here that I represent the border communities in Arizona. We now begin to see that this Government is working with the United States in trying to stop the flow of drugs from Mexico into this country. Mexico, as you know, is in hard times. If we are going to stop the drugs from coming from Mexico into this country, it has to be a binational effort.

I agree with my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin that one of the problems is that we are doing very little in this country to stop the consumption. As long as there is a demand for consumption of drugs in this country, you are going to find countries in Central America, South America, Mexico or wherever continue to bring or produce those products because this country has such a high demand.

I think we need to address that problem, because as long as we have a high demand for drugs in this country, then these countries will continue to produce them. I would tell my colleagues that we have an equally high problem in this country. We have to do as much as we can to lower the consumption and use of drugs in the United States.

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

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I just want to tell the gentleman, as a former criminal prosecutor, I could not agree with you more. We cannot eradicate all the crops in the world. We cannot stop the introduction of drugs, all of the massive paraphanalia that comes in with the drug crops, and stop the flow of money the other way.

We have got to stop drug abuse by stopping the demand. We have got to convince our children and our people that it is culturally impermissible, it is socially unacceptable, to use drugs in this country. At that point, drug abuse will stop.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take the floor only for a moment. I agree and associate with everything that the gentleman from Louisiana and the gentleman from Wisconsin said, with one big exception. Our interdiction effort is working. That is the reason why they are coming in from Mexico now, is because of the success of the interdiction system and the interdiction effort in south Florida using our United States naval assets. That has been a tremendous help. The problem is, to do the same thing on the Mexican border will require absolute cooperation from the Mexicans, including flyover cooperation which we have never received. That is the big difference.

The rest of it is absolutely necessary. I totally agree. But I think in this particular effort, in this particular matter, I want the record to be absolutely clear that our U.S. Navy in cooperation with all of the Federal law enforcement officials and local law enforcement officials is doing a terrific job in south Florida.

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

Mr. SHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. Could my friend the gentleman from Florida apprise us, I remember during the debate we had on NAFTA, he was very eloquent about a particular case, in an extradition case. Could you give us an update on where that is and if the administration ever took any action on your behalf?

Mr. SHAW. While we were negotiating, they had the man on trial down there, which means if he were returned here, it would be double jeopardy. It was a double-cross. It was just plain and simple. The Mexicans just did not level with us and tell us the truth. We desperately need extradition from Mexico. We have not received that cooperation. We have yet to extradite one single Mexican national back to the United States. We have got to work on that. We have been working, the attorney general has been working hard to try to do that. I was working hard. But none of us to date have succeeded.

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

Mr. SHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. PASTOR. Very recently I was in Austin, TX and had a chance to meet with Mexican officials. One of the concerns that they have and are asking us to assist is that, as you know, we have the former attorney general in this country, and they asked that we send him back to Mexico so that he could be prosecuted. The judge in this country refused to extradite him. Right now the Mexican Government is saying, you ask us to cooperate, we need cooperation from you so that we can extradite this known—

Mr. SHAW. Reclaiming my time, I do not know the facts of that situation, but we have extradited, particularly Mexican nationals and even Americans back into Mexico. Our extradition treaty has been a one-way street.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to delay the debate at this point, but I just want to make note for our colleagues that the drug war has to be fought on five major battlefields to reduce both demand and supply simultaneously. It is all well and good to try to reduce consumption, but let's not forget the supply side.

We have got to eradicate, we have got to interdict, we have got to enforce, and on the demand side, we have got to teach our young people and we have got to treat and rehabilitate. We cannot neglect any one of those facets in our drug war.

Mr. SHAW. The gentleman certainly knows of what he speaks. He has done a lot for this House in the war on drugs.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER], as modified.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 411, noes 0, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 449]

AYES—411

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Metcalf
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Studds
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Upton
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—23

Chapman
Collins (MI)
Doolittle
Fields (LA)
Foglietta
Kasich
Martinez
McNulty
Menendez
Meyers
Moakley
Nadler
Reynolds
Sanders
Schumer
Serrano
Solomon
Stokes
Stump
Velazquez
Waxman
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

□ 0910

So the amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I was going to offer an amendment that terminated the IMET program and the enhanced IMET program to Guatemala. However, given the subcommittee's action in eliminating the IMET program because of Guatemala's grave human rights problems, and the assurance that the chairman has given me of extended oversight of the enhanced IMET program, I will not be offering this amendment.

However, I do want to recognize the efforts of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] and the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] who have worked with me on this amendment who have long been involved in the Guatemala issue.

Mr. Chairman, I think as my colleagues know, Guatemala is also, especially in the Western Hemisphere, one of the more outstanding human rights violators. There have been cases where Americans have been killed, thousands and thousands of disappearances, and a military that is out of control and the objective of the amendment was to get the United States out of the business of associating itself with the military.

But some in the committee have developed an enhanced IMET program which deals with teaching human rights, teaching ethics to military officers in the Guatemalan military, and feel with the extended oversight and the good record that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] have established on a number of human rights amendments today, that I will offer the amendment.

And I would like to recognize the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] who is active in this issue and who has had a long history in support of human rights in Guatemala.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite words.

(Mrs. MORELLA asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the subcommittee and the chairman for their recognition of the severity of human rights problems in Guatemala.

The bill authorizes only expanded IMET funding for Guatemala. The chairman has assured me that candidates for this program will be carefully screened for past abuses.

I hope that the committee and the Members of this body will continue their attention to the situation in Guatemala. I urge members to review the

devastating report of the U.N. human rights monitoring mission in Guatemala. They will find that in spite of progress in peace talks and almost 10 years of democratic government, the administration of justice in Guatemala is nearly nonexistent, and military impunity, not only for human violations, but also for drug trafficking and other criminal conduct, continues unabated.

Members of the Guatemalan military continue to impede the Harbury-Bamaca case; the government prosecutor assigned to her case resigned this week because of death threats against him and his family and an assassination attempt last week. For 6 years I have been working to resolve the case of Sr. Dianna Ortiz, an American citizen who was kidnaped, raped, and tortured, as well as the cases of Michael Devine and Myrna Mack. In these and a number of other cases, members of the Guatemalan military have prevented the judicial process from working.

