It also provides a central traffic point for DOE's nuclear agency and critical message traffic from overseas embassies. It would be, I think, something that all Members of this House could join together on. We are not anxious to restrict our capabilities to monitor potential proliferation of nuclear activities in countries, particularly in third-world countries, where we think the threat is most likely to occur.

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

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCDADE. 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. 2203.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] and I have discussed this issue. We are, as we so often are, in accord. I support the motion and I urge its adoption.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1300

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MCDADE, ROGERS, KNOLLENBERG, FRELINGHUYSEN, PARKER, CALLAHAN, DICKEY, LIVINGSTON, FAZIO of California, VISCLOSKY, EDWARDS, PASTOR, and OBEY.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 2159, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous materials.

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

There was no objection.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 27, 1997, and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2159.

□ 1302

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2159) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with Mr. THORNBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, July 30, 1997, the bill had been read through page 93, line 15.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 31, 1997, no other amendment shall be in order, except pro forma amendments offered for the purpose of debate, unless printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD before Friday, August 1, 1997.

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

Mr. Chairman, just to bring the Members up to date, we are resuming our debate on the Foreign Operations bill, H.R. 2159. Just to refresh Members' memories, this bill was well under the allocation that was given to the subcommittee. In fact, it is some $87,000 under last year's appropriation and nearly $4.5 billion less than the Senate bill and the President's request.

So once again, as we continue this debate, we would like for our colleagues to keep in mind that final passage on this measure will actually mean another reduction in foreign aid, and I think it is very important that Members of the House understand this.

Once again, the American people are requesting that we be frugal in our efforts to assist the President and the executive branch in their efforts to have an effective foreign policy. But under the circumstances, the committee felt, and I feel, that the reduction is in order. So with that, Mr. Chairman, I will continue the effort.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from California, the ranking Democrat on the subcommittee.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, once again, I, too, want to remind our colleagues of the great leadership of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] in bringing this bipartisan legislation to the floor. This is a difficult bill and there are many contentious areas that are covered in it.

We began the debate, as Members may recall, before the August district work period. At that time, I said that the gentleman from Alabama had resolved many of the contentious issues. One area of agreement that I have with the gentleman on the bill, of course, is the funding level. I hope to work on that in conference. But, again, in terms of the issue-by-issue consideration of the bill, I think a great deal was accomplished because of the gentleman's openness, accessibility, and spirit of bipartisanship.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman once again for his leadership and once again separate from the remarks about, yes, we must be frugal and prudent in all of our spending, subject all of it to the harshest scrutiny, but I support the larger number of the administration, a minor disagreement with the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for her kind remarks, and it has been a pleasure working with the gentlewoman in her first year as ranking Democrat on our subcommittee. The gentlewoman has been a pleasure to work with, as has been her entire staff.

Mr. Chairman, it has been a joint effort, both Republicans and Democrats joining together, to bring to the floor what I consider a responsible bill. I know the gentlewoman is concerned that it is not sufficient, but nevertheless, under the circumstances, I certainly feel that it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ASSISTANCE TO TURKEY

SEC. 571. (a) Not more than $40,000,000 of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Economic Support Fund'' may be made available for Turkey.

(b) Of the funds made available under the heading ''Economic Support Fund'' for Turkey, not less than fifty percent of these funds shall be made available for the purpose of supporting private nongovernmental organizations engaged in strengthening democratic institutions in Turkey, providing economic assistance for individuals and communities affected by civil unrest, and supporting and promoting peaceful solutions and economic development which will contribute to the settlement of regional problems in Turkey.

AMENDMENT NO. 76 OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 76 offered by Mr. CAMPBELL:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. 572. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for ''ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND'', and increasing the amount made available for ''CONTRIBUTION TO THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FUND'' (as authorized by Section 526(c) Public Law 103–306; 108 Stat. 1632), by $25,000,000.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would allocate 25 million additional dollars to the African Development Fund. The amendment is revenue neutral, budget neutral, and is

scored by CBO as neutral on all relevant points for budgetary purposes. It takes the $25 million that we would like to give to the African Development Fund from the Economic Support Fund.

The Economic Support Fund is the generic fund that is one of the largest components of this bill and is already funded at $57 million above the fiscal year 1997 enacted level.

So, there is no question that this money would not add to the size of the bill, the cost of the bill, or the size of the burden on the U.S. taxpayers from the deficit.

Why is it necessary to dedicate $25 million more into the African Development Fund? The United States investment of time, compassion, and dollars in Africa, in my view, brings the greatest return from the point of view of our national interests, our sense of compassion, and what we can do for people who are most in need.

The people who live in sub-Saharan Africa have the lowest life expectancy of any people on Earth. Americans on average live 48 percent longer, almost half a lifetime longer than the average person living in sub-Saharan Africa.

International relief organizations characterize sub-Saharan Africa as having one half of its population living in absolute poverty.

What does the African Development Fund do? Well, in combination with the African Development Bank, it assists those individuals, entrepreneurs, small businesses, who are able and interested in helping themselves to create the conditions for economic growth from which the alleviation of poverty will come in a permanent way.

Mr. Chairman, it is not a handout. It is an assist in becoming economically self-sufficient so that some day when we speak of these issues again on the House floor, we will not be referring to a life expectancy so short and infant mortality rate so high and absence of inoculation for childhood diseases that is so sadly widespread.

The United States has in the past funded the African Development Bank and the African Development Fund. The African Development Bank offers assistance for the more creditworthy borrowers. That is an important area, but it is not the subject of this amendment.

The African Development Fund offers assistance for the poorest of the poor. It offers loans on concessional bases. In the past, the United States has had some concern about the management of the African Development Fund and, for that reason, has not been putting any money into this for several of the last years. However, the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, the Committee on International Relations, the State Department, AID, have all been studying the progress made by the African Development Fund and have come to the conclusion that it is appropriate to recommit United States resources to this very important area. The only issue now is the amount.

Mr. Chairman, here is why that additional $25 million is so important. Presently, the Senate bill, the other body's bill, has zero. The President has requested $50 million. The committee's bill requests $25 million.

If we can go to conference with a full $50 million, I would be very hopeful and prayerful that we could actually get $50 million, which is what the President has requested. It certainly puts us in a better bargaining position than if we go to the conference with $25 million, which is in the bill.

Several Members of the European Community have announced that their willingness to assist will be conditional upon the United States putting forward its commitment. Because whereas we have committed to assist with the African Development Fund, we have, in fact, not contributed for the last 2 years, when we said we would. The amount that is already overdue is $132 million.

Mr. Chairman, I am not asking for that today. I am asking for the additional $25 million so that we can make a good down payment on getting this fund started again and thereby engage our European allies in this most worthy project.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues out of compassion to care for those who are the most needy in the world, please to support this amendment. I am proud to say that it is supported by many colleagues, including the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE], and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Mr. Chairman, I conclude by saying for those concerned about our friends in the Middle East, that AIPAC has allowed me to say they do not oppose this amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise, first of all, to thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], chairman of this fine subcommittee, for his effort and his work, including his work with me over the years on many issues dealing with human rights, particularly in Africa.

I also thank the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for her forthright and open presentation and commitment on human rights and issues dealing with foreign affairs in this world. I am proud to be associated with both of these fine colleagues.

Mr. Chairman, the effort of the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] today is one that I proudly support, and I join the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] to be able to stand today for what I think is a vital change and recognition in the policy of teaching someone to fish, rather than giving them a fish.

Interestingly enough, as the world mourns one of the most dynamic ambassadors that committed herself to the idea of helping those less fortunate, Princess Diana, who visited Africa on several occasions and was not fearful of working with the heads of State, but as well as the people of those nations in helping them to pull themselves up by their bootstraps, that we would come today to be able to support legislation that adds $25 million to the African Development fund.

Mr. Chairman, this does not cause for any increase in spending in this particular bill, but helps to raise the funding to a level of $50 million; a request made by the President and one that we have not met at this time.

It is extremely important to recognize what the African Development Fund stands for. It makes loans on market-based terms to creditworthy borrowers.

□ 1315

That is, while the AFDF lends to the poorest members on highly concessional terms, that means that what happens is those poorest nations, those poorest individuals, those poorest nongovernmental agencies are able to receive money that will help lift them and their constituents up by the bootstraps.

The interesting thing that we should note is that in fact this money does go to the poorest nations in sub-Saharan Africa. The African Development Bank concentrates its loans on smaller projects than the International Development Association, the concessional lending arm of the World Bank, in areas such as microenterprise, primary education, preventative health care, agriculture and basic infrastructure.

In fact, as I visited South Africa just a few months ago, I was delighted to see some of the very examples of what the African Development Fund is engaged in, complementing those participants in ideas and programs of which they initiated, which they were the idea persons for, and which they were able to draw from the very basis of their soul and see the success that was brought about by these matching funds.

The AFDF account is funded at 25 million, half of what the President requested. Interestingly enough, the ESF account is as a full 57 million above fiscal year 1997 enacted levels, which is good, but yet this does not answer the question when we find that countries like sub-Saharan Africa or in sub-Saharan Africa, India, and Latin America receive the lowest United States foreign aid per capita of any recipients in the world. This is particularly striking because these regions have the lowest GNP per capita in the world and the lowest life expectancy on earth. Sub-Saharan Africans die younger than anyone else by a huge margin.

I believe that there have been great strides in AFDF, particularly, as has been noted by this committee, that the

new management of the African Development Bank and Fund have made great strides in restructuring the whole infrastructure of the organization so that they have drawn confidence in the way that they handle the dollars that they were given.

Additionally, I think it is important that the moneys, such as the ESF funds, that they will not impact Israel or Egypt. This shows a true combined effort in those seeking to help sub-Saharan Africa to provide a grass-roots initiative, to enhance those grass-roots organizations who can show themselves proud and be able to draw in others who would draw with them and work on infrastructure and education and health needs. This is the kind of money that the United States can be most proud of rendering.

I believe that this Congress would do well to support this increase because this is worth 1,000 times what it is in actual dollars. This is worth people realizing that I can do something. This is worth people understanding that I do not have to ask for fish because I can learn to fish.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would simply say that I rise to support this funding amendment and would ask my colleagues to join enthusiastically to help sub-Saharan Africa stand on its own feet.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment I am sure is well-intended, but it ignores the history of the institution that they are trying to help. Just to refresh the Members' memories as to the history of the African Development Fund, just 2 years ago this Congress rescinded the $60 million included in the bill for the African Development Fund because it was unneeded. There was no objection whatsoever 2 years ago.

Now, under new management, we feel like the fund is back on its feet, that they indeed are moving in a progressive manner by which to help the very people that the proponents of this bill wish to help. So we as a committee did insert $25 million to reestablish our confirmation that they are moving in the correct direction. And now for an amendment to come to the floor increasing the $25 to $50 million plays havoc with the entire bill.

The gentlewoman from Texas mentioned that this does not impact Israel nor Egypt, but she is wrong because it does impact Israel and Egypt because if we deplete the funds which are very limited in the economic support fund, we are going to deny the administration the opportunity to assist Jordan. And if Jordan is not assisted, then Israel and Egypt both will suffer. So it indeed does impact the Middle East, and I take issue with her indication that it does not impact either Israel or Egypt.

The Senate, we understand, has nothing in the bill. The proponents of this fund came to me early on and requested our assistance, and out of deference to them, we did include the $25 million to reestablish the fund. But to come at this moment and to say, let us double what the committee, I think very prudently and wisely has given, in my opinion, does great harm to our bill.

So it does impact Israel. It does impact Egypt. It denies Jordan the full funding that the administration has requested because it subtracts from a very, very small residue that remains after we give the moneys to Israel and Egypt. So I would respectfully request that the committee consider what we did in the Appropriations Committee. I would like for the proponents of this amendment to recognize that we came a giant step forward in trying to be of assistance to them. I would like to also remind the proponents of this measure that we included another $50 million in the Child Survival Fund which will indeed help the needy people in the country of Africa.

I respectfully request that the Members vote against this amendment because it just disrupts many portions of our bill and at the same time sends an indication that we are going to give a fund who just 2 years ago was deemed unacceptable by this Congress, that indeed we are going to fully fund it at $50 million instead of the $25 million.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the chairman and, as I said, his hard work on this issue. I think it is important to at least understand my commitment and my thrust behind supporting this increase.

Frankly, this $25 million increase provides the appropriation that was requested by the President of the United States. Under the President's discretion, it is clear that Egypt and Israel and Jordan, I might add, would not have to be impacted and the advocacy groups for Israel have conceded and feel very comfortable that this would be the right direction to go. It is worth noting that this is a full $57 million above the fiscal year 1997 enacted level, but I think the argument is strongest by noting how poor sub-Saharan Africa is and how low its GNP is and how it is, in the world's economy, the poorest, almost the poorest area, along with India and other parts of Latin America.

This infusion of capital under a newly managed African Development Bank would clearly be the right direction that this Nation should take in its new policies, or at least its stated policies of making sure that foreign affairs dollars have a return; that is, foreign affairs dollars are appropriately invested so that we get the full return. Investing in sub-Saharan Africa by giving to these nongovernmental agencies, these agencies that deal with the poorest of the poor, helping in infrastructure, health care, helping in education, has to be an investment for the 21st century.

With all due respect to the chairman's opposition, I might say that Egypt and Israel and Jordan would be protected. These additional moneys would be appropriately invested and we would get a return on our foreign affairs dollars that we could be very proud of in helping sub-Saharan Africa.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL].

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend from Michigan for his kindness.

Please, let us focus for a moment on this question. AIPAC, the American-Israeli Public Affairs Committee, has informed me they do not oppose this amendment. It took goodwill on all sides and that is the position. It is not correct to say that this amendment would jeopardize the U.S. interest or the interests of our friends in the Middle East.

I would like, with my friend's permission, to call on the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee, if he would be kind enough to engage me in a colloquy right now, if the chairman of the subcommittee would be kind enough to engage me in a colloquy.

With all respect and recognizing that we differ on this amendment, it is imperative that I lay out that there is no opposition from the American-Israeli Public Affairs Committee to this amendment.

May I kindly ask if the gentleman has any information to the contrary.

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

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, no, and I would not expect that they would be involved in any appropriation we make to any other country for any other purpose. It is not the role of AIPAC to be that involved.

My point is that we have a very limited amount in the economic support fund over and above what we traditionally have given to Israel and Egypt. If we allow the appropriation to Egypt and to Israel, then indeed it jeopardizes the possibility of Jordan getting the $100 million they have requested and the administration supports.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, an additional question, if I am laboring, it is only at pains to make it clear that the gentleman is expressing his understanding and not that of anyone else, but his own understanding of the impact.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I wrote the bill, and we know how much money is in the economic support fund.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I have one additional question, if I may. If the amendment to be offered later regarding funds for Cambodia is adopted, it is my understanding that will

free up $37 million presently allocated to Cambodia in the ESF account.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Let me correct the gentleman there. There is nothing earmarked in this bill. We do not earmark money for Israel. We do not earmark money for Egypt or Cambodia or any place else. There is nothing earmarked in the bill. We give to the administration a designated amount of money for the economic support fund. If the administration wants to give this money to the African Development Fund, they have that prerogative.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, my last question, is it not the gentleman's understanding and that of his committee that the total amount would include money adequate to spend for Cambodia? I completely grant no earmark and, hence, if today we restrict the amount of money that is going to Cambodia, that amount of money which was anticipated in the gentleman's total amount for ESF would be available to go to the Africa Development Fund without jeopardizing any other recipients?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, if the administration were to desire to do that, since there are no earmarks, we do not earmark money for Cambodia, we do not earmark money for anybody.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I am most grateful to the gentleman. And to the gentleman from Michigan, deep thanks for allowing me the chance to rebut.

Let me conclude, the clarity is apparent that we are not jeopardizing any of the U.S. objectives in the Middle East, that the total amount of ESF funds is more than enough to fund this very small amount of $25 million, that it will be even more so if the amendment to restrict spending in Cambodia is adopted at $37 million.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my support for the Campbell amendment to increase the United States contribution to the Africa Development Fund [ADF] from $25 to $50 million.

With the exception of the World Bank the ADF is the largest source of capital for 39 of Africa's poorest countries. The fund, supporting largely the agricultural, health care, education and economic reform sectors, reaches the poorest levels of society by supporting macro-economic development, thereby staving off natural and man-made disasters.

The ADF has undergone necessary and significant internal reforms to make the organizations more efficient. Staff has been reduced by 30 percent the net income has increased by $150 million, and procurement reforms have increased transparency and decreased abuses.

The ADF is a success story. Please support this vital organization by passing the Campbell Amendment. Thank you.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the sponsorship of this important amendment to H.R. 2159, the foreign operations appropriations bill before the House today.

This amendment would appropriate an additional $25 million to the African Development Fund. This amendment is budget neutral and will provide the much needed support to the development of stable democracies on the continent of Africa.

It is important as we grapple with how best to assist the former republics of the Soviet Union to also provide assistance for the sustained development of Africa.

The African Development Fund is the largest source of capital for the 39 poorest countries, outside of the World Bank. It is the largest co-financing partner for IDA in Africa, and in 1997, the fund will lend 4 times more assistance than USAID.

This amendment would reduce the Economic Support Fund by $25 million in order to provide the level of support that Africa needs in critical areas of agriculture, primary health care, basic education and economic reform.

The help offered by United States taxpayers—not to dictatorships, but to non-governmental organizations like CARE and multilateral financial institutions under sound management like the African Development Fund—will go farther in sub-Saharan Africa than anywhere else on Earth.

As a supporter of this amendment I am interested in helping the poorest people in the world.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL].

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 24, 1997, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

□ 1330

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. YATES

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 51 offered by Mr. YATES:

At the end of the bill, insert the following after the last section (preceding the short title):

LIMITATION OF ASSISTANCE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF CROATIA

SEC. 572. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by title II of this Act may be made available to the Government of Croatia if that government relocates the remains of Croatian Ustashe soldiers, who participated during the Holocaust in the mass murder of Jews, Serbs, and Gypsies, at the site of the World War II concentration camp at Jasenovac, Croatia.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, there is no Member of the House for whom I have higher regard and greater respect than the chairman of the subcommittee and for the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], the ranking member. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], our chairman, has conducted our hearings in an outstandingly fair and rational manner. It is not easy to disagree with him on any subject, and there are not many that I disagree with him upon and I am sure that he and I do not disagree upon the purpose of our amendment.

Croatia's role during the Holocaust was a most despicable one. The Ustashe, Croatia's soldiers, were Hitler's shock troops to exterminate the Jews, with whom they came in contact in Croatia. Literally hundreds of Jews were killed and their remains were buried in the cemetery at Jasenvoc in Croatia. Now the government has indicated that it will bury Ustashe killers with their victims in the cemetery at Jasenvoc.

Why is this such an important issue? Elie Weisel has put it very well, and I quote. ''Such an act,'' he says, ''will kill the victims twice. The first time was when they were murdered. The second time was when we murder their memory.'' That is exactly what the Government of Croatia would do in the event that it undertook to bury the Ustashe in the cemetery with its victims.

The victims and their killers in death would be used to eradicate the crimes that were committed during World War II. All that we have to receive from the Government of Croatia is the absolute assurance that the Ustashe will not be buried with their victims in this cemetery. As I indicated, we have asked for such assurances from President Tudjman and we have not received them. All that we have received is a statement as vague as we do not plan to bury them together at this time. That is today, Mr. Chairman. Tomorrow they may decide to do so.

The amendment that I offer will hold up payments to the Government of Croatia until such time as it gives our Government the assurances that the Ustashe will not be buried in that cemetery. I urge support for my amendment.

POINT OF ORDER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair notes that the gentleman from Alabama was on his feet seeking recognition when the gentleman from Illinois embarked upon debate. The Chair did not interrupt the debate from the gentleman from Illinois.

Without objection the gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. CALLAHAN. My point of order I think can be resolved, Mr. Chairman, and indeed the gentleman I think is going to ask for unanimous consent to amend his amendment. The original amendment that was introduced I think would create a point of order, but it is my understanding the gentleman from Illinois has an amendment that he is going to request unanimous consent to submit.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is correct. I concede the gentleman's point of order, Mr. Chairman.

AMENDMENT NO. 51, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. YATES

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to offer an amended version of the amendment I offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 51, as modified, offered by Mr. YATES:

At the end of the bill, insert the following after the last section (preceding the short title):

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF CROATIA

SEC. 572. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by title II of this Act may be made available to the Government of Croatia to relocate the remains of Croatian Ustashe soldiers, at the site of the World War II concentration camp at Jasenovac, Croatia.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the modification of the amendment?

Without objection, the modification is agreed to and the point of order reserved by the gentleman from Alabama is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I have spoken in connection with my previous amendment. The statement that I made on the previous amendment I now ask unanimous consent to be made available for this amendment.

I thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for their cooperation.

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

There was no objection.

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

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 33 offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

LIMITATION ON PROCUREMENT OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 572. Funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used for procurement outside the United States or less developed countries only if—

(1) such funds are used for the procurement of commodities or services, or defense articles or defense services, produced in the country in which the assistance is to be provided, except that this paragraph only applies if procurement in that country would cost less than procurement in the United States or less developed countries;

(2) the provision of such assistance requires commodities or services, or defense articles or defense services, of a type that are not produced in, and available for purchase from, the United States, less developed countries, or the country in which the assistance is to be provided; or

(3) the President determines on a case-by-case basis that procurement outside the United States or less developed countries would result in the more efficient use of United States foreign assistance resources.

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, this was placed in the legislation the last several years. The essence of this is just simple, common sense. I was under the impression that we had an agreement worked out with the appropriators on it. It basically says that we give money to these foreign countries basically to help them in the form of aid, and they do make purchases with this American money that our taxpayers work hard to send here to Washington. The amendment says that, ''Look, we give you that money. If you produce a product in your country and you need some farm equipment and you have farm equipment, go ahead and buy from your own people. But when you do not produce a product and you have to go outside your country to make a purchase and you're using American taxpayer dollars,'' this amendment says to purchase items made in America unless they would be so prohibitively costly it would negate the purpose of our foreign aid to this country in the first place.

The appropriators allowed the amendment the last time it was offered. I thought we had an agreement on it. I believe that it is absolute madness that we continue to write checks and give money away and then they take our money and buy products from other countries. It makes no sense. We talk about authorizing, but we have not had a reasonable authorization bill that spoke to any merit or substance at all, and this is a limitation on the use of American taxpayer dollars when these countries buy a product that they do not make themselves.

This is eminent common sense. This is reasonable appropriation policy, it is a reasonable appropriation measure, and I would ask the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, the chairman of the subcommittee, if this amendment has been approved several times.

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

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. This amendment has been approved several times. In fact, the gentleman from Ohio and I have talked about this amendment. I am not sure that we talked about the language as it is written, but conceptually I think that I and the committee agree with the gentleman, that in every instance where we are providing aid to any foreign country and they are going to purchase some commodity, then they ought to give preference to U.S. firms. That is the purpose of it.

My reserving the point of order was simply to give me the opportunity to read the gentleman's language which, as he and I discussed, was one-sentence, buy American language. This one is a little bit more complex. I am willing to withdraw my point of order but must advise the gentleman that we may have to work on the language that has been drafted in conference, but at the same time to preserve the meaning of the gentleman's amendment. We do insist that these countries that receive American aid ought to be, without us making it into law, buying American goods, anyway. As a matter of fact, it is already in the bill; the sense of the Congress is already in the bill. It says 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.

I have not had time to thoroughly analyze the page-long amendment that the gentleman has presented and thus the reason I had voiced some concern.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, before I yield to the distinguished ranking member, let me say this. That sense of the Congress speaks to some basic intent, but it does not really do that which should be done after all these years of foreign aid. I have a number of other amendments that I feel very strong about, but I have talked with the gentleman about authorizing and appropriating and I am pulling back all of those. But I have one sincere effort here in the Congress, I really do, and that is this type of language. I would be willing to have the gentleman work on this language. This makes certain specifications that go a little bit beyond that sense of the Congress, but I would urge the gentleman, knowing his record, in lieu of that, to accept this language in general and to tailor where he may need it but leave it to the point where it is more than that sense of Congress.

I appreciate his having inserted that through my efforts over the years, but this I think takes us into some policy that appropriators should be taking on a reasonable limitation in the use of our taxpayers' dollars on these expenditures.

Mr. CALLAHAN. If the gentleman will further yield, the appropriate place for this language would be in some authorization bill, not in an appropriation bill and thus my argument. I or anyone on my committee that I am aware of has any objection to the destination he is trying to reach. We all agree with him. Thus, we insert in our bill language that was a sense of the Congress. But as I have said, we are going to have to take a look at the language.

I withdraw my point of order, but with the understanding that in conference we are going to have to work

with the Senate to get language that is more compatible with an appropriation bill rather than an authorization bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. TRAFICANT was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from California, the distinguished ranking member.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I support the statement of our chairman about the clarification of the language in conference but support the spirit of the amendment that is put forth by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] and once again call to the attention of our colleagues the refinement of the amendment, that the bill may be used for procurement outside the United States or in less developed countries only if such funds are used for purchases in the country receiving assistance and such purchases would cost less than procurement in the United States or less developed countries, and if such purchases are not available in the United States or less developed countries, and this is the important point that I think we will work on in conference, if the President determines that such purchases would result in a more efficient use of U.S. foreign assistance resources. The waiver language as well I think is a smart approach to the gentleman's leadership on this issue.

Again, I associate myself with the comments of our chairman.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the statement. Just let me close by saying this. These authorization bills sometimes never get an opportunity to see the light of day. This limitation is very important. I really thank the chairman for withdrawing his point of order, and I plan to work with and lean on and grab ahold of the chairman and see what I can do because he has done a great job.

□ 1345

Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate it if we would keep the spirit and the intent in the bill.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The amendment was agreed to.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a point of order against section 539 of the bill found on page 66, line 15, through page 67, line 22, on the grounds that it violates 5(b) of rule XXI of the rules of the House.

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

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, clause 5(b) of rule XXI states that it shall not be in the order of the House to consider a measure carrying a tax or a trade provision not reported by the committee of jurisdiction.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the measure on the floor would preclude the President from waiving certain import sanctions against Serbia-Montenegro which are imposed pursuant to certain codified Executive orders. The provision imposes a new requirement on the President that an Executive order lifting these import sanctions cannot be issued until the President certifies to the Congress that certain democratic reforms have occurred in Kosova. This change of authority over import restrictions falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means and clearly constitutes a tariff measure for purposes of rule XXI 5(b) of the rules of the House.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the point of order applies, and I urge the Chair to sustain the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, section 539 of the pending bill would prohibit the termination of sanctions against Serbia and Montenegro until certain conditions are met. This provision was included in the fiscal year 1996 Appropriation Act as a result of an amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL] on July 11, 1995.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I oppose the amendment; however, it was made in order under a rule approved by the House on that very same day by a vote of 236 to 162, and for the RECORD I might remind the Members that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means voted for that rule.

I agree with the gentleman that this provision does not belong in this bill. I would say the same thing about a number of other provisions. However, lack of an authorization act for many years has resulted in this bill being used for purposes other than the appropriation of funds. Since the House has specifically approved this provision in the past, I believe that it was my duty to include it in this appropriation bill.

The Committee on Ways and Means does not agree and believes this is a violation of the House rule, and the Parliamentarian agrees, and I will, of course, defer to them on this matter, and I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. If no other Member wishes to be heard on the point of order, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] makes a point of order against section 539 of the bill on the grounds that it carries a tariff measure in a bill reported by committee, Committee on Appropriations, not having jurisdiction to report tariff matters in violation of clause 5(b) of rule XXI.

Under clause 5(b) of rule XXI, this point of order may be raised at any time during consideration of the bill for amendment in the Committee of the Whole even after section 539 has been passed in the reading for amendment.