I look forward to working with the chairman and other Members of the House in resolving human rights concerns in Guatemala and in supporting a negotiated resolution of Guatemala's civil war.

□ 0915

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like to add my thanks and congratulations to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] and the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. The tragedy of Guatemala, while it remains an unfortunate fixture in our history, nevertheless shows promise of bringing change. The actions of the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on International Relations in a greater oversight role, a new vigilance, I believe, in the Select Committee on Intelligence, the recent announcements by the new DCI in his public statements about new standards for agency activities in the region and the investigations on several levels ordered by the President I think bodes well for the future, for whatever mistakes have been made, I am convinced we are going to know the truth about the past, and, more importantly, that this program in the future and future American involvement may be now on a new and higher standard of which we can all be proud.

I thank the gentleman for offering the amendment and for having yielded me the time.

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

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to assure my colleague from New Mexico that neither myself or the other members of the subcommittee have any interest in protecting the Guatemalan military from scrutiny of its human rights performance. At the urging of our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES], the subcommittee intends to monitor the activities very closely. For this reason the bill supports administration's present cutoff for all IMET to Guatemala. All the bill does is say that, if the administration makes the decision to resume IMET in Guatemala, it cannot be military IMET. It must be human rights IMET.

In light of this I would hope that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] would withdraw his amendment if he has indeed introduced it.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The time of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] has expired.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply take the time to simply say that I, for one, would hope that Guatemala would not receive even expanded IMET. I think they have demonstrated that they do not know how to use any military training. I think they demonstrated that it is a virtually hopeless case to reform that military at this juncture in their history, and so I simply want to express my strong reservation about the administration providing any kind of IMET whatsoever to Guatemala.

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

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I just returned from a trip to Guatemala and saw, and I am particularly interested in this subject, and I think that one of the problems there is a recognition or a feeling that the Guatemalans only have a public relations problem——

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. RICHARDSON was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Having just returned from a trip to Guatemala, having met personally with the President, with the Foreign Minister of Guatemala, with a number of business leaders in Guatemala, I remain troubled that the Guatemalan Government remains captive of the Guatemalan military, that the Guatemalan business leaders, many well-intentioned, many working hard to bring reforms in their country, have not yet recognized that they have something more than a public relations problem, that this is not just a concern of one Member of Congress. This is not just the concern of the American Embassy in Guatemala City where our Ambassador, Marilyn McAffee, has been doing an outstanding job of bringing to the attention of the President, to the President of the Congress of Guatemala, the concerns that we have with human rights in that country, but that this is a deep and continuing concern of the American people.

I visited firsthand with a prosecutor in one of the highly publicized cases thanks to the important work of our colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI]. That prosecutor has been under continual death threats, and he has every reason to be concerned with his life since this year in Guatemala over 20 people in the city of Guatemala City have been found shot with a single bullet wound to the back of the head. The Guatemalan military and its legal counsel stood in the way of an exhumation near a former Guatemalan military base in the northern part of the country to try to get to the bottom of the investigation concerning the death of Mr. Bomaca. It is the Guatemalan prosecutor who wanted to proceed with that exhumation who faced continual death threats, who has this week, after going public about those death threats, actually threatened to resign if his safety cannot be assured.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. RICHARDSON was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

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

Mr. DOGGETT. He has every reason to be concerned also given the fact that it was only within the last year that the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Guatemala was assassinated, that Guatemala during the last year has failed to make any progress in the prosecution of any human rights cases, that the military still seems to feel that it is a power unto its own and that it will not reform.

All of this, of course, occurs at a time that an officer of the Guatemalan military remains under indictment in the State of Florida for drug trafficking, and the Guatemalan Government refused to extradite that officer to the State of Florida. The problems that Guatemala has with reference to drugs trafficking rank right up there along with this human rights abuses and indeed may well be directly connected to those abuses, and now in Guatemala City there is a wave of kidnapings that know no political basis.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, given the serious nature of the problem in Guatemala, I am troubled about having any assistance

continue there. I was very pleased that, when we considered the foreign assistance bill, that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] succeeded in adding an amendment to that piece of legislation that conditioned our foreign assistance to Guatemala on a number of things. The significant progress in extraditing the colonel in the Guatemalan military who has been indicted in the State of Florida, significant progress be demonstrated in the human rights cases that are pending in Guatemala, specifically the situation with Jenifer Harberry with whom he has worked, and with whom I met in Guatemala and is a person of tremendous courage who continues to pursue the investigation of the death of her husband, and who continues apparently to be thwarted at every avenue in her attempts to investigate that death. Also I met with another very courageous woman there, Mrs. Carpio, from one of the most prominent families in Guatemala, whose husband was the editor of one of the leading newspaper in Guatemala who was the subject of a political assassination. No progress has been made with reference to the investigation of that assassination. The same is true of an anthropologist in Guatemala with whose sister I met in Guatemala City where little, if any, progress is being made.

So, many of the leaders in the effort to bring about change in Guatemala are women who have been left as widows, as sisters who have been left without any realistic hope that their cases are going to be thoroughly and fully investigated. It was only a couple of days after returning to the United States that I, along with several other Members of Congress, received calls from Guatemala concerning the latest efforts to block the exhumation of Mr. Bomaca. We communicated directly with the President after consulting with the State Department, with the Foreign Minister, and have yet to receive a response, but the word that comes back is that this investigation still remains blocked, that no progress has been made concerning this investigation.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. TORRICELLI. If I understand, I would like to congratulate the gentleman for the work that he has done in helping to expose the problems of Guatemala, the time he has taken to go there and the expertise that he developed on the issue. I say to the gentleman, ''You may have made an enormous contribution.''

But I also want to remind my colleagues that, indeed, it is not one, but there are 11 Guatemalan military officers, who have been indicted in the United States for narcotics trafficking that have not been extradited. So, those who would advance continued American military cooperation with Guatemala should recognize that they are harboring outlaws themselves who have been trafficking in cocaine to the United States. At this point it is estimated that fully a third of all the cocaine that reaches the United States is warehoused in Guatemala before it reaches our cities and towns, this in a country that is completely controlled by military units, where nothing happens by chance. It raises the question about the integrity of their operations and should make suspect any American military cooperation in the future.