In this respect, the standard of timeliness, this point of order is unlike those arising under clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI.

Current law authorized the President to waive application of certain sanctions to Serbia-Montenegro. Among these sanctions are import prohibitions which affect tariff collections. Section 539 of the bill constrains the authority of the President on these matters. It, thereby, carries a tariff measure within the meaning of clause 5(b) of rule XXI, and the point of order is sustained, and section 539 is stricken from the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. PAUL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 32 offered by Mr. PAUL:

After the last section (preceding the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON FUNDS FOR ABORTION, FAMILY PLANNING, OR POPULATION CONTROL EFFORTS

SEC. 572. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available for—

(1) population control or population planning programs;

(2) family planning activities; or

(3) abortion procedures.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is very clear. If the amendment passes, no funds in this bill could be used for population control, family planning, or abortion procedures. That will take in about $385 million that we could save by passing this amendment.

The most important part of this amendment would be that we would absolutely assure that none of the funding would ever be used for abortion. One of the ways that the funds get to abortion, to the use of abortion, is that the funds are granted for birth control, and then the funds elsewhere can be saved, and those other funds can be used for abortion. In other words, it can be the funds are fungible.

It is claimed that people have a need for birth control, and this may be true, but we have not been well received around the world. I am not quite sure exactly when the U.S. Government and the American taxpayer got involved in the birth control business overseas, but we have been doing it now probably for several decades. But there is a lot of resentment toward America imposing our will on other people.

For instance, we have sent over the use of Norplant, a very controversial medical procedure. I am a gynecologist, and I can attest to it. It is very controversial, yet it was used on hundreds of thousands of women overseas. When that procedure was finally brought to the United States, it was rejected by the American people.

I, as a gynecologist, spent more time taking these Norplants out than putting them in because of the severe complications with them, but nevertheless we, as taxpayers, have continuously sent more funding overseas to support these procedures.

But there is no moral justification for us in the U.S. Congress to go and

tax poor people in America, to go over and impose our ideas and our beliefs on other people's culture, and we have been doing this now for several decades, and a lot of resentment has been building up. There is no constitutional authority for programs like this. There is nowhere in the Constitution where we can find any justification for us imposing our will on other people in this manner.

But worst of all, if funds are used for birth control and other funds are saved and then they are used on abortion, it is in a way indirectly supporting abortion.

Later on we will vote on another amendment to curtail the use of funds for abortion, and I will support the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] in this regard because we hope that that would at least help, but one way where we can assure and not worry about it would be to pass this amendment and not send any money over in the first place because it is not authorized, it is not permissible, it is not moral, and there is a lot of resentment toward us for these very, very reasons.

The issue that always comes up is that the people need help, but there are a lot of voluntary associations in this country that are willing to help. If we feel compelled to help poor nations in their birth control effort, it can be done through voluntary means, not through coercion, not taking by force money from people who have philosophic and religious and social beliefs against these programs that we are imposing on others.

So this is a program that should be just abolished. It should be stopped. We should not send any funds over there. This argument that we can control the way funds are being spent once they are overseas, we are kidding ourselves when we use that argument. We really lose control of these funds once they get into the hands of other governments or agencies that are dealing with these problems overseas.

Typically, programs that are run by governments and international governments do not work very well, and these programs have done very poorly. At the same time, there are poor countries around the world that have car loads, millions, of condoms sitting around that are not used. They cannot get surgical gloves to do surgical procedures. There are countries reported in Africa where they do not have penicillin, and yet they have all the birth control pills that they want.

So I argue that this program is unnecessary, unconstitutional, it is an abuse of the rights and beliefs of so many Americans, and it is not well received overseas. The best thing we can do is just take the money away from these programs, take the $385 million and return it to the American taxpayers. This would be a far better way to use this money other than aggravating, antagonizing people in other countries.

What would we think if some foreign government came over and decided that our inner cities were overpopulated and they wanted to impose some population controls and some birth control methods on the inner cities? I am sure there would be a strong objection to that.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong opposition to the amendment, as proposed, by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL]. If enacted, the Paul amendment would cause death and suffering for millions of women and children whose lives and well-being depend on the availability of family planning and health service supported under USAID's population assistance program. Over 580,000 women die annually, 1 woman every minute, of causes related to pregnancy and childbirth. Family planning can prevent 25 percent of all maternal and infant deaths by avoiding unintended pregnancies and spacing births.

The Paul amendment would close the most effective avenue to prevent abortions. Certainly we all consider abortion a failure, and if we want to reduce the number of abortions, we should support family planning.

The World Health Organization estimates that 40 percent of unintended pregnancies end in abortion. That is a tragedy. Family planning enables couples to prevent unintended pregnancies. Large declines in numbers of abortions have occurred due to the expansion of family planning services in many countries across the globe, including South Korea, Chile, Hungary, Russia, Kazakhstan, Ukraine, Colombia, and Mexico. This amendment would end a 30-year program that is recognized as one of the most successful components of U.S. foreign assistance.

And this is not about the United States going to another country and forcing anything on anyone. This is a voluntary program that the countries asked for. And again, to reference the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL], we are not later going to be voting on any amendment that will curtail funds for abortion. The discussion in this bill is about curtailing funding for family planning.

More than 50 million couples in the developing world use family planning as a direct result of this program, and the average number of children per family has declined more than one-third since the 1960's. Three out of four Americans surveyed in 1995 wanted to increase or maintain spending on family planning for poor countries.

I urge our colleagues to reject overwhelmingly the ill-advised Paul amendment and to support international family planning.

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

Mr. Chairman, while I have every respect for the philosophy of the gentleman from Texas, and I share his views on abortion, I do not think that is what this debate or this amendment addresses. Indeed, I feel like I have made a giant and major impact on the elimination of AID funds for abortion anywhere in the world. As a matter of fact, my bill says that none of the funds of this bill may be used for an abortion, period.

So this is not an abortion issue; this is a family planning issue, because some feel like that if they go into a country and through educational processes they will eliminate the need for abortions, and they well may be right.

So do not imply to anyone in this body or anyone in this audience watching today that the bill that I wrote permits abortion in any fashion because it absolutely restricts it. Abortions for family planning purposes cannot be performed with any of the money anywhere in this bill, period, flat no.

Now when I took this committee over as chairman several years ago, Mr. Chairman, if I had come to you and said to you and the proponents of the right to life, said, I am going to cut funding for family planning by up to half, then I would have been heralded as a hero.

□ 1400

Now I have done that, only to be addressed on the floor as a proponent of abortion, which I am not.

So I would submit to this Congress and to the gentleman from Texas, while I agree with his views with respect to the right to life, he is absolutely wrong in his allegation that any of this money for family planning purposes can be used for abortion. It does not, it cannot, it will not, and never will as long as I am chairman of this committee.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would oppose the gentleman's amendment, indicating to the Members that the restriction is already there and that we have cut family planning significantly over the period of time that I have used. If you use 1995 figures, we have cut $518 million from family planning activities.

So I think we have done an outstanding job, and I would urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

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

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to imply that the gentleman has permitted or endorsed or encouraged or the bill says directly there are funds here for abortion. I will concede that.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, if the gentleman would answer my question, is there anything in this bill that leads the gentleman to believe that any of this money can be used for abortion anywhere in the world?

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I am addressing the fungibility argument.

Mr. CALLAHAN. The fungibility and the tangibility of what is in this bill, you cannot use any of this money for abortions anywhere in the world. If the

gentleman would concede to that point, I would be happy to yield.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, that is true directly, but indirectly the fungibility argument is very important. If you use funds for other things, you say the governments and agencies can use them for abortion. So you do it indirectly.

Yes, it might be a little harder to comprehend the fungibility argument, but it is there. If we support a country or a government or an agency that does permit and endorse abortion and they can use these funds for birth control pills, they can use their other funds to do the abortion.

So, yes, the gentleman is correct that directly there are no funds in this bill that will provide for abortion. But indirectly it opens up some funds and makes them available for abortion.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, will the gentleman admit that we have done a very favorable job in moving in the same direction the gentleman would like us to move? Would the gentleman not admit that since when I took over this committee we have saved $518 million? And now we have reduced it, we have reduced it to a level of $385 million. I think we have made significant inroads and yet preserved the ability of agencies to go into a country with limited educational opportunities to give them advice.

Maybe it can be through a church, maybe it can be through abstinence programs, but I do think education in that manner actually denies the probability of abortions even being presented. But if they were presented, none of this money could ever be used under any circumstance for an abortion anywhere in the world for family planning purposes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield further, the efficiency of the programs are to be questioned. If you look at the Norplant program, they put this Norplant in hundreds of thousands of women. It is not a good medication. I have personal experience from it. Then they use that as an example of the reason to promote it in the United States.

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

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

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I once again reiterate my opposition to the Paul amendment and support the statement of our chairman, Mr. CALLAHAN.

As this Congress should know by now, because it has been reiterated on this floor, no money in this bill can be used for abortion. That is the Helms language. That is the law of the land. Let us be clear.

So we want to take it to a fungibility place. I hope that Mr. PAUL will support the Gilman-Pelosi-Campbell Lowey-DeLauro-Slaughter-Greenwood proposal on the floor tomorrow, which addresses the fungibility issue very directly.

First of all, I do not think it needs to be addressed. But for those who need that comfort and clarification, I am pleased to be a supporter of that amendment. In that amendment it says that none of the funds would go to organizations that do not promote abortion as a method of family planning and that utilize these funds to prevent abortion as a method of family planning. It puts these conditions on receiving the funds; also, it says, except in the case of organizations that do not promote abortion as a method of family planning.

So there is nothing about fungibility here. This is about organizations that promote family planning and discourage the use of abortion for family planning. So fungibility is not a principle that applies here.

But if we are going to use the principles of fungibility, we are opening a door for many issues across the board in this bill and every other bill that comes along. I do not know that this Congress wants to go down that path.

But I am pleased to say that the amendment that will be offered tomorrow as an amendment to the Smith amendment will clarify, once and for all, this is not about fungibility. It is about family planning, and none of the money goes to any organization, unless they are promoting family planning and discouraging abortion as a tool for that.

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would also go on record opposing the amendment of the gentleman from Texas. I want to reiterate, as the gentlewoman from California has said, that I will support her amendment tomorrow.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL].

There are so many reasons to support this amendment, an amendment whose time has come. This amendment will eliminate funding for all population control activities overseas. We have spent hour upon hour in this Chamber debating the many issues surrounding foreign aid, which includes the funding for international family planning.

There are many problems with the U.S. taxpayer spending nearly $400 million every year for international population control activities. One very obvious and practical problem that cannot be ignored is that the taxpayer simply cannot afford this type of program any longer.

I wish I could count the number of times I have come to the floor to speak out in one way or another against excessive Federal spending and Government intervention. Every time I implore Members of this body to consider how we are sabotaging our children's futures, how we slowly but surely chip away at any prospects for a solid financial foundation every time we vote to spend more and more tax dollars on inappropriate and unconstitutional programs without any regard to the reality of our Federal Government's financial situation.

But there is an even bigger problem than one simply associated with dollars. This problem is more fundamental to the appropriate role of the Federal Government as defined by the Constitution.

Some might say that many provisions of this appropriations bill fall outside of the guidelines given to us by the Constitution. Some might say that a debate of that nature goes beyond the scope of this amendment.

I think we should talk about the Constitution more. I think that every time we consider a bill, an amendment, a motion to instruct conferees, every time we take any legislative action, we should remember our oath to uphold the Constitution. This means that sometimes, even when things sound like a great idea or the perfect solution to a problem facing our constituents back home, or faceless and nameless individuals suffering thousands of miles away, we have to show some restraint, if only because we are not empowered to act outside the legislative walls erected for us by our Founding Fathers.

Furthermore, I believe that international population control funding is not even a good idea. What concerns me greatly is that it appears that many of my colleagues have simply accepted the assertions of the population control lobby when they constantly and unfailingly contend that overpopulation is the cause of nearly all of the world's human suffering.

For decades, we have heard doomsday predictions that the Earth's population is growing so much, to the point that we will soon be unable to sustain this rate of growth. Make no mistake about it and do not be misled. This is not an overcrowded planet. Too many people are not the problem.

I would assert, however, that those more interested in redistributing wealth and power have everything to lose if the myth of an unsustainable population explosion is debunked. I would further contend that sound public, policy based on real science, not misguided public and political maneuvers and schemes based on radical environmentalism, is the answer to the world's hunger and environmental problems. Flooding Third World developing and developed countries with potentially harmful contraceptives and family planning information, while appearing to meet a very humanitarian need, is such a misguided policy.

There have been numerous reports about the atrocities many women have suffered, all under the auspices of family planning. We have seen women in the slums of Bangladesh and Haiti who

are part of experimentation with Norplant. We have heard accounts of women in Turkey who were told by volunteers that ''family planning'' is more important than husbands, tradition, culture or God, and that sterilization is better than children.

Surely even those who advocate dollars for responsible population control policy would be alarmed at this information. Surely we should not force our constituents to contribute to these programs that undermine the cultures of our neighbors.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply conclude by expressing once again that we need to reevaluate our priorities, our financial situation, and most importantly, our constitutional obligations, and support this amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. I rise in strong opposition to this amendment which will eliminate USAID funding for international family planning.

The need for family planning services in developing countries is urgent and the aid we provide is both valuable and worthwhile. Last February, both the House and the Senate showed their commitment to the USAID International Family Planning Program by voting for the early release of the funds for this program.

Eliminating family planning will deeply hurt millions of women and children.

Nearly 600,000 women die each year of causes related to pregnancy and childbirth; 99 percent of these women live in developing countries. In many countries, women are the primary caregivers of children and a mother's survival is crucial to the survival and well-being of her children. Our international family planning programs are working to reduce maternal deaths and illness due to childbirth.

The ability to control the timing and spacing of childbearing helps mothers, infants, and children thrive. Infants born less than 2 years after a sibling are more likely to have low birth weight, making them more vulnerable to illness and death. One in five infant deaths alone could be averted by the better spacing of births.

In addition, the health of the mother is also put at risk when couples cannot control the number and timing of births. For example, very young women and women who have births very close together are at greater risk for postpartum hemorrhage, a leading cause of maternal death. And for every woman who dies during childbirth, many more face injuries and infections, leaving them permanently disabled or infertile.

This amendment will prevent us from eliminating these tragedies. Simply put—this amendment will end our family planning programs. Period.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. We cannot let them eliminate international family planning—there is too much at stake. I urge you to continue this vital investment in the reproductive health and safety of women and children.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL].

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 24, 1997, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL] will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. FOX OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 41 offered by Mr. Fox of Pennsylvania:

Page 94, after line 3, insert the following:

Sec. 572. None of the funds made available under the heading ''DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE'' may be used to directly support or promote trophy hunting or the international commercial trade in elephant ivory, elephant hides, or rhinoceros horns.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Fox-Miller amendment, which would restrict funding of the CAMPFIRE program used to directly support or promote trophy hunting or the international commercial trade in elephant ivory, elephant hides, or rhinoceros horns.

Mr. Chairman, for the past 8 years, the Communal Areas Management Programs for Indigenous Resources, otherwise known as CAMPFIRE, has implemented many valuable programs which have helped improve the quality of life for the people of Zimbabwe. Our amendment would do nothing to interfere with these beneficial programs.

Unfortunately, too much of the funding, however, from the U.S. Agency for International Development is used to promote the killing of the African elephant, which remains on the endangered species list.

The organizations to my left, over 200, have supported our amendment, as well as over 20 newspapers from around the country.

The CAMPFIRE program, instead of becoming more sustainable, has become increasingly dependent on foreign subsidies from USAID other international sources. In 1989, USAID spent an average of $1.3 million per year over 6 years on CAMPFIRE, whereas in 1995, USAID pledged to spend an average of $5.12 million per year over 4 years on the program.

Additionally, CAMPFIRE relied on funds from countries such as Japan, the Netherlands, Germany, Norway, Great Britain, the European Commission, Sweden, and Canada, which in 1995 totaled in excess of $1.4 million and which has no ban on its use for the promotion of trophy hunts.

We are very concerned that U.S. taxpayer dollars have been used by CAMPFIRE implementing agencies to lobby the U.S. Congress in an ongoing effort to advocate the ivory trade and the weakening of the foreign species provision of the Endangered Species Act.

We believe it is inappropriate for the U.S. Government to supply funds to foreign entities which then use those funds to launch special-interest lobbying efforts to Members of Congress.

□ 1415

American taxpayers have footed the bill for these agencies to open and maintain offices in Washington, London, Brussels, and Johannesburg in support of these lobbying efforts.

American tax dollars were used to help CAMPFIRE agencies overturn the ivory trade ban, which undermined the U.S. negotiating position at the June 1997 Convention of International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora.

Since 1989, the United States has officially opposed the resumption of international trade in any elephant parts, including ivory. At the same CITES convention, the elephant was downlisted from appendix I to appendix II.

The American position has been so resolute because the devastation of the elephant during the 1980's was so severe. There were 70,000 to 100,000 elephants slaughtered a year by poachers feeding the international demand for ivory. The continent-wide population dropped from 1.3 million to 60,000 in just a decade's time.

Elephants are still in peril throughout much of their range, and the resumption of the ivory trade is a grave threat. The Fox-Miller amendment is pro-CAMPFIRE, maintaining existing funding levels and allowing USAID to invest in a wider range of revenue-generating activities that have thus far received insufficient attention. USAID has provided funds for CAMPFIRE implementing organizations for more than 9 years. More than $25 million American tax dollars have been used to a very significant degree to promote trophy hunting and the international trade in ivory.

Our amendment places a restriction on the use of taxpayer funds for the 10th and final year of funding. It is past time that a greater share of USAID funds be used to promote other revenue-generating activities such as ecologically-sensitive wildlife tourism.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] for offering this amendment. I think this is an important amendment. I rise in strong support of this legislation to prohibit the use of taxpayer funds to promote or support the African elephant ivory trade or trophy hunting.

Contrary to what Members may have heard, this amendment does not prohibit and will not prohibit trophy hunting within the Communal Areas Management Programs for Indigenous Resources, known as the CAMPFIRE Program. Nor is the Fox-Miller amendment in any way inconsistent with the recent decision of the Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora to permit the limited resumption of the ivory trade.

The issue here is whether or not United States tax dollars should be used by organizations and agencies implementing the CAMPFIRE program in

Zimbabwe to Promote activities that are clearly opposed by the vast majority of people who pay taxes, our constituents.

A poll completed earlier this year found that 88 percent of Americans opposed the resumption of the ivory trade. That was also the position of this administration. That is nearly 9 out of 10 Americans who oppose the activities that are funded in the bill as it currently exists. That is why we need this amendment.

This amendment is not aimed at CAMPFIRE, whose programs I have visited in Zimbabwe and whose mission of rural economic development is highly admirable. To this point, much of the revenue that CAMPFIRE has generated for local economic development has come from trophy hunting. Very wealthy hunters pay $12,000 or more for a permit to shoot elephants and other exotic animals, and much of that money is repatriated to these villages for economic development.

CAMPFIRE officials told me over and over again that they are committed to moving away from trophy hunting as a major source of revenue for the Program. These officials recognize that while trophy hunting may provide large amounts of quick money in the start-up phase of CAMPFIRE, that we are now beyond that stage and a more diverse program of economic development is needed.

Moreover, there is no need to use U.S. taxpayer money to promote trophy hunting. That is already done through international hunting groups, magazines, and others. There has been no difficulty in attracting a sufficient number of hunters to satisfy the annual quota of elephants. We certainly do not need to spend millions of taxpayer dollars to convince hunters to do that which they are already prepared to journey halfway around the world and pay $12,000 plus all of their expenses to do; that is, to hunt elephants.

Some might suggest withholding all U.S. aid from the CAMPFIRE program. I think that would be unwise. I think it would be an unfortunate action and would deprive the program of critical funds to assist rural development in Africa.

Instead, what we should do is we should assist the development of a more diversified economic program promised by CAMPFIRE involving nonhunting activities such as camping, photo safaris, local craft sales, lodges, and much, much more. We should target our U.S. tax dollars to these meritorious and noncontroversial efforts, rather than to continue to squander our constituents' tax dollars on promoting big game hunting by very wealthy individuals. That is the goal of this amendment, to diversify and to stabilize the CAMPFIRE Program.

Our amendment would also end the unacceptable practice of using United States tax dollars to fund organizations like the British-based Africa Resources Trust, that lobbies CITES to overturn the ban on the international ivory trade, that lobbies Congress to weaken the Endangered Species Act. We should not be sending taxpayer dollars to these organizations to lobby against positions of the U.S. Government and to lobby within this Congress for those tax dollars.

Do not let anyone tell you that this amendment would injure CAMPFIRE or the struggling villages and populations for whom the program holds so much promise. This amendment puts our tax dollars exactly where CAMPFIRE is headed, in economic diversification, not a program heavily dependent upon shooting elephants to generate revenues.

Do not let anyone tell you that the Fox-Miller amendment will interfere with the recovery of the African elephant promoted by CAMPFIRE; 8 out of 10 elephants in Zimbabwe do not live in the CAMPFIRE areas. It is not trophy hunting and culling that has allowed for the growth in the African elephant herds; it is the international ban on hides and ivory, which has been weakened due to the vigorous lobbying of CAMPFIRE and groups it supports with United States taxpayer money.

CAMPFIRE, the local villages, the Zimbabwean Government can all continue their hunting and culling operations as necessary for trophy hunting, species protection, and human safety. CITES can go forward with the limited sale of ivory from existing stockpiles.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MILLER of California was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, these limited sales from existing stockpiles can go forward, but not with the dollars that nearly 90 percent of the Americans do not want expended for that purpose.

For 8 years U.S. taxpayers have supported CAMPFIRE, and I would hope that that support would continue. This is a program of merit. But let us not let it jeopardize our participation in the CAMPFIRE Program itself by continuing to fund with American taxpayer dollars those hunting actions that are not acceptable to those very same taxpayers, and that, if continued, will eventually sour the support for the entire CAMPFIRE rogram.

I want to say to my colleagues that I had an opportunity to visit these programs, and a number of other Members of Congress have visited these programs. It is a very, very exciting program and a program of merit to bring about economic development in incredibly, unbelievably poor rural communities.

This money is being used to develop wells for drinking water, to develop granaries to grind corn into food, and to provide for electrification in some cases of these villages; the bare, bare necessities of any kind of semblance of adequate livelihood.

This program is of merit. But what is not of merit is continuing to use the very few dollars we have to lobby, to come back and to pay for trips to Washington, DC and to Europe, and to set up offices throughout Europe to lobby on behalf of GATT and WTO and weaken the Endangered Species Act; and what is not acceptable is to continue to funnel those monies into activities that the very participants in trophy hunting are fully capable of paying for themselves. These are, for the most part, very wealthy individuals who pay huge amounts of money to go out and to get a trophy elephant or some other animal.

We ought not to be using these moneys. We ought to be using these moneys for economic diversification of the CAMPFIRE Program, so it will have a lasting effect. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of the Fox-Miller amendment to H.R. 2159. This amendment, which prohibits the use of American tax dollars for the purpose of supporting and promoting the international trade in ivory or rhino horn, is a sensible restriction on activities that many Americans find offensive.

This amendment is modest. It will not stop Zimbabwe or other nations from authorizing or conducting trophy hunting, which is their sovereign right in accordance with international treaties. Our Government has very sensibly opposed the international trade in elephant ivory and hides for many years. This amendment will ensure that taxpayer funds will not be used to undermine that position.

Mr. Chairman, the wildlife of Africa is one of the greatest treasures of our planet. Accordingly, I urge our Members who care about preserving these resources to support the Fox-Miller amendment. More than 80 percent of our constituents throughout the country oppose the hunting of elephants, according to a recent survey. This amendment prevents their hard-earned tax dollars from supporting this practice.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The Agency for International Development has been sponsoring a program in Zimbabwe known as the CAMPFIRE Program. This project, implemented in cooperation with the government and local authorities, is designed to help rural farmers and others develop a self-sustaining economy based partly on tourism.

The project helps curb the illegal poaching of African elephants by providing the people of the area with an incentive to conserve these elephants. Part of the incentive is to allow limited legal hunting, although U.S. funds are not used, and let me repeat, U.S. funds are not used for this purpose.

Funds generated from the hunting are used to support economic development.

Concerns have been expressed that the project has promoted efforts to allow international trade in elephant ivory. Although that does not seem to be true, the committee bill includes bill language prohibiting, and I reiterate, prohibiting the use of any funds in contravention of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species.

Concerns have also been raised about possible illegal lobbying activities. The AID general counsel has found no evidence that U.S. funds were used for lobbying activities, and our committee report reiterates the obvious: the use of taxpayer funds for lobbying is prohibited.

We worked with those on the committee, especially the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], who had concerns about this program, and I believe we addressed these concerns. I looked to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] on this issue due to his vast knowledge of foreign aid issues and due to his position as ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations. We negotiated with him in good faith to produce both a good bill and report language that represented a responsible approach to this issue.

The author of the amendment does not seem to want the U.S. Government to be involved in any way, directly or indirectly, with a program that involves wildlife management. However, the people of Zimbabwe have no choice but to deal with the facts of their existence. Failure to implement a responsible wildlife management program in that country will inevitably lead to an irresponsible program, since the people of Zimbabwe will be forced to deal with the increase in the elephant population.

The end result will be an increase in poaching and further conflicts between subsistence farmers and the elephants. This will lead to more elephant deaths, the exact opposite of what the sponsor of the amendment is seeking.

I reiterate, the bill prohibits any funds from being used to circumvent the prohibition on the illegal trade in elephant ivory. It is a responsible approach. I might add, and we bring this out in the report language on page 11, since this program has been started the elephant population has increased from 43,000 to 67,000 in just a few short years.

□ 1430

I urge the House to support the committee position and to oppose the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Fox amendment. Mr. Chairman, I must say at the outset that I have been in this House for over 12 years, and I cannot think of a more important conservation measure than that which is referred to as the CAMPFIRE Program. And I cannot remember a time when a program has been more grossly and greatly misrepresented than this one has in the last few minutes. Let me explain where this program came from, why it is important, and why it ought to be retained as is.

First, let me say that the point made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] that it is funded through the use of funds that the gentleman objects to, in an earlier news release this month, the gentleman indicated that 90 percent of the funding for this program came from the sources that he objects to. Therefore, the gentleman's argument falls of its own weight, because if we are going to remove 90 percent of the funding, there will be no CAMPFIRE Program. It is pretty simple.

Therefore, if we are going to have a CAMPFIRE Program, which the gentleman from Pennsylvania purports to support and at the same time purports to withdraw 90 percent of the funding, it seems like a fairly ridiculous proposal.

Mr. Chairman, in the early 1980's this program was born. It was born because of concern which came to fruition in 1988 with the passage of the African Elephant Conservation Act of that year, and that came about because the population of elephants in the African countries was dropping substantially.

In 1979, for example, there were about 1.3 million elephants in Africa. By 1988, there were less than 750,000. In 1973, there were 130,000 elephants in Kenya, and by 1987, there were only 20,000.

In 1977, in the Selous Game Reserve in the United Republic of Tanzania, there were 109,000 elephants. By 1988, there remained only 55,000.

So the subcommittee which I served on in the old Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the Subcommittee on Fish and Wildlife, studied this situation and recommends some changes in law which we thought would be beneficial. And, in fact, the African Elephant Conservation Act of 1988 was passed in that year and it provided broad authority for our country to unilaterally take action to save elephants. We did that under the Bush administration and the same policies have been followed by the Clinton administration.

Also, the Convention on International Trade and Endangered Species, known as CITES, has enacted international regulations which essentially do three things: First, Outlaw the international trade of ivory; second, permit the continuation of trophy hunting as a fund-raiser; and third, the moneys resulting from conservation efforts such as tourism and hunting would be used for conservation by African countries.