Although we have not proceeded with this amendment today, we do so, and I trust the gentleman agrees in the belief that in good faith the Clinton administration will not proceed with expanded IMET given the current situation.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I agree wholeheartedly. We should not, and this situation needs to be monitored very closely because the situation in Guatemala remains very dark indeed, and there is a failure to recognize the true dimension of this problem, the potential for trade, for commerce. It is a beautiful country, as my colleagues know from their travels there. There is great potential there, but, as long as there is this roadblock and this indifference to the issue of human rights, we are not going to see the full potential of our relationship developed.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I, too, wish to congratulate the gentleman in the well for his continuing interest in making sure that recipient countries of aid from this country do not violate basic human rights of their own citizens, and what is interesting to me is that I find no one on the other side contributing to this discussion, even though earlier today, when we had an amendment on the little country of Haiti in the Caribbean, we had all kinds of discussions.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] has expired.

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1868, the fiscal year 1996 foreign operations appropriations bill as reported out of the full Appropriations Committee. I want to commend Chairman CALLAHAN and the distinguished ranking member, Mr. WILSON, for their diligent work in crafting a very difficult foreign assistance appropriations package. However, I must note that the bill falls short in meeting important funding needs in some areas, particularly in providing adequate assistance for Latin and Central America.

United States assistance for emerging democracies of Latin and Central America is threatened by the 40 percent reduction to the Development Assistance Fund, the elimination of funding for the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank [IDB], and the reduction in funding for the Inter-American Foundation [IAF].

Latin America is at the cusp of full consolidation to democratic rule and commitment to free-market, free trade economic policies. Today, the region represents our fastest growing trading partner and accounts for $91 billion in U.S. exports which support nearly 2 million U.S. jobs. However, nearly half the region remains in poverty. These countries will continue to need U.S. Government engagement and foreign assistance in each of the areas of sustainable development if they are to become consumers of U.S. goods and services and full participants in the proposed free trade area of the Americas. Resource levels to the region have dropped precipitously over the past several years and cannot be reduced disproportionately if these goals are to be achieved.

The Fund for Special Operations, the concessional lending arm of the IDB, lends to the five poorest countries in Latin America. Its programs focus on poverty reduction, basic human needs, grassroots development, and projects designed to assist women and the environment. In an era when U.S. bilateral foreign assistance is being cut dramatically, the small U.S. contribution to the Fund for Special Operations is an effective investment in the development of our poorest neighbors in the Western Hemisphere. While this bill has eliminated the $21 million administration request for the fund, I believe this small U.S. contribution is critical in leveraging significant funds from other donor nations around the world.

The Inter-American Foundation has made significant contributions in providing direct financial support for self-help efforts initiated at the grassroots level by people in Latin America. The IAF effectively channels funds to the private sector, not governments. Projects supported by the IAF create opportunities for the poor to acquire skills and accumulate capital, opening the way for their participation in the mainstream economy. The $11 million reduction in IAF funding contained in this bill will dilute the IAF's effectiveness and ability to support innovative, private sector, sustainable development programs.

A further reduction in resources to Latin and Central America essentially means a premature United States exit from the region. It means backing away from our democratic neighbors, leaving much work unfinished and many commitments unmet. It is my hope that as this bill moves through the legislative process, these concerns will be addressed.

I am pleased to note that the bill provides the full funding level for the U.S. contribution to the North American Development Bank created under the NAFTA agreement. NADBank was established primarily to finance environmental clean-up projects along the United States-Mexican border area. Communities on both sides of the border have been plagued for years by the problems of raw sewage dumped in boundary waters, unsafe drinking water, and inadequate municipal waste disposal. The agreement with Mexico gives priority to infrastructure projects addressing these environmental problems. In addition, NADBank will provide support for NAFTA-related community adjustment and investment projects throughout the United States. Because the NADBank is a new player in the international capital markets, full funding is critical to ensure the Bank's financial strength and ultimately, its success.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my concern and disappointment regarding efforts to condition aid to India during

consideration of H.R. 1868, the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act of 1995. Specifically, I object to amendments which would prohibit United States development assistance to the government of India or any nongovernmental or private voluntary organization that operates in that country, based on allegations of human rights abuses. I would like to take this opportunity to set the facts straight.

India is the world's largest democracy, with a free and open press as well as a strong pluralistic culture. At the same time, it is a developing nation and does face some tough challenges, including human rights issues. However, India has taken a number of positive steps to improve human rights conditions. For example, reports of human rights violations in Jammu and Kashmir caused India to form an independent National Human Rights Commission [NHRC], resulting in the punishment of 174 security force personnel to date. Additionally, India remains open to international efforts to monitor the situation in Punjab, Jammu, and Kashmir. Most recently, United Nations Human Rights Commissioner Josey Ayala-Lasso was in New Dehli last week after visiting Jammu and Kashmir and was impressed with the Indian Government's transparency and committment to NHRC's task. Further, in past efforts to deny aid to India, India's Terrorist and Disruptive Activities Act [TADA] has been cited as a tool used by the Indian Government to legally violate human rights. However, Prime Minister Rao allowed TADA to lapse on May 23, 1995, and it is no longer effective. This real evidence and significant progress toward high standards for human rights in India cannot be ignored in this debate. By denying aid to a country which has taken positive steps to address human rights concerns, the United States would be sending the wrong message to India and to other developing countries faced with human rights problems.

Mr. Speaker, it is also important to consider the positive diplomatic and economic relationship developing between the United States and India as we consider United States foreign assistance. Over the last 4 years, India has been transforming under an ambitious policy of economic reform, making the transition from a highly regulated, centrally planned economy to a market-oriented economy open to United States investment and exports. In fact, the United States Commerce Department has designated India as one of the most important big emerging markets, with a middle class exceeding 200 million people. A number of American companies are recognizing and seizing upon this tremendous opportunity.