Huge successes have come from this program which the gentleman from Pennsylvania would defund. We have seen the African elephant population increase from 4 to 6 percent a year; a huge springback in the years since 1989 when this law became effective.

We have also seen a number of very important conservation groups endorse this program and, in fact, four have written to me, in some cases as late as today, supporting my position. Those organizations include the African Wildlife Foundation, the International Union for Conservation of Nature, the National Wildlife Federation, and the World Wildlife Fund; all support my position and oppose the Fox amendment.

Mr. Chairman, they do so for a number of reasons. For example, 7 million people in southern Africa have directly benefited from programs like CAMPFIRE. In Zimbabwe alone, 5,000 to 10,000 jobs have been created and 33 percent of the land in that country is devoted now to conservation and wildlife management, which benefits African elephants. Mr. Chairman, I am beside myself trying to figure out how the gentleman from Pennsylvania, my friend, wants to defund this program.

The population of African elephants has also increased from 4 to 6 percent, as I said earlier. In Zimbabwe alone, increasing from 45,000 elephants to 66,000 elephants over this same period of time, the program the gentleman from Pennsylvania wants to defund.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SAXTON was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, in addition, the number of households participating in CAMPFIRE has grown from 9,000 in 1989 to 105,000 in 1996.

Our Nation's support for the CAMPFIRE Program is without question, and it is a misrepresentation to say that CAMPFIRE moneys were used in opposition to the U.S. position on sport hunting, because our law provides for the recognition of sport hunting and our negotiation position has provided for the recognition of sports hunting.

Our Nation's support for the CAMPFIRE Program allows thousands of people to improve their livelihoods and has created a situation for the comeback of the African elephants. This is not a program that we should be trifling with.

Congress, this Congress, is criticized over and over again for doing things that do not work, and yet this amendment brought to the floor today would defund one of the most successful programs that we have had in the area of conservation.

It is not a coincidence that elephant populations have increased under CAMPFIRE, and it would be a terrible mistake to end the Agency for International Development's essential involvement and investment in this program.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the Committee for 2 minutes.

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, let us make it real clear here. I understand how there may be two sides to the issue, but I want to be very clear. Whether my colleagues embrace the position of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON], my friend, that the program is fine and we should allow lobbying money to promote hunting and illegal trade in ivory, the fact is that no one wants to defund this program. To say otherwise is an absolute misrepresentation of my position and those who are advocates for elephants and endangered species across the globe.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that we are all for maintaining the funding of CAMPFIRE. To say otherwise is an absolute misrepresentation and not correct. The fact is we want to make sure the funds get to the people of Zimbabwe, in fact get to the CAMPFIRE Program, and are not used for the purpose of promoting illegal trade of ivory or illegal hunting.

The fact is that funds are being used to lobby and that is what we object to, the lobbying portion, and not to anything else. Because Zimbabwe decides for itself whether there is hunting and whether there is trade.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I rise in support of the Fox amendment. We should not force the American taxpayer to directly pay for promoting the international ivory trade or elephant trophy hunting. I believe that the Fox-Miller amendment is a very smart approach to this very complicated challenge before the House today.

The Fox amendment bars the use of American tax dollars for the purpose of supporting or promoting the international commercial trade in ivory or rhino horn. The Fox amendment does not stop Zimbabwe, or any other nation, from authorizing or conducting trophy hunting.

The Fox-Miller amendment is pro CAMPFIRE maintaining existing funding levels, allowing USAID to invest in a wide-range of revenue-generating activities that have received insufficient activities in the past. When one U.S. agency, USAID, undermines the work of another U.S. agency, the Department of Interior, taxpayer dollars are wasted and U.S. policy positions are undermined.

The Interior Department has maintained a firm stand against renewing the international trade in elephant ivory and hide since 1989. Again, the Fox amendment bars the use of American tax dollars for the purpose of supporting or promoting trophy hunting. It does not take the funding away from CAMPFIRE, but directs it away from lobbying efforts and into conservation efforts.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for her statement and for her support of this amendment and for her clarification.

The suggestion of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] that somehow this is an effort to defund CAMPFIRE is just outrageous in the sense that the gentleman understands, if he reads the amendment, it is a very simple amendment and that is not what it does.

What this amendment suggests is we should not be using taxpayer dollars to fund an activity that over 88 percent of the taxpayers in this country find abhorrent and do not agree with. They would agree with the CAMPFIRE Program, but what they do not agree with is using their dollars to support trophy hunting of big game. That program, that component, that part of CAMPFIRE can stand on its own, because it has centuries of tradition, if you will, and a constituency of people who seek to do it. More people apply to do it than are allowed to do it each and every year.

Mr. Chairman, what we ought to now be taking is this risk capital in USAID and putting it into diversification of these rural economies so that more and more people in these economies can participate and these economies hopefully can prosper and increase the standard of living within those rural economies in Zimbabwe and other countries.

But, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey cannot come here and suggest that somehow this is about defunding CAMPFIRE. That amendment will eventually come if we keep funding trophy hunting, because the American people do not want anything to do with trophy hunting with American taxpayer dollars. Or if CAMPFIRE continues to lobby, then we will have an amendment that will wipe out the whole program.

What we are trying here to do is to preserve the best of this program and the use of taxpayer dollars and let that very strong part, that is a very strong constituency, trophy hunting, stand on its own and then get on with the diversification of the program.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I once again commend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], the chairman of our committee, who was very sensitive to the concerns of many of us on the committee. The bill language is an attempt to correct this situation. I think that the Fox-Miller amendment goes the committee one better, and I support the perfecting amendment that my colleagues have put forth.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is very wise and smart and addresses the problem appropriately to stop the U.S. taxpayer from funding trophy hunting, from subsidizing lobbying efforts to support trophy hunting, but still maintains the funding for CAMPFIRE. I urge my colleagues to support the Fox-Miller amendment. It is pro-CAMPFIRE and pro-environment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment and there are a number of reasons why. I think importantly, if we look at the issue of taxpayer funding and the whole issue of foreign aid, we are in a period of time where we are declining the amount of money that we are going to spend, and I support that. I think that we should spend less money on foreign aid than we currently are.

But then we have to look at, if we are going to spend money, what are we going to spend it on? I would argue that we should spend it on programs that have proven to be successful. This program happens to be one of the few that has proven to be extremely successful.

Mr. Chairman, I recently had the opportunity to visit Africa and to visit one of these CAMPFIRE sites. I was amazed at how little I actually knew about how this CAMPFIRE Program worked, until I was there on the ground and had the opportunity to see it. We get this romantic vision of what it is like from TV, and we think the big game hunter is going out there and hunting elephants and all this stuff.

It is not like that. There are people living in huts who have to erect big fences around their houses to keep the elephants out. They are terrified that these elephants are going to kill them. Some wonder why then we have declining numbers of elephants in Africa. It is because the people did not care about them. They were killing their children, they were destroying their farmland, there was no economic incentive, there was no social incentive for them to maintain a high number of elephants.

So then we had to come up with a program that actually would give them that financial incentive and social incentive to protect those elephants, and this program was devised where a limited number of elephants would be hunted and it would bring money into these communities. Then all of a sudden we saw the numbers, as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] said earlier, we saw the numbers go from 44,000 to 67,000 in Zimbabwe alone.

□ 1445

And why? Because there was an economic incentive. There was a social incentive for them to protect these elephants. Now, all of a sudden, instead of looking the other way when a poacher came in and shot an elephant, they went after the poacher. They wanted to

keep them out because these elephants were important to them.

I had the opportunity to visit a school while I was over there. It was a little three-room school, but those people were so proud of that school. How did they pay for it? They do not have any money. The average income is $400 a year. How did they pay for the school? They paid for it with moneys that came from this CAMPFIRE Program. They paid for it with the help that we were able to give them. We saw wells that were put in, and for the first time these people had fresh drinking water out of a well. These things were important to them. They may seem like everyday life to us, but when we are looking at the outback of Africa, these were very important issues to them.

I want to talk a few minutes about endangered species and about the program that was created. The program that was created in this circumstance created an economic incentive for these people to promote more African elephants. They were hugely successful at it.

If you want to look at our endangered species program, you can see everything that we are doing wrong. We want to look at some of the good ideas that have come out of this program and we look at a way of conserving our wildlife that I think we have something to learn from. It has been hugely successful.

I have also heard Members talk about the CAMPFIRE Program somehow promoting the illegal trade and poaching of elephants and ivory. There is nothing that could be further from the truth because what this has done has stopped the illegal poaching of elephants in these areas, areas where we still have illegal trade, and illegal poaching of elephants and ivory are coming from the areas where they do not have this program. So if we want to do what is right for the wildlife, it is to vote against this amendment because this program has been successful. If we want to do what is right for the people of Africa, we have to vote against this amendment.

We have heard earlier in the debate Members talk about the idea of getting away from hunting and getting into photographic safaris and ecotourism, and they are doing that. In fact, while I was there, I had the opportunity to visit one of the sites where they were conducting the photographic safaris, and in the safaris they had several camps that were set up and it was like a mini hotel that they had to set up. And they had to bring in fresh water and they had to bring in sewer facilities and they had to somehow develop an electrical system, all of this in the name of conducting a photographic safari.

And if you contrast that with the hunters that come in where you pitch a tent out in the middle of nowhere, what is best for the environment? The development of a hotel on the edge of a river somewhere so people can come in and take pictures of the animals, or a small tent that is set up and the people do not do any destruction to the environment at all?

But they are getting into the photographic safaris and in the future, maybe some day, that will be a major source of income for them. They would like to see it go into that and have a greater income and diversify. But currently that is not there, and 90 percent of the money that is coming in from this is coming in from the hunts. If we do away with that, we have killed the program. And whether our intention is to kill the program or not, that is exactly what we are doing is killing the program.

I think that even though I believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] had good intentions going into this, I believe that there were some mistakes made. I believe that this is going in the opposite direction of what we need to do. I think this is the kind of program we need to look at and learn from, of some of the right things to do and the wrong things to do.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to this amendment.

I do not claim to know as much as some of the previous speakers, but from what I can tell, this has been a successful program that has encouraged conservation and has actually reduced poaching and improved the situation in Zimbabwe. As I understand it, in Kenya what they have done is, they have eliminated this type of hunting and the poaching has increased and conservation efforts have decreased.

And really, Members need to understand what this is about. This is really about eliminating hunting. It would be the same thing if we said in the United States that we are going to take the Pittman-Robertson money and we are going to take the Dingell-Johnson money and we are going to say that it cannot be used for anything that has to do with hunting.

And what would happen if we did that? Those programs would fall apart. They have been some of the most successful programs that we have ever put together in this country.

Everybody understands that without hunters, without their contribution to conservation in this country, we would not have the kind of wildlife that we have at the present time. If we eliminate hunting in Zimbabwe, which is what we will do with this program, we will have the results that we have seen in Kenya.

I think we should be very clear about what this is about. This is about eliminating hunting. And if Members are for that, I guess they want to vote for this amendment. But if they believe in conservation, if they believe in approaching this the right way and they believe hunting is a good way to manage our natural resources, they will oppose this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this misguided amendment to restrict the ability of the Agency for International Development [AID] to fund the CAMPFIRE program [Communal Area Management Programme For Indigenous Resources].

While I am not normally an advocate of foreign aid, CAMPFIRE has been one of the most successful programs ever funded by the Agency for International Development.

In fact, it has been so successful that the program, which started in Zimbabwe, has been adopted by other African countries, including Botswana, Namibia, Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania, and Zambia.

What is the CAMPFIRE program? In short, it is an initiative to improve the standard of living among Africa's poorest rural farmers by giving them an economic stake in the wildlife resources of their country. Under CAMPFIRE, villagers receive a direct economic benefit from their wildlife and, therefore, a powerful incentive to conserve those resources.

In some rural areas, CAMPFIRE provides up to 90 percent of the money villagers use to build and maintain their homes, hospitals, and schools. Without CAMPFIRE, many Africans and numerous wildlife species, including elephants, face a bleak future.

Under the CAMPFIRE program, a village receives a percentage of the money collected from the proceeds from wildlife management. For instance, if a sport hunter wants to shoot a Cape buffalo or an African elephant, it will cost him thousands of dollars. Prior to CAMPFIRE, all this money went directly to the central government in Harare. Today, a significant percentage of those funds remains at the local level and the villagers themselves, in a democratic process, decide how this money will be spent. This is the essence of the CAMPFIRE program is local control of wildlife and financial incentives, which result in effective conservation programs.

The CAMPFIRE program is strongly supported by not only the Clinton administration but also such major conservation organizations as the African Wildlife Foundation, International Union for the Conservation of Nature, International Union for Conservation of Nature, National Wildlife Federation, Safari Club International, the World Wildlife Fund, and the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies. These entities enthusiastically support this program because they recognize that:

Seven million people in Southern Africa have directly benefited from programs like CAMPFIRE.

In Zimbabwe, 5,000 to 10,000 jobs have been created and 33 percent of the land in that country is now devoted to wildlife management.

The population of African elephants has increased in Zimbabwe from 45,000 to more than 66,000 today and poaching in CAMPFIRE areas has been stopped.

The number of households participating in CAMPFIRE has grown from 9,000 in 1989 to about 105,000 in 1995.

The number of elephants shot in CAMPFIRE areas has decreased since its introduction from 300 per year to 130 in 1996.

Our Nation's support of the CAMPFIRE program allows thousands of people to improve their livelihoods, to provide education and the most basic health care for their children, and to effectively manage their wildlife resources.

In addition, it encourages the growth of democratic ideals.

It is not a coincidence that elephant populations have increased under CAMPFIRE, and it would be a terrible mistake to end AID's essential investment in this innovative program. In the final analysis, CAMPFIRE and programs like it are Africa's best hope for conserving its wildlife resources and providing its population with a bright future.

I urge a no vote on the Fox/Miller amendment.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to voice my strong support for the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] and my distinguished colleague and fellow Californian [Mr. MILLER] to eliminate the use of U.S. taxpayer funds to promote or support the trophy hunting of elephants under the USAID sponsored program called Communal Areas Management Programs for Indigenous Resources [CAMPFIRE]. This amendment to the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act of 1997 echoes the sentiment of the American people to eliminate trophy hunting and to prevent the use of taxpayer dollars to lobby for and to promote trophy hunting.

As elected officials, we are duty bound to uphold the will of our constituents, the wishes of the American people. A 1997 Penn & Schoen survey found that 84 percent of Americans oppose trophy hunting, domestically and abroad. Despite this overwhelming opposition to the practice of trophy hunting, the USAID-funded CAMPFIRE program uses trophy hunts to generate funds for the majority of its projects. A recent study of the CAMPFIRE program showed that 90 percent of the funds generated from CAMPFIRE districts intended to help the indigenous populations came from trophy hunting. While CAMPFIRE funds may be used for the development of many successful and positive programs in Africa, we cannot condone the methods which are used to generate these funds.

The U.S. Government has consistently supported the international ban on trade in ivory in order to prevent the destruction of endangered species. United States conservation policy should remain consistent. Our foreign assistance should not be funding elephant hunts for ivory at the same time that we are also supporting an international ban on trade in ivory. Not long ago, our Government rightly spoke out at the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species [CITES] to express strong opposition to the down-listing of the African elephant from appendix I to appendix II of the convention. This down-listing would further dilute the international ban on the ivory trade. The bipartisan Fox-Miller amendment would bring our foreign assistance into line with existing United States conservation policy toward preserving the African elephant.

Mr. Chairman, another disturbing effect of the CAMPFIRE program is the lobbying efforts undertaken in a number of capitals in support of expanding the program. CAMPFIRE plans to expand beyond Zimbabwe and has opened offices in Washington, London, Brussels, and Johannesburg for the principal purpose of lobbying. CAMPFIRE is a sustainable development program and should not be engaging in the process of lobbying on its own behalf with taxpayer dollars.

The argument has been made that the CAMPFIRE program benefits the people of Zimbabwe, and therefore, we should continue our assistance because it helps the impoverished villagers of that country. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the assistance has limited impact upon the population of rural Zimbabwe. Only 5 cents out of every dollar generated actually benefits rural households in Zimbabwe.

The comments from my constituents in San Francisco and San Mateo County speak volumes about the public's view of this trophy hunting program that is supported by the CAMPFIRE program. Mr. Chairman, I would like to share a few of the comments of my constituents with my colleagues:

The CAMPFIRE program is an outrageous contradiction that flies in the face of a government continually professing its concern for nature and the environment on a global basis.—Carol Kemski, San Bruno, California.

This cruel and destructive government program should not be supported by our tax dollars.—Ron Scheinberg, San Francisco, California.

I am aghast by the fact that the USAID is diverting our tax dollars into CAMPFIRE in order to enable trophy hunting of elephants.—Mary Larkin, San Francisco, California.

Mr. Chairman, the Fox-Miller amendment will not stop trophy hunting in Zimbabwe. The government of that country has the sovereign right to do what it chooses to do in this regard. But this amendment will stop U.S. taxpayer funds from being used to support trophy hunting, which 84 percent of the American people oppose.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment and stop the outrage of U.S. taxpayer funding of trophy hunting.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 24, 1997, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. TORRES

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 17 offered by Mr. TORRES:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

PROHIBITION OF FUNDS FOR SCHOOL OF THE AMERICAS

SEC. 572. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used for programs at the United States Army School of the Americas located at Fort Benning, Georgia.

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

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to preface my remarks about this amendment by first thanking the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] for his efforts to work with me on how we address the funding elements that are provided in this bill for the U.S. Army School of the Americas. And while I do appreciate what has been done on this subject that is reflected in the language in the bill before us, I am compelled to offer this amendment together with my colleagues on the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA] which prohibits any of the funds of this bill being used for the school.

I think it is important to note that in last year's bill, this committee directed the Departments of State and Defense to submit a report no later than January 15 on a number of concerns that the Members had expressed about the school, such as the screening process for applicants and monitoring of graduates. This approach was agreed upon at that time despite our inclination to cut off those funds. This year, this report was received at the ''eleventh hour'' just prior to the subcommittee's markup on June 25, nearly 6 months late.

The report, 3½ pages in length, does not represent what I believe to be, nor the committee, many of the committee Members, a serious effort to be responsive to the issues that were addressed. It merely details how screening is intended to be carried out and contains no evaluation of how this process is carried out.

It further states that the school, that neither the school nor other U.S. personnel have the capacity to monitor graduates. The lateness of the report and its brevity indicate that the school and the Defense Department have failed to take reforms seriously.

I am offering this amendment today because I believe it is time to forge a new relationship with Latin America, to mark a new era in U.S. support for democracy in this hemisphere. The cold war is over, Mr. Chairman. Rooting out Communist insurgents is passe. Human rights violations in the pursuit of eliminating the enemy cannot be condoned.

The School of the Americas cannot deny its dismal connection with the worst human rights violators in the region. The school's graduates who are human rights violators are not just a bunch of bad apples. The list of human rights violators connected with the school is long and is getting longer as names of violators are matched up with those of graduates.

The Salvadoran Truth Commission cited 19 out of 26 officers for the massacre of Jesuit priests; 100 out of 246 Colombian officers cited for war crimes; 6 Peruvian officers involved in the killing of 9 students and a professor; Panamanian dictator Manuel Noriega. The list goes on and on and on and cannot be dismissed as just a few exceptions.

Throughout Latin America, the School of the Americas is seen as a training ground for repressive militaries and dictators; and its record, its

record, I underscore that, cannot be ignored. The recently declassified training manuals used at the school as lesson plans and reading materials show that something indeed was wrong with the school's curriculum. These manuals taught armies to violate human rights, to use physical abuse, to use blackmail, to use blacklists, to use censorship, to spy on civilian organizations like student groups, like trade unions, like community organizations and opposition political parties, to confuse the boundaries between civilians and combatants and to ignore the rule of law.

Over and over again the school has tried to downplay rather than fully acknowledge these problems with its training. It is good that the school has added 4 hours on human rights in its courses, but this hardly makes the School of the Americas a school for human rights. These changes are just far too little, too late.

Let me emphasize that cutting off funds to the school does not prevent the many forms of conduct and cooperation between the United States and Latin American militaries. This year alone, over 60,000 military troops will rotate throughout Latin America on various training missions and assignments. Additionally, the international military education and training program for military personnel will come to the United States and study at many of our U.S. institutions. The School of the Americas is just but one of those.

But it does make an important break with the past. It shows Latin Americans who have worked valiantly for human rights and civilian control over militaries in their countries and U.S. religious orders whose missionaries and priests were killed by militaries trained at the School of the Americas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. TORRES was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I repeat again, the priests that were killed by militaries trained at the School of the Americas, and that the United States now is fully determined to chart a new course. We want to do that. The school represents an outdated approach to a fragile region that is struggling with democracy, and we only have to read and watch television every day to see what is happening.

Cutting off funds to the school in this bill sends a clear signal. It is an important step in forging a new relationship with Latin American militaries based first and foremost upon adherence to civilian authority and the respect for human rights.

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

Mr. Chairman, the School of the Americas was established to heighten the professionalism of the military establishments throughout the Americas. Approximately 60,000 young Latin American and Caribbean officers have graduated from the SOA since its creation in 1946, the vast majority of whom have served their nations honorably and responsibly.

Mr. Chairman, opponents of the School for the Americas focus on the excesses of a few notorious graduates. This Member is the first to acknowledge that some very unsavory characters have managed to attend the school. But such criticism overlooks the overwhelming majority, well over 99 percent, of honest, capable, intelligent officers who study at the School of the Americas. They return to their homes and serve their nations honorably and with distinction. And this Member would remind his colleagues that graduates of the SOA are personally responsible for the return of democracy in nations such as Bolivia and Argentina, and many of the school's graduates have lost their lives while combating drug lords in Colombia and Peru. Focusing on a few bad apples does a disservice to the commissioned and noncommissioned officers who have attended the School for the Americas and who subsequently fought terrorists and narcotraffickers in the jungles of Latin America.

□ 1500

While the early focus of the institution was on combating Soviet-backed insurgencies, in recent years the school's emphasis has shifted toward combating drug trafficking and responding to rural disease and environmental degradation. One very positive result of the recent attention to the school has been a much greater emphasis on human rights. Every student at the school is now exposed to a rigorous formal and informal training program in basic human rights. Specific classes and case studies are used to enhance the training and to make U.S. concerns unambiguously clear. The roles and rights of civilians, clergy and human rights observers and U.N. personnel are integrated into the training program.

While the SOA has rightly increased its emphasis on human rights, this Member believes that there is a basic value in encouraging military officers from Latin America and the Caribbean to study and to train in the United States. An institution such as the SOA, which annually hosts approximately 1,300 students from almost 20 countries, provides a level of professional training that is not otherwise available. Moreover, exposure to the U.S. lifestyle, values, and ideals offers important lessons for the future military leaders of Latin America.

Mr. Chairman, opponents have pointed to three manuals that were for a short time used by the school. It is true that these manuals had short passages, in one instance less than a sentence, that were inconsistent with U.S. Army doctrine. When discovered, these manuals were immediately withdrawn and destroyed. The school now employs U.S. Army training manuals that are appropriate and which are now being translated, and have been translated into Spanish.

This Member would tell his colleagues that the School of the Americas does not employ confidential torture manuals, nor does the SOA in any way engage in such heinous exercises as training its students to keep their shock victims alive for interrogation as some have alleged. This body should not participate in this wrongful demonization of the School of the Americas.

Mr. Chairman, the training at the School of the Americas does far, far more good in encouraging appropriate human rights practices than any possible harm which could come from even a perversion of such an education program that some former student might practice. It is time to end this misguided attack on the SOA.

This Member wishes he could guarantee to his colleagues that no future graduate of the SOA will ever abuse human rights or undermine civilian government, but obviously this is impossible. What this Member can guarantee is that every effort will continue to be made to fully indoctrinate the students on respect for human rights and democracies. The training at the school undoubtedly does far, far more good than any hypothetical harm which would come from even a perversion of such an educational program some future student might practice.

This Member must say, therefore, that it is time for this body and for certain organizations outside of this body to abandon this misguided attack on the School of the Americas. I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment and send a message to the organizations, get your facts straight, catch up with reality. It is time to stop and get off this hobby horse. The School of the Americas is an important institution for the United States and for democracy throughout the hemisphere.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to give a specific example of how the School of the Americas helps America, the United States of America. The Colombian National Police, which is one of our frontline combatant units against the drug cartels in Colombia, gets a great deal of training from the School of the Americas. The first 40 hours of their training is in the area of human rights. General Serrano and the Colombian police because of that have a stellar human rights record. Our State Department has told us in committee that the Colombian National Police, which is a recipient, a beneficiary of the School of the Americas, has an almost 100 percent human rights record. I believe it is because of the School of the Americas, because of the training they are getting there.

The thing that is interesting about this is these people who are trained in the School of the Americas, the Colombian National Police that are fighting

the war against drugs, against the Colombian drug cartel, lay their lives on the line every single day not just for their people in their country but for our kids in America who are the recipients of the drugs that are coming out of Colombia and Latin America and Central America. For us to close down the School of the Americas and to cut off funding would be a giant step, a giant step in the wrong direction.

The last point I want to make very briefly is this. We know for a fact that the people in Colombia who are suffering human rights abuses go to the Colombian National Police, who have been trained in how to deal with human rights abuses for protection. I think it would be a terrible mistake for us to cut off funding for this very important program if for no other reason because of the Colombian National Police who are fighting so hard every single day to protect our kids from drugs and to stop the flow of drugs coming into America.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. GILMAN. I want to commend the gentleman for focusing attention on the narcotics training that they receive at the School of the Americas. They receive first rate instruction on a variety of subjects, but included very out-front and very positively is their training countering the illegal drug threat. I am pleased to join my colleague in opposition to the gentleman from California's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD a letter from General Barry McCaffrey, our drug czar and the former Commander in Chief of the U.S. Southern Command, in support of the School of the Americas, stressing the important role in countering the illegal drug trade, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY,

Washington, DC, July 16, 1997.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CALLAHAN: My purpose in writing is to ask for your support of the U.S. Army School of the Americas. The Appropriations Bill for Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs being considered today contains language that, if enacted, would make this important institution ineffective.

As Commander in Chief of U.S. Southern Command, my responsibilities included furthering the development of professional Latin American armed forces that promoted and protected human rights and that were supportive of democratic governance. The School of the Americas was, and continues to be, the Department of Defense's preeminent military educational institution for accomplishing these goals. The soldiers, sergeants, and officers that come to the School of the Americas interact with our own soldiers. They are systematically exposed to the principles of military subordination to civilian authority and the rule of law. They also receive first rate instruction on a variety of subjects including countering the illegal drug threat.

The School of the Americas is closely supervised by the U.S. Army and U.S. Southern Command. Its curriculum is beyond reproach. Indeed, it has been at the forefront of the effort to incorporate human rights training in all military instruction. It is deserving of your support. Your leadership will be important in ensuring that this important vehicle for effective military-to-military relations remains viable.

Respectfully,

BARRY R. MCCAFFREY,
Director.

Mr. Chairman, the war on drugs in Latin America is real. Professional training to fight narcoguerrillas is critical. The School of the Americas helps meet that need. General McCaffrey does point out that the school is closely supervised by the U.S. Army and the U.S. Southern Command. Its curriculum is beyond reproach. Indeed, it has been at the forefront of the effort to incorporate human rights training in all of its military instruction. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for his participation.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Torres amendment, and I wish to speak briefly but from the heart on this issue. I have seen firsthand the work of many of the graduates of the School of the Americas who served as officers in the Salvadoran Armed Forces during the recent conflict in that country. I had the privilege of working with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], the honorable dean of our State delegation, on the House investigation of the brutal 1989 murders of six Jesuit priests, their housekeeper, and her 15-year-old daughter. For those unfamiliar with the case, units of the Salvadoran Army surrounded the university where these eight people worked. Soldiers entered their home, forced the six priests out of bed, and then outside into the yard. The soldiers then forced the priests to lay down on the ground, put high-powered rifles to their heads, pulled the triggers, and blew their brains across the grass. These same soldiers then went back inside the house and found and killed the terrified housekeeper and her teenage daughter.