The United States Government should be fostering the improved climate of relations with India as a democratic nation working to build a market-based economy and free society. Any attempt to stigmatize India, however small, should be rejected. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to oppose any amendments to H.R. 1868 that would deny United States assistance to India.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the motion to rise.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 238, noes 171, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 450]

AYES—238

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Brown (CA)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thornton
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—171

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lofgren
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sawyer
Schroeder
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slaughter
Stark
Stenholm
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thurman
Torricelli
Towns
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—26

Ballenger
Boucher
Chapman
Clement
Collins (MI)
Fawell
Foglietta
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Istook
Jefferson
Kaptur
Kasich
Largent
Linder
McKeon
McNulty
Moakley
Radanovich
Reynolds
Sanders
Scarborough
Schumer
Stokes
Waxman
Young (AK)

□ 0947

Messrs. RANGEL, OLVER, BEILENSON, VOLKMER, TUCKER and GUTIERREZ changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. SALMON, HORN, and MCDADE, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. SPENCE changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to rise was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. WALKER, chairman pro tempore 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. 1868) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 67, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET—FISCAL YEARS 1996–2002

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–165) on the resolution (H. Res. 175) waiving points of order on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 67) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1944, RESCISSIONS AND DISASTER SUPPLEMENTAL ACT OF 1995

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–166) on the resolution (H. Res. 176) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1944) making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance, for antiterrorism initiatives, for assistance in the recovery from the tragedy that occurred at Oklahoma City, and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1868, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM 9:57 A.M. TO 11:30 A.M. TODAY

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourn today, it adjourn to meet at 11:30 a.m. today.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I probably will not object, I would like to inquire of the majority leader what this unanimous-consent request would result in with regard to the schedule for this morning.

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

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, today is still yesterday. If this unanimous-consent request is agreed to, then we will adjourn and we will come back in an hour and a half, when today will be tomorrow, we will reconvene the House, and we will forego 1-minutes. Then we will go into the rule on the budget conference report, and then from there we will move on to the budget conference report.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, could the gentleman tell the Members what might happen after that?

Mr. ARMEY. Assuming, of course, that that will go swimmingly.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Side stroke, all the way.

Mr. ARMEY. To coin a phrase, as it were, we would then expect to move on to the rule on the rescission bill and then on the rescission bill.

Following that, we would hope to complete consideration of the Medicare select conference report.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman tell us if there is business beyond that that he would like to try to finish today or tomorrow?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I would hope that that would complete our day for today, and that perhaps we would return tomorrow and take under consideration the appropriations bill that has been under consideration.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ARMEY. We would return the day after tomorrow.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, just for purposes of Members having time to do what they need to do this morning, and I will not object, but if we go into the full House to do the rule on the budget conference report, it would be difficult, I might tell my colleagues, for us to get a vote until the previous question on the rule, which Members can factor in the additional time that Members will have between now and then. That is probably an additional 45 minutes on top of the hour and a half.

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

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct, assuming there is no vote on the approval of the Journal, in which case we could roll that to a later point, and we should be able to give all our Members an opportunity to freshen up, come back, and be ready to run the table.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to be available for one additional question, is it still the gentleman's intent to have the House adjourn at 3 o'clock tomorrow?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman is correct. I have every intent, albeit a decreasing optimism, of being out of here by 3 o'clock tomorrow. However, it is important that we meet our departure times, especially after a rigorous week, and if everything goes well, we should have every expectation of having everyone out for the 4th of July work period by 3 o'clock on Friday.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, are we contemplating Chief Justice Warren Burger's funeral today at 12:30, and is there going to be any time for those who may wish to attend to do so?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield further the gentleman is perfectly correct in making the question. At that time we should be in general debate, and there should be an opportunity for Members who wish to attend. I appreciate the gentleman making the inquiry.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to ask the majority leader, Members have inquired as to whether or not the committees that are on, that are scheduled to meet at 10 o'clock, will be meeting.

Mr. ARMEY. I am sure that would be at the discretion of each of the separate committees, but we will not be in the House under the 5-minute rule, so it would be perfectly acceptable within the rules of the House for them to do so.

Mr. GEPHARDT. One last inquiry, Mr. Speaker, of the distinguished majority leader. Will there be any 1-minute speeches today?

Mr. ARMEY. Again, Mr. Speaker, let me thank the minority leader for asking. With the gentleman's acceptance, I would propose that we not do so.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman mentioned that later on tomorrow, the next legislative day, that the second item of business would probably be the rule, and then the new rescission bill. When will that bill be available for Members to review?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman from Missouri will yield further, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman asking me. That will happen as soon as we can get to it.

Mr. VOLKMER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, some Members might like to take a look at it before we vote on it.

Mr. ARMEY. I appreciate that. It is available now and I am sure we can make it available to the gentleman.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United

States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 19(3) of the Public Telecommunications Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–356), I transmit herewith the report of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 28, 1995.*

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GUNDERSON (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), after 6:15 p.m. today, on account of personal reasons.

Mr. MCNULTY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), after 8 p.m. tonight, on account of attending a funeral.

Ms. HARMAN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), on Wednesday, June 28, from 8:30 p.m. to midnight, on account of personal business.

Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today after 8:30 p.m., on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 57 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, June 29, 1995, at 11:30 a.m.

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:

[Submitted Wednesday, June 28]

Mr. SOLOMON: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 175. A resolution waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 67) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002 (Rept. 104–165). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 176. A resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1944) making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance, for anti-terrorism initiatives, for assistance in the recovery from the tragedy that occurred at Oklahoma City, and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes (Rept. 104–166). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

[June 29, 1995.—legislative day of June 28, 1995]

By Mr. SKAGGS:

H.R. 1954. A bill to amend the National Park Service Concessions Policy Act to enable the Secretary of the Interior to authorize scenic commercial overflights at units of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed Private Securities Litigation Reform Act.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S9199–S9323

Measures Introduced: Seven bills were introduced, as follows: S. 975–981. **Page S9305**

Measures Reported: Reports were made as follows:

Special Report of the Committee on Rules and Administration of a review of the legislative activity during the 103d Congress. (S. Rept. No. 104–100) **Page S9305**

Measures Passed:

Private Securities Litigation Reform Act: Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1058, to amend the Federal securities laws to curb certain abusive practices in private securities litigation, and by 69 yeas to 30 nays, 1 responding present (Vote No. 295), the bill was then passed, after striking all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the text of S. 240, Senate companion measure, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, and taking action on further amendments proposed thereto, as follows: **Pages S9199–S9226**

Adopted:

(1) By 57 yeas to 42 nays, 1 responding present (Vote No. 293), Specter Amendment No. 1485, to clarify the standard plaintiffs must meet in specifying the defendant's state of mind in private securities litigation. **Pages S9200–01**

Rejected:

(1) Boxer Amendment No. 1480, to exclude insider traders who benefit from false or misleading forward looking statements from safe harbor protection. (By 56 yeas to 42 nays, 1 responding present (Vote No. 294), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Pages S9201–02**

(2) Specter Amendment No. 1483, to provide for sanctions for abuse litigation. (By 57 yeas to 38 nays, 1 responding present (Vote No. 291), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Pages S9199–S9200**

(3) Specter Amendment No. 1484, to provide for a stay of discovery in certain circumstances. (By 52 yeas to 47 nays, 1 responding present (Vote No. 292), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Page S9200**

Subsequently, S. 240, Senate companion measure, was returned to the Senate calendar. **Page S9226**

Authorizing Use of Capitol Grounds: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 38, authorizing the use of the Capitol grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby. **Page S9323**

Congressional Budget—Conference Report: Senate began debate on the provisions of the conference report on H. Con. Res. 67, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002. **Pages S9236–60, S9296–S9304**

Comprehensive Regulatory Reform Act: Senate began consideration of S. 343, to reform the regulatory process, with committee amendments in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S9261–96**

Senate will resume consideration of the bill on Thursday, June 29, 1995.

Messages From the President: Senate received the following messages from the President of the United States:

Transmitting the report of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. (PM–58). **Page S9304**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

George D. Milidrag, of Michigan, to be a Member of the Advisory Board of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

Lawrence H. Summers, of Massachusetts, to be Deputy Secretary of the Treasury.

Frances D. Cook, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Sultanate of Oman.

J. Stapleton Roy, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Indonesia.

Thomas W. Simons, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.

John M. Yates, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Benin. **Page S9323**

Messages From the President: **Page S9304**

Messages From the House: **Pages S9304–05**

Measures Referred: **Page S9305**

Executive Reports of Committees: Page S9305
Statements on Introduced Bills: Pages S9305–08
Additional Cosponsors: Pages S9308–09
Authority for Committees: Pages S9309–10
Additional Statements: Pages S9310–15

Record Votes: Five record votes were taken today. (Total—295) Pages S9199–S9202, S9219

Recess: Senate convened at 8:40 a.m., and recessed at 7:08 p.m., until 9 a.m., on Thursday, June 29, 1995. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's RECORD on page S9323.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

AUTHORIZATION—DEFENSE

Committee on Armed Services: Committee met in closed session to mark up proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, and to prescribe military personnel strengths, but did not complete action thereon, and will meet again tomorrow.

AUTHORIZATION—DEFENSE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Acquisition and Technology met in closed session and approved for full committee consideration those provisions which fall within its jurisdiction of proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1996 for national defense programs.

AUTHORIZATION—DEFENSE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Airland Forces met in closed session and approved for full committee consideration those provisions which fall within its jurisdiction of proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1996 for national defense programs.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 883, to enhance the safety and soundness of federally insured credit unions, and to protect the National Credit Union Share Insurance Fund;

An original bill to extend and authorize funds for the Defense Production Act of 1950; and

The nominations of Martin Neil Baily, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Council of Economic Advisers, Charles L. Marinaccio, of the District of Columbia, Deborah Dudley Branson, of Texas, Marianne C. Spraggins, of New York, and Albert James Dwoskin, of Virginia, each to be a Director of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation, Steve M. Hays, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the National Institute of Building Sciences, and Tony Scallon, of Minnesota, and Sheila Anne Smith, of Illinois, each to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the National Consumer Cooperative Bank.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee ordered favorably reported the following bills:

H.R. 402, to make certain technical corrections to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act and the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands within Alaska and to resolve certain other issues, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, and in lieu of S. 537, Senate companion measure;

S. 283, to extend the deadlines under the Federal Power Act applicable to the construction of two hydroelectric projects in Pennsylvania;

S. 801, to extend the deadline under the Federal Power Act applicable to the construction of two hydroelectric projects in North Carolina; and

S. 638, authorizing funds for project development programs of United States insular areas, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

MEDICAID

Committee on Finance: Committee held hearings to examine the overall Medicaid program, focusing on certain recommendations on how to control the cost of the Medicaid program, receiving testimony from Florida Governor Lawton Chiles, Tallahassee; Vermont Governor Howard Dean, Montpelier; Illinois Governor Jim Edgar, Springfield; and Utah Governor Michael O. Leavitt, Salt Lake City.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

BIA REORGANIZATION

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded hearings on S. 814, to provide for the reorganization of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, after receiving testimony from Hilda A. Manuel, Deputy Commissioner for Indian Affairs, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; William Ron Allen, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe of Indians, Sequim, Washington; Tadd Johnson, Bois Forte Band of Chippewa Indians, Nett Lake, Minnesota; Chuck Jacobs, Oglala Sioux Tribal Council, Pine Ridge, South Dakota; and Herman T.J. Laffoon, Colorado River Indian Tribes, Parker, Arizona.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: Fourteen public bills, H.R. 1941–1954 were introduced. **Pages H6480–81, H6560**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed as follows:

H. Res. 175, waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany H. Con. Res. 67, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002 (H. Rept. 104–165); and

H. Res. 176, providing for the consideration of H.R. 1944, making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance for anti-terrorism initiatives, for assistance in the recovery from the tragedy that occurred at Oklahoma City, and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995 (H. Rept. 104–166). **Pages H6559–60**

Committee To Sit: The Committee on Science and the Committee on International Relations received permission to sit today during proceedings of the House under the five-minute rule. **Page H6403**

Flag Desecration Constitutional Amendment: By a recorded vote of 312 ayes to 120 noes, Roll No. 431, (two-thirds of those present voting in favor), the House passed H.J. Res. 79, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress and the States to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States. **Pages H6403–46**

By a yea-and-nay vote of 63 yeas to 369 nays, Roll No. 430, rejected the Bryant of Texas motion to recommit the joint resolution to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the bill back to the House with an amendment that gives Congress and the States the power to prohibit only the "burning, trampling, soiling, or rending" of the flag; and directs Congress to determine what constitutes a flag, and to prescribe procedures for the proper disposal of the flag. **Pages H6436–45**