Mr. Chairman, I knew these priests. I was privileged to call them friends. They all had names and family and parishioners, students and colleagues who loved them. When the 26 Salvadoran military personnel cited for these murders were identified, 19 were graduates of the School of the Americas. If this were the only horror story associated with the School of the Americas, we would not be having this debate today. But there are hundreds and hundreds of such stories. And tens of thousands of men, women, and children throughout Latin America have been tortured or have perished on the orders of or at the hands of these graduates.

Let me be clear, Mr. Chairman. The little we do know about actions and atrocities committed by the School of the Americas graduates does not come from information or surveys carried out by the school itself. It comes from the hard, often dangerous investigations undertaken by human rights groups, U.N.- and government-appointed truth commissions and other dedicated individuals. The school has always taken a posture of denial, that ignorance is better than knowing the truth.

Mr. Chairman, nothing can bring back my friends to life. Nothing can fill the intellectual, spiritual, and visionary void left by their murders. But I have walked on the ground where they died, and I will not support one more single tax dollar being used to keep open a school that helped to shape and train these killers.

I want to thank my fellow colleagues, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES], and members of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations who support this amendment for their leadership on this issue. I urge all of my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the Torres amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to participate in this debate, but I do have an active interest in this matter and have had occasion in the past to get myself involved in it in one way or another. As a matter of fact, my long history goes back to what we then called Benning School for Boys, which I had the honor of attending in my own training to be a second lieutenant of infantry. It hurts me to see that school associated with the kind of record which we now hear with regard to the School of the Americas. I am not trying to point the finger at everything the school does. I commend the effort to improve the training and improve the sensitivity to human rights of the officer corps of our neighboring nations. But it has not succeeded in accomplishing that goal in the way that I would like.

It is unquestionably true that over these past 50 years of the school's existence, a large, very large number of the graduates have been involved in human rights violations. I would not want to characterize all of the graduates as being some kind of evil persons. I am not sure that if we did not have the school, we still would not have violations of civil rights in those societies which are conducive to or organized in a way that encourages violation of civil rights. We have instances in this country of where commissioned officers and noncommissioned officers are guilty of violating the civil rights of individuals, both within the ranks and outside the ranks. We do not blame the entire establishment for those few cases.

But here is a situation where over 50 years, it is undeniable that the graduates of this school have been involved

in this kind of practice. I would suggest that the time has come to acknowledge that we assisted in perpetrating these atrocities through the training that we gave to these officers. While we should continue to offer assistance and to provide training, if necessary, in other ways, we ought to abolish the school and start with a clean slate. Some of these same officers could be eligible to go to West Point or some of our other academies. We train the elites from many of these countries in our most prestigious universities. We should continue to do that. For those who seek a military career, we could give them the ROTC course at Harvard possibly or some other alternative to what they are getting at the School of the Americas. But we need to put this past behind us. We cannot continue as a nation to condone the fact that graduates have engaged in the sort of practice that have been described here, the slaughter of priests and nuns and the disappearance of thousands of people throughout Latin America.

Let us put that behind us. Let us discontinue the funding of this school. If we feel it necessary to continue to assist in the development of an improved military, let us find improved methods to do that job if it does indeed need to be done.

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

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment which amounts to a step backward in the war on drugs and two steps backyard in our support of freedom, democracy, and human rights in our own backyard. In July, both General McCaffrey, the drug czar, and General Shalikashvili, chairman of the Joint Chiefs, highlighted the importance of the School of the Americas in the war on drugs. The frontlines of this war are found throughout Latin America and the Caribbean. Colombia, Panama, and Bolivia serve as prime examples of countries whose drug interdiction strategies would be crippled without the benefit of United States equipment and, most importantly, United States training at the School of the Americas. The school is a key to preserving democracy in our hemisphere.

Since 1946, the U.S. Army has trained the Latin American military leaders who have turned back dictatorship, returning political power to the people and yielding military authority to civilian institutions.

□ 1515

In 1972, there are only six democracies in Latin America. Today, thanks in part to the school's instruction, there are 19.

As civil war in the region has given way to peace, and democracy has taken hold, the U.S. Army School of the Americas has developed a military human rights training program that is unmatched anywhere in the world today.

Just over 1 month ago, I joined almost every other Member in this body in passing legislation congratulating El Salvador, and much has been said about El Salvador during this debate, for recent elections and the country's progress toward full democracy. The resolution passed overwhelmingly, 419 to 3.

What my colleagues probably do not know is that one of the Salvadoran government's top officials, a Minister of Defense, Major General Guzman, is a former School of the Americas instructor. General Guzman is typical of the vast majority of the school's 60,000 graduates and visiting instructors who in one very important way, has returned home to apply his human rights training to remedy his country's problems of the past.

General Guzman institutionalized human rights training in the Salvadoran armed forces. Before his program was initiated, human rights violations numbered more than 2,000 each month, but after 5 years, that number has dropped to less than 20 per month, and today, under General Guzman's zero tolerance program, violations almost never occur.

The School of the Americas is not the answer to all Latin America's problems. There is still work to be done. But I urge my colleagues to consider the lives that the School of the Americas has saved. Every year, the school graduates thousands of men and women who return to their countries to apply the lessons they have learned in a Latin American environment still plagued by instability and violence.

The stories that we do not hear are those heroes. These are the military leaders who fought for democracy and yielded military control to civilian authorities. These are the police officers fighting the drug lords in the street. These are the men and women who have returned control of the governments of Latin America to the people of Latin America.

This is not simply a matter of foreign assistance. It is critical to our own self-interests to maintain democracies in countries so close to our borders. The School of the Americas allows us to do so without deploying our own troops.

The State Department, the Salvadoran and Honduran Ambassadors to the United States, the President of the Committee of Presidents of the Central American Legislative Human Rights Commission, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the acting Commander in Chief of the United States Southern Command, the Under Secretary of the Army, the Director of the National Office of Drug Control Policy, the authorizing committee on both sides of the Capitol, and the last Presidential administration have argued that the school serves vital national interests through its counterdrug operations and its counterdrug cadet leadership development courses, its professional military training program, including unique peacekeeping instruction, and its one-of-a-kind human rights training initiative. Through these programs, the school allows the United States to support and defend Latin American democracies and to encourage responsible government policies without forward deployments such as those used in Bosnia and in Haiti.

I, for one, am not ready to surrender Latin America and the Caribbean to drug lords and dictators. I urge my colleagues to take responsibility of the human rights leadership by opposing this amendment which would close the School of the Americas, diminishing opportunities for the expansion of democracy in Latin America.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I agree with my distinguished colleague's last words about the necessity to fight against drugs. In Latin America, and around the globe, wherever we find that problem, I think it is important that all of us in this Congress take a stand against the drugs which are infecting this country and the entire world.

So I am glad that there is that kind of support, and it is bipartisan support for fighting drugs. However we are called upon, and looking at the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES], to make an assessment of a school that is operated out of Fort Benning, GA, which does more than just train people to deal with drugs, and we all agree that we want drugs dealt with, and there are many ways in which they can be dealt with, but that is not what the School of the Americas is about.

The School of Americas in Fort Benning, GA, has a roster of graduates that reads like a Who's Who of human rights violators:

Nineteen of the twenty-six Salvadoran officers accused in the 1989 massacre of the six Jesuits and their housekeeper and the housekeeper's daughter were graduates of the School of the Americas.

Ten of the twelve cited in the El Mozote massacre where an entire village was wiped out without a trace; men, women and children, wiped out; 10 of the 12 people involved in that were graduates of the School of the Americas.

Two of the three officers cited in Archbishop Romero's assassination were graduates of the School of the Americas.

The School of the Americas; of what America is this the school of? Certainly not the United States of America, because the people of the United States of America do not support murder, do not support rape, do not support torture. Yet this is called the School of the Americas, and its graduates are involved in rape, murder, torture, genocide. The School of the Americas indeed.

The people of the United States do not support the kind of conduct which

has come from this school and which is being done in the name of Americas.

Four churchwomen, including Sister Dorothy Kazel, a nun from Cleveland, OH, and someone who happened to be a friend of mine, were raped and brutally murdered in El Salvador. The U.N. Truth Commission investigating the murders verified that the School of the Americas trained three of the five officers responsible for the churchwomen's deaths.

Now Sister Dorothy was more than a friend to me. She was a friend to humanity. She went to El Salvador to bring about peace and justice for those who desperately need it, and she was brutally murdered for her efforts, along with Jean Donovan and two other nuns. Sister Dorothy Kazel's sister-in-law asked me to deliver this message to my colleagues in the United States Congress, and I quote:

''Congress needs to act now. The women were killed by officers trained at the School of the Americas. I just don't understand why we are training human rights violators on our own soil. Why does this school still operate?''

Mr. Chairman, those who oppose closing the School of the Americas defend it as a haven for human rights protectors. The inversion of meaning is an ongoing problem in political philosophy. It is something that the writer, George Orwell, well understood where wrong becomes right and worse becomes the better reason and where murderers and rapists become human rights protectors.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KUCINICH] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. KUCINICH was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Where wrong becomes right, where worse becomes the better reason and where people who have murdered become human rights protectors.

Well, I think the American people are well aware of the record of the School of the Americas. We owe it to them, and we owe it to the memory of Sister Dorothy Kazel, the other nuns, the Jesuit priests, the civilians who have been murdered, and to everyone else who has ever been terrorized by the School of the Americas, to see that this school be shut once and for all. This is the Congress of the United States of America, and it should not let anyone defile the name ''America'' in our own name on our own soil with our own tax dollars. Close the School of the Americas.

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

Oh, the outrage is becoming palpable now. The do-gooders are out there. Pass out the rose-colored glasses, Mr. Chairman. The cold war is over; we are hearing that today.

Every American citizen ought to grab up their children, close their doors and take out their weapon, if it has not been taken away every time the do-gooders get out there and start saying the cold war is over, because we know what is coming next, another piece of legislation, another diatribe that we must cut back, cut back, cut back, cut back.

Well, the cold war may be over in a formal sense, Mr. Chairman, but there are many very good, productive, positive reasons to deny the do-gooders this latest opportunity to prove to the world that we can be more namby-pamby than some other country somewhere in the world at some point in time.

Mr. Chairman, one thing that escapes me in this latest round of do-good-ism that we are hearing today is what these folks think would happen if the School of the Americas were closed and if we then, as they would have us do, then search out every other program in which we provide some sort of training, control over foreign military officers. Do they think that all of a sudden magically, as they had been anointed with this vision of the universe, that every one of these other officers would all of a sudden adopt their view of the world, their view of so-called human rights, their view of what is right and wrong in the world, their view of what we must do in the world? I do not think so.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that the School of the Americas provides a very valuable tool not only for this country to influence foreign officers in a positive way as we have heard from opponents of this measure today already, but it also provides an important outlet for the yearnings that these foreign officers have to learn about this country and what we do that is so good that these other folks herald and then break down.

There are, Mr. Chairman, other countries more than willing to step into the breach should we retreat. Communist China; now there is a country with a stellar human rights record. They are already obtaining a foothold in Latin America. Perhaps they would step into the breach and create a School of the Americas.

Would that make the do-gooders happy? Perhaps, I do not know. Some other country, perhaps Cuba, would step into the breach wanting to increase its influence in Latin America.

The fact of the matter is, though, Mr. Chairman, somebody would be there to step into the vacuum that would be created if we were to suddenly pull out from the School of the Americas.

Mr. Chairman, over the years, and even currently, these officers that are out there fighting for our kids on our streets in the United States of America are trained, many of them, both directly and indirectly, through the process of talking with the other graduates who come back to their country, and they do teach and they do talk with their fellow officers. They do learn, and they are equipped, better equipped, with the tools to fight the terrorists.

Now the cold war may be over, but terrorism is not over. The cold war may be over, but the war against narcotics traffickers is not. The cold war may be over, but the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, there are narco-terrorists out there in Latin America, and we need to use every legitimate tool at our disposal, and this is a legitimate tool at our disposal and the way that we can reach out and influence for the better these officers.

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

Mr. BARR of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

□ 1530

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

Mr. Chairman, I apologize for having to run off the floor to a meeting, but the points that the gentleman are making are so well taken. We are fighting a battle today of terrorism. We are fighting a battle of illegal drugs in this country. These officers that are trained at the School of the Americas are doing a service by going back to their countries and teaching people what it is all about as far as decent human rights for people.

I just wish I had more time to participate in the debate, but I hope everybody comes over here and votes against this ill-conceived amendment.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman, who knows whereof he speaks.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, let me mention the whole process here is rather bizarre. We see the folks on the other side saying, well, because these people went to the School of the Americas and sometime in the future, after that point, they committed these bad acts, therefore we must close the doors of the School of the Americas.

How preposterous. Should we search out and close the doors of every school in the United States of America because one of them may have produced at some point in time a Ted Bundy or somebody else that goes out and commits an act? Blaming the school for the bad acts of its graduates in this instance is ill-conceived.

This is nonsense, Mr. Chairman, and it ought to be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] has expired.

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

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

Mr. BARR. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio just made a very impassioned statement. It is understandable, given his personal knowledge of a victim.

But I just would like the gentleman to think about the fact that the noncommissioned officers and officers that come to this school do not come with a

table that has nothing written on it. They come bringing some values themselves.

What we are attempting to do with the School of the Americas is, in some cases, a very difficult task of changing the whole culture of a military in a government. If you had visited Guatemala or El Salvador like this gentleman in the early 1980's, you would understand about the progress that has been made and the great difficulty we had in getting the right kind of people to come to the school in the first place.

I would just like to suggest we have made dramatic progress, and in the absence this, we are going to have a much deeper problem in the hemisphere.