H. Res. 173, the rule under which the joint resolution was considered, was agreed to earlier by a recorded vote of 271 ayes to 152 noes, Roll No. 429. Earlier, agreed to order the previous question by a yea-and-nay vote of 258 yeas to 170 nays, Roll No. 428. **Pages H6403–15**

Foreign Operations Appropriations: The House continued consideration of H.R. 1868, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996. **Pages H6446–80, H6483–H6558**

Agreed To:

The Smith of New Jersey amendment that prohibits any Federal funding to any private, non-governmental, or multilateral organization that directly or indirectly performs abortions in a foreign country except in special cases; and prohibits funding to the United Nations Fund for Population Activities unless that organization ceases all activity in China (agreed to by a recorded vote of 243 ayes to 187 noes, Roll No. 433); **Pages H6447–62**

The Menendez amendment that reduces the amount of United States assistance to Russia by the amount spent on the construction of the Juragua nuclear power plant in Cienfuegos, Cuba; **Pages H6463–68**

The Goss amendment, as modified, that prohibits the government of Haiti from receiving any funds after March 1, 1996 if the President determines that the upcoming election is not held in a democratic fashion (agreed to by a recorded vote of 252 ayes to 164 noes, with 1 voting "present", Roll No. 441); **Pages H6468–80, H6483–94**

The Visclosky amendment that strikes provisions limiting the current prohibition on United States aid to the government of Azerbaijan; **Pages H6494–H6505**

The Traficant amendment that expresses the sense of Congress that to the greatest extent practicable, all equipment and products purchased with funds provided should be American-made; **Page H6518**

The Porter amendment that limits the amount of funds appropriated for the Government of Turkey to $21 million (agreed to by a recorded vote of 246 ayes to 155 noes, with 1 voting "present", Roll No. 433); **Pages H6521–36**

The Kaptur amendment that prohibits the United States contribution to the North American Development Bank until the President is informed that Mexico has made its contribution; **Pages H6536–37**

The Richardson amendment that prohibits funds for international narcotics control or crop substitution assistance to the Government of Burma (agreed to by a recorded vote of 359 ayes to 38 noes, Roll No. 444); **Pages H6537–39**

The Roemer amendment, as amended by the Obey substitute (substitute agreed to by a recorded vote of 348 ayes to 67 noes, Roll No. 447), that limits the funds available for assistance to Russia to not more than $195 million (agreed to by a recorded vote of 401 ayes to 2 noes, Roll No. 448); **Pages H6546–51**

The Souder amendment, as modified, that prohibits any funds from being extended to Mexico unless the appropriate Federal entity or official through which the funds will be extended is apprised of the fact that Mexico has decreased the level of drug traffic into the United States, as determined by the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy (agreed to by a recorded vote of 411 ayes, Roll No. 449); and **Pages H6551–55**

The Callahan motion that the Committee rise (agreed to by a recorded vote of 238 ayes to 171 noes, Roll No. 450). **Page H6558**

Rejected:

The Meyers of Kansas amendment to the agreed to Smith of New Jersey amendment that sought to strike language that prohibits any Federal funding to any private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organization that directly or indirectly performs abortions in a foreign country except in special cases (rejected by a recorded vote of 201 ayes to 229 noes, Roll No. 432); **Pages H6451–62**

The Bonior motion that the Committee rise (rejected by a recorded vote of 188 ayes to 231 noes, Roll No. 435) **Pages H6477–79**

The Meek amendment to the agreed to Goss amendment that sought to allow continued assistance to Haiti if the President determines that the Haitian government is continuing to make progress in implementing democratic elections (rejected by a recorded vote of 189 ayes to 231 noes, Roll No. 436); **Pages H6468–80, H6483–86**

The Volkmer motion that the Committee rise (rejected by a recorded vote of 185 ayes to 236 noes, Roll No. 437); **Page H6486**

The Pelosi amendment to the agreed to Goss amendment that sought to allow contained assistance to Haiti if it is made known to the President that the democratic process is becoming strengthened (rejected by a recorded vote of 186 ayes to 233 noes, Roll No. 440); **Pages H6490–93**

The Wise motion that the Committee rise (rejected by a recorded vote of 179 ayes to 236 noes, Roll No. 438); **Pages H6490–91**

The Volkmer motion that the Committee rise and report the bill back to the House with the enacting clause stricken (rejected by a recorded vote of 166 ayes to 255 noes, Roll No. 439); **Pages H6491–92**

The Traficant amendment that sought to cut 1% from almost all foreign aid programs (rejected by a recorded vote of 139 ayes to 270 noes, Roll No. 442); **Pages H6518–21**

The Burton of Indiana amendment, as amended by the Callahan amendment, and then as amended by the Volkmer substitute (substitute agreed to by a recorded vote of 284 ayes to 118 noes, Roll No. 445), that sought to limit the amount of development assistance funds available to the Government of India to $65 million (rejected by a recorded vote of 191 ayes to 210 noes, Roll No. 446); and **Pages H6539–46**

The Wilson substitute to the Menendez amendment was offered, but subsequently withdrawn that sought to reduce the amount of United States assistance to any government that aids in the completion of the construction of the Jurugua nuclear power plant in Cienfuegos, Cuba. **Pages H6464–68**

Meeting Hour: It was made in order that, when the House adjourns on the legislative day of June 28, it adjourn to meet at 11:30 a.m. on Thursday, June 29. **Page H6559**

Amendments Ordered Printed: Amendments ordered printed pursuant to the rule appear on page H6482.

Quorum Calls—Votes: One quorum call (Roll No. 434), three yea-and-nay votes and 19 recorded votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H6414, H6414–15, H6445, H6446, H6461–62, H6462, H6477–78, H6478–79, H6485–86, H6486, H6490–91, H6492, H6493, H6493–94, H6521, H6535–36, H6538–39, H6545, H6546, H6549–50, H6550–51, H6555, and H6558.

Adjournment: Met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 9:57 a.m. on Thursday, June 29.

Committee Meetings

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

Committee on Agriculture: Ordered reported amended H.R. 1103, Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, STATE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary approved for full Committee action appropriations for Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary for fiscal year 1996.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on District of Columbia held a hearing on Privatization and the D.C. Government. Testimony was heard from L. Nye Stevens, Director, Federal Management and Workforce Issues, General Government Division, GAO; Michael C. Rogers, City Administrator, District of Columbia; and John O'Leary, Deputy Director, Reason Foundation Privatization Center.

TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government approved for full Committee action appropriations for Treasury, Postal Service and General Government for the fiscal year 1996.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS REGULATORY RELIEF ACT

Committee on Banking and Financial Services: Continued markup of H.R. 1362, Financial Institutions Regulatory Relief Act of 1995.

OVERSIGHT

Committee on Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power held an oversight hearing on High-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal. Testimony was heard from Senators Bryan and Reid; Representatives Ensign and Vucanovich; the following officials of the NRC: Ivan

Selin, Chairman; E. Gail dePlanque and Kenneth C. Rogers, both Commissioners; Daniel A. Dreyfus, Director, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, Department of Energy; Susan Clark, Commissioner, Public Service Commission, State of Florida; and public witnesses.

Hearings continue June 30.

TRANSFORMATION OF THE MEDICAID PROGRAM

Committee on Commerce: Subcommittee on Health and Environment continued hearings on the Transformation of the Medicaid program. Testimony was heard from Jonathan Ratner, Associate Director, Health financing Issues, GAO; P. William Curreri, M.D., Commissioner, Physician Payment Review Commission; and public witnesses.

OLDER AMERICAN'S ACT

Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities: Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth and Families held a hearing on the Older American's Act. Testimony was heard from Representatives Martinez, Morella, Regula, Kennedy of Massachusetts and Wyden; Fernando M. Torres-Gil, Assistant Secretary, Administration on Aging, Department of Health and Human Services; Ed Bill, Office of Services to the Aging, State of Michigan; and public witnesses.

SAFETY AND HEALTH IMPROVEMENT REFORM ACT

Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities: Subcommittee on Workforce Protections continued hearings on H.R. 1834, Safety and Health Improvement Reform Act of 1995. Testimony was heard from Robert Reich, Secretary of Labor; and public witnesses.

FUNDING CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight: Subcommittee on Civil Service held a hearing on Funding Civil Service Retirement. Testimony was heard from Representatives Bilirakis, Quillen, and Bateman; James L. Blum, Deputy Director, CBO; William Flynn, Associate Director, OPM; and Johnny Finch, Assistant Comptroller, General Government Division, GAO.

ILLICIT DRUG AVAILABILITY

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight: Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs, and Criminal Justice concluded hearings on Illicit Drug Availability: Are Interdiction Efforts Hampered by a Lack of Agency Resources? Testimony was heard from George Weise, Commissioner, U.S. Customs Service, Department of the Treasury; and Adm. Robert E. Kramek, USCG, Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation and U.S. Interdiction Coordinator.

OVERSIGHT

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight: Subcommittee on Postal Service continued oversight hearings on the U.S. Postal Service. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the U.S. Postal Service: Marvin Runyon, Postmaster General; Michael S. Coughlin, Deputy Postmaster General; and Joseph J. Mahon, Jr., Vice President, Labor Relations.

OVERSIGHT

Committee on International Relations: Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade held an oversight hearing on the U.S. AID Housing Investment Guaranty Program. Testimony was heard from Frank Conahan, Senior Defense and International Affairs Advisor to the Comptroller General, GAO; and David Hale, Deputy Assistant Administrator, AID, U.S. International Development Cooperation Agency.

ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENAS AND RELATED MATTERS

Committee on International Relations: Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights met to consider issuance of subpoenas, writs of habeas corpus ad testificandum, and/or other measures to secure the attendance of witnesses.

STATE TAXATION OF NONRESIDENTS' PENSION INCOME

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law held a hearing on state taxation of nonresidents' pension income, including the following bills: H.R. 371, to prohibit a State from imposing an income tax on the pension income of individuals who are not residents or domiciliaries of that State; H.R. 394, to amend title 4 of the United States Code to limit State taxation of certain pension income; and H.R. 744, to limit State taxation of certain pension income. Testimony was heard from Senator Reid; Representatives Vucanovich and Stump; and public witnesses.

DIGITAL PERFORMANCE RIGHT IN SOUND RECORDINGS ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property concluded hearings on H.R. 1506, Digital Performance Right in Sound Recordings Act of 1995. Testimony was heard from Bruce Lehman, Assistant Secretary and Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce; Marybeth Peters, Register of Copyrights, U.S. Copyright Office, Library of Congress; and public witnesses.

UNITED STATES POW/MIAs IN LAOS

Committee on National Security: Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a hearing on U.S. POW/MIAs in Laos. Testimony was heard from Kent Wiedemann, Deputy Assistant Secretary, East Asia and Pacific, Department of State; the following officials of the Department of Defense: James W. Wold, Assistant Secretary, POW/MIA Affairs; and Brig. Gen. Charles R. Viale, USA, Commander, Joint Task Force for Full Accounting; and public witnesses.

CONFERENCE REPORT—CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET

Committee on Rules: Granted, by a voice vote, a rule waiving all points of order against the conference report to accompany H. Con. Res. 67, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, and its consideration. The rule provides 1 hour of debate. Finally, the rule provides that clarifying procedural language and the correct revenue amounts for reconciliation published in section 2 of the rule shall be effective upon final action on the budget resolution by the Congress. Testimony was heard from Chairman Kasich.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Science: Ordered reported amended the following bills: H.R. 1815, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization Act of 1995; H.R. 1175, Marine Resources Revitalization Act of 1995; and H.R. 1601, International Space Station Authorization Act.

The Committee began markup of H.R. 1870, American Technology Advancement Act of 1995.

RESTRUCTURING THE FEDERAL SCIENTIFIC ESTABLISHMENT

Committee on Science: Held a hearing on Restructuring the Federal Scientific Establishment. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a modified closed rule on H.R. 1944, making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, providing one hour of general debate to be equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule permits the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to offer one amendment, which shall be considered as read and shall not be subject to amendment or division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendment. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Testimony was heard from Chairman Livingston and Representative Taylor of North Carolina.

SBA's LOWDOC LOAN PROGRAM

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Government Programs held a hearing on SBA's Low-Documentation (LowDoc) Loan Program. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the SBA: Patricia Forbes, Assistant Deputy Administrator, Economic Development; and John Cox, Associate Administrator, Financial Assistance; and public witnesses.

PAYROLL TAXES BURDEN ON SMALL BUSINESSES

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Taxation and Finance continued hearings on the Burden of Payroll Taxes on Small Businesses, with emphasis on the current dollar burden and impact of payroll taxes on small businesses. Testimony was heard from Mark Iwry, Benefits Tax Counsel, Office of Tax Policy, Department of the Treasury; and public witnesses.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Committee on Standards of Official Conduct: Met in executive session to consider pending business.

Joint Meetings

IMMIGRATION

Joint Hearing: Senate Committee on the Judiciary's Subcommittee on Immigration concluded joint hearings with the House Committee on the Judiciary's Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims to review recommendations for immigration reform in the United States, after receiving testimony from Barbara Jordan, Chair, United States Commission on Immigration Reform.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 29, 1995

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services, closed business meeting, to continue mark up of a proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996, and to receive a report from the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence on the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996, 9 a.m., SR–222.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, to hold hearings on the nominations of Robert Talcott Francis II, of Massachusetts, and John Goglia, of Massachusetts, each to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board, and Robert Clarke Brown, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority, 9:30 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, to hold oversight hearings with the Committee on Environment and Public Works, on energy and environmental implications of the Komi oil spills in the former Soviet Union, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Subcommittee on Parks, Historic Preservation and Recreation, to hold hearings on S. 594, to provide for the administration of certain Presidio properties at minimal cost to the Federal taxpayer, 2 p.m., SD–366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works, to hold oversight hearings with the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, on energy and environmental implications of the Komi oil spills in the former Soviet Union, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Subcommittee on Clean Air, Wetlands, Private Property, and Nuclear Safety, to hold oversight hearings on

the Clean Air Act's inspection and maintenance program, 2 p.m., SD–406.

Committee on Finance, to continue hearings to examine ways to control the cost of the Medicaid program, focusing on the program's historical perspective, 9:30 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations, to hold hearings on the nominations of John Todd Stewart, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Moldova, Michael William Cotter, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Turkmenistan, A. Elizabeth Jones, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Kazakhstan, Victor Jackovich, of Iowa, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Slovenia, and John K. Menzies, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, 9:30 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on Governmental Affairs, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, to hold hearings to review the friendly fire incident during the Persian Gulf War, 10 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary, business meeting, to consider pending calendar business, 9:15 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Labor and Human Resources, Subcommittee on Aging, to hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Older Americans Act, 9:30 a.m., SD–430.

NOTICE

For a listing of Senate Committee Meetings scheduled ahead, see page E1360 in Wednesday's RECORD June 28.

House

Committee on Commerce, Subcommittee on Health and Environment, to continue hearings on H.R. 1627, Food Quality Protection Act of 1995, 1:30 p.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, to continue hearings on the Implementation and Enforcement of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, hearing on Departmental Reorganization, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and the Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology, joint hearing on Investment Budgeting in Other Countries, State and local Governments, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Human Resources and Intergovernmental Relations, to continue oversight hearings on delays in the FDA's Food Additive Petitions and GRAS Affirmation Process, 2 p.m., 2247 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on National Economic Growth, Natural Resources, and Regulatory Affairs, hearing on Political Advocacy with Taxpayers Dollars, 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on International Relations, hearing on International Terrorism, 10 a.m., and to mark up the following: H.R. 927, Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act of 1995; and H.J. Res. 83, relating to the United States-North Korea Agreed Framework and the obligations of North Korea under that and previous agreements with respect to the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsular and dialog with the Republic of Korea, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law, hearing on H.R. 1047, Voluntary Environmental Self-Evaluation Act, 10 a.m., 2237 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Crime, hearing on Cocaine and Federal Sentencing Policy, 9:30 a.m., 2226 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims, hearing on H.R. 1915, Immigration in the National Interest Act of 1995, 9:30 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Lands, hearing on legislation regarding Utah Wilderness, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Science, to continue hearings on Restructuring the Federal Scientific Establishment, 9:30 a.m., and to mark up pending business, 12 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Technology, hearing on Effective Standards on International Competition, 9:30 a.m., 2325 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, hearing on H.R. 1670, Federal Acquisition Reform Act of 1995, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, executive, to consider pending business, 11 a.m., HT–2M Capitol.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, hearing on the Privatization of Coast Guard Vessel Traffic Service Systems, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Subcommittee on Education, Training, Employment and Housing, oversight hearing on the Veterans Employment Training Service reorganization, implementation of the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Act and One-Stop Employment Centers, 9:30 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9 a.m., Thursday, June 29

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: After the recognition of four Senators for speeches and the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 10:30 a.m.), Senate will resume consideration of S. 343, Comprehensive Regulatory Reform Act.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

11:30 a.m., Thursday, June 29

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of conference report on H. Con. Res. 67, Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (rule waiving all points of order);

Consideration of H.R. 1944, 1995 Rescission and Disaster Supplemental appropriations (rule providing for consideration in the House); and

Possible consideration of the conference report on H.R. 483, to extend Medicare Select.

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶The Congressional Record is available as an online database through *GPO Access*, a service of the U.S. Government Printing Office. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d Session (January 1994) forward. It is available on a Wide Area Information Server (WAIS) through the Internet and via asynchronous dial-in. The annual subscription fee for a single workstation is $375. Six month subscriptions are available for $200 and one month of access can be purchased for $35. Discounts are available for multiple-workstation subscriptions. To subscribe, Internet users should telnet swais.access.gpo.gov and login as newuser (all lower case); no password is required. Dial in users should use communications software and modem to call (202) 512–1661 and login as swais (all lower case); no password is required; at the second login prompt, login as newuser (all lower case); no password is required. Follow the instructions on the screen to register for a subscription for the Congressional Record Online via *GPO Access*. For assistance, contact the *GPO Access* User Support Team by sending Internet e-mail to help@eids05.eids.gpo.gov, or a fax to (202) 512–1262, or by calling (202) 512–1530 between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m. Eastern time, Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $112.50 for six months, $225 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $118 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, directly to the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.