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

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to get into this debate until I heard the previous speaker's comments, and they compelled me to say what I am going to say now.

I would much rather be a ''do-gooder'' than a stand-byer, while a school which is supposed to teach American values instead consistently produces graduates who defile the very values that that institution is supposed to support and promote.

I do not mind being called a ''do-gooder'' at all in comparison to being a do-nothinger. I also do not mind being called ''namby-pamby'' because I happen to be offended by the fact that, time and time again, graduates of the School of the Americas have engaged in conduct that would make every decent American gag.

If being ''namby-pamby'' is being opposed to instruction manuals on torture, if being ''namby-pamby'' is being opposed to the consistently failed record of this institution in turning out graduates who understand democratic values, if it is being ''namby-pamby'' to object to the fact that graduates of this institution have systematically in a number of countries around this hemisphere wiped out innocent women and children, then call me namby-baby. I do not mind it at all.

You are doggone right, we are opposed to this institution continuing. This institution has been given the opportunity year after year after year to demonstrate that it can turn out a different kind of military for Latin America. So far, there is very precious little evidence that in fact it has done so.

The gentleman from Nebraska is right: What this institution is charged with doing is a very difficult thing to do. It is very difficult to take people from the kind of culture which has produced many of them, bring them to this country, and in a very short period of time inculcate the kind of values that we would like to see those graduates represent.

But the fact is that you have to make a judgment sooner or later about whether that institution has succeeded or not, and there are a lot of us in this institution who do not think that it has succeeded.

So I would suggest that to call people ''do-gooders'' or to call them ''namby-pamby'' because we happen to object to the fact that thousands of individual innocent civilians have been slaughtered by the graduates of this second-rate institution, is, I think, to do something to the dialogue in this House that you ought not to do.

I would say one other thing: For years we have heard every justification dragged up that it is possible to drag up in order to defend the continued funding for this institution. Now the latest argument we hear is, ''Oh, they are necessary to prevent the drug traffic from succeeding in this hemisphere.''

Well, I just have to tell you that drug program administrators who cannot run an antidrug program without relying on this kind of institution ought to find themselves another line of work.

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate being recognized to speak in favor of the School of the Americas. Not everything is perfect. Unfortunately, the folks who support this amendment are correct in that in the past there have been graduates of this school who have abused human rights and caused all sorts of pain and suffering.

That has been a very, very small minority of student participants, and the things that they did, they did not learn at the School of the Americas. They certainly were not trained with that intent by the School of the Americas.

That was many, many years ago. Some debates, Mr. Speaker, are timely, and some debates are timeless. This debate seems to be timeless in that once the side who opposes the School of the Americas has got their point across and the changes have been made, it is time to stop. But, instead, we are continuing year after year, rehashing the same ground, regurgitating the same arguments over and over again.

This debate, rather than being timeless, should be timely, and the time to debate it was properly in the early 1990's under Secretary Cheney. Under Secretary Cheney many, many changes were made that threw out some of the offensive materials which the supporters of this amendment keep referring to.

It is not the case any more. What we are doing is we are debating Model T's in the era of 1997 automobiles. It is just that there is a photograph there. We are looking at the moving picture here, and the moving picture has gone on and times have changed.

But to be on the safe side, the committee this year has put in some very strong safeguards. One, the Secretary of Defense must certify that the instruction and training provided by the school are fully consistent with training and doctrine provided to U.S. military personnel, especially, Mr. Chairman, regarding human rights.

Number two, the Departments of Defense and State have improved the guidelines for screening and admitting students to better avoid students with records of human rights violations or who may have tendencies in that direction.

Number three, the Department of Defense completes a comprehensive report on training activities of the school and an assessment of the performance of the graduates.

These are three things that are in the bill right now. This amendment is not necessary.

The abuses that they are referring to that happened are horrible, and I certainly agree, but they happened many years ago by graduates that would not be admitted to the school today.

Now, let me say this on a personal basis. I have visited the school. It is disturbing, greatly disturbing to me, that most of the supporters of this amendment have not taken the time to visit the school. In fact, I would challenge my colleagues, if you have been to the school and you support the amendment, when you speak, please let folks know, and tell us about the terrorists you saw in the classroom.

I am not going to tell you that I could tell terrorists from a nonterrorist sitting in a classroom, Mr. Speaker, but I can tell you this: I talked to young idealistic men and women from South America who had lots of ideas on democracy, lots of enthusiasm about the American system of government, and lots of enthusiasm for freedom and its noble concepts.

I have visited them, and I have talked to the students. It makes a tremendous difference in your opinion of an institution when you have been there and talked to the students.

If you do not go, maybe if you support this amendment, you should make it a priority to visit it. I would be glad to help any of my colleagues who would like to go down to Columbus, Georgia. We could probably get you in and out of there in a day. It would mean so much to the students down there, it would mean so much to the institution, and perhaps it could mean a whole lot to the great cause that we share of freedom.

Mr. Chairman, I ask Members to please vote against this amendment, and support the School of the Americas.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the School of the Americas and in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that most of us here do not oppose international military training in general. The amendment addresses only the military training provided at Fort Benning because of a negative image, or stigma, remaining from a relatively very few problems from the past. This makes this issue a self-feeding problem to a large extent because the negative stigma is perpetuated by the very groups who use it as justification to close the school.

The negative propaganda and baggage that continues to follow the school is just not a valid argument to shut down the only school of this kind in the world with such devoted attention to teaching professionalism, respect for

rule of law and civilian leadership, and human rights to young officers and soldiers of Latin America who would not otherwise get this critical training. In fact, the School of the Americas provides much more of this kind of training to its students than our own military men and women receive.

We also often hear lists of human rights abuses committed by Latin American military personnel who may or may not have received some varying level of training at the School. These cases—while horrible—are very rare when compared to the large number of students trained at the school. To close the school simply because less than one percent of its graduates haven't successfully applied what they've learned is inappropriate, shortsighted, and counterproductive.

Let me just ask everyone: If the United States set up a program to teach Latin American militaries to reject repressive behavior, to respect human rights, and advance the cause of democracy in our own back yard, would you support it? What if it were only 99 percent effective? That's what we're dealing with in plain English. No exaggerations, no distortions, no feel-good hype. Why would we throw away the opportunity to teach hundreds of Latin American military officers to respect human rights just because a few don't get the message?

I challenge all members of this committee to visit the school before you take active action, such as this amendment, to close it. With all due respect, I know very few members here today, including Mr. TORRES himself, have actually visited the School down at Fort Benning. If it's not possible for you to visit, Colonel Trumbel, the School's Commandant, is available to meet with any Member one on one here in Washington to discuss any and all concerns you may have. I ask that you please get the facts, investigate the school for yourself rather than relying on second-hand propaganda, before you vote to close this school.

What can we do here today to improve the school?

The language in the bill regarding the School of the Americas takes major steps to address remaining concerns of Congress. I remind you that the bill as it currently stands denies all funds from the school until: First, the Secretary of Defense certifies the instruction and training provided by the school are fully consistent with training and doctrine provided to U.S. military personnel, especially regarding human rights, second, DOD and State have improved the guidelines for screening and admitting students to better avoid students with records of human rights violations, and third, DoD completes a comprehensive report on training activities of the School and an assessment of the performance of its graduates.

These are very significant steps to improve any remaining problems. I ask that you support the very reasonable compromise language currently in the bill and oppose this amendment.

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

I rise as a do-gooder to support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, American values are based on doing good for people. That is the purpose of this bill. This bill proposes to do good for the less fortunate people of the world and for less fortunate nations.

My good friend, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], talked about reality. Reality is the story told by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCGOVERN] as to what happened in El Salvador at the hands of graduates from the School of the Americas. Reality is what was described by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KUCINICH] as to what happened to his friends at the hands of graduates of the School of the Americas.

The fact is that graduates of the school went forth to engage in activities that were totally inimical to the values of the people and of the Government of the United States.

Sure, there are some students who are graduates who are good, but they are not the ones who were in power in the countries to which the graduates went.

The impression is given that if you close the school, all training will stop. That is not true. All the universities in this country are available for training, and a course can be set forth that will permit this to be done.

The fact is that this school has failed. Its record is one of failure. The record cannot be dismissed by saying that critics of that record are do-gooders.

Mr. Chairman, I have a letter here that was received by the National Security Archives, the government library of George Washington University, dated July 17, 1997, fairly current, signed by the current Ambassador from the Embassy of Honduras. This is what he said:

> Thank you for your fax regarding the letter that was distributed to Members of Congress quoting four Latin Americans, including myself, on the issue of funding for the School of the Americas.
>
> In that letter I am quoted extemporaneously. My statement was geared toward the need to enhance the school's program to deal with today's challenges, narco-terrorism, violation of human rights, extreme poverty, suitable development, elements I consider valid.
>
> Nevertheless, at the time I made that statement, I wasn't aware of allegations or evidence of the school's programs that led to violation of international human rights. Otherwise, I would have mentioned my government and I deplore any activities undertaken there or anywhere else that would encourage officers to carry out violations of international human rights norms.
>
> The negative effect of the school's academic programs have, unfortunately, been felt in my country, where at least five military officers trained in the school have been requested to come before our courts for violation of human rights.
>
> The Honduran Government clearly does not condone any such activities and is opposed to any academic program the school had or has in that regard. I hope this letter clarifies our position.

So, Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. There is still the opportunity for training of worthy students from the Latin American countries, and they should be given that opportunity for training, but not in the School of the Americas.

□ 1545

The record justifies the closing of that school.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the Torres-Yates-Foglietta amendment to close the U.S. Army School of the Americas.

I want it to be clear that I do not oppose military to military, or civil military training, but, I believe the school has too many negative implications, baggage—as it were—to be an effective tool of U.S. foreign policy.

I believe the school to be a relic of the cold war. It represents a severely outdated approach to a fragile region struggling to attain real democracy and civilian control of the military and should have been closed years ago.

Some members have told me that the Latin American military respect our Armed Forces because of the work the school has done over the years.

Yes, but what about the civilian population of Central and South America. What about those civilians who refer to the school as the school of assassins. What do they think of the United States and our military assistance? Are we really fulfilling our national security and foreign policy objectives by alienating the civilian population of Latin America?

I am proud of the young men and women serving in our Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps. I am proud that their colleagues from Latin America think so highly of them. But, I do not see how closing the School of the Americas will diminish this respect.

Closing the school will not put a halt to military contact between our Armed Forces and those of Latin America.

In fact, I believe closing the school will allow for a more rounded education. One where the soldiers of Central and South American countries participate alongside their counterparts in the U.S. military in the full range of U.S. military training.

Closing the school will allow the students to become exposed to the total American experience instead of being isolated in one region of our country.

Additionally, these future leaders will be better prepared to work with, and more importantly communicate with, our military should we become engaged in joint military operations sometime in the future.

It would send a clear message to the people of Latin America that we care about their civil and human rights and are trying to support their democracies.

In closing, although I have been an opponent of the school for many years, I have attempted to work with the Army and the Departments of State and Defense through the Foreign Operations Subcommittee to resolve the numerous complaints surrounding the curriculum at the school.

I wanted to come to some kind of positive resolution to this matter, but, in just the past year it has become very clear to me that my good faith efforts were to be unrewarded.

The committee previously instructed the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to prepare and submit to the Committees on Appropriations no later than January 15, 1997, a report on the School of Americas at Fort Benning, GA.

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

Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago the gentleman from Ohio started out listing the who's who of human rights violators in the hemisphere, the school's roster of graduates. I would like to continue that for a moment.

One hundred of 246 Columbian officers cited for war crimes by an international human rights tribunal in 1993; six Peruvian officers involved in the killings of 9 students and a professor in 1992; Colonel Julio Alpirez, linked to the cover-ups and the murders of Efrain Bamaca and United States citizen Michael DeVine in Guatemala; ranking officers in notorious Honduran Battalion 3–16; Argentina dictator Leopoldo Galtieri and Panamanian strongman Manuel Noriega.

Let me just stop at this point and say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I am absolutely surprised and appalled at the energy that they are expending to defend the School of the Americas.

I do not know why those who posture themselves as law-and-order policymakers, I do not know why anybody who gets up time and again talking about how tough they are on crime and criminals and human rights violators, would expend so much time and energy defending this U.S. Army School of the Americas.

We know the list of violators who have been the graduates of this school. How can we defend them? It is not enough to say, oh, some of them made mistakes, some of them were not right, some of them killed some people. What are Members talking about? We are talking about people who are trained in the School of the Americas who go back to these countries. They become our direct contacts. These are the ones we support. We support them in the leadership of those nations.

I cannot believe that some of the Members have forgotten about Haiti already. We spent a lot of hours in this body about trying to right the wrongs of Haiti. It took a great threat by the President of the United States, ready to move in with our own military unless we got rid of the graduates of the School of the Americas: General Cedras, have Members forgotten him already? Have they forgotten Mr. Francois in Haiti, who headed the police force, a graduate of the School of the Americas?

These two gentlemen, if they can be called that, in Haiti were the ones who built the airstrip where the drug runners were able to come in and bring their dope into Haiti to be shipped out to America and other places. These places on the globe that we are discussing are the locations for the transshipment of drugs right into the United States.

The Congressional Black Caucus has made it absolutely clear that getting rid of drug trafficking and drugs is our number one priority. We do not take kindly to those who would call us do-gooders because we have decided that there must be, at some point in time, a real war on drugs.

Are Members not tired of the failure of this government to deal with drugs and the drugs that enter this country? Are Members not tired of the relationships we have with the Noriegas of the world? These become our partners in crime. Whether it is Noriega or Cedras or Francois, they were all supported by our government while they were dealing dope into our communities.

We are sick and tired of you simply going out on the street corners of America locking up these young black and Latino males, and even white, with small amounts of drugs. We want to stop drugs and the big dope dealers, and those who are allowing their countries to be transshipment points to bring drugs into the United States. You cannot defend Noriega and Cedras and these graduates of the School of the Americas. These are dope dealers who we embraced, that we trained and sent back.

What is wrong with the School of the Americas? Once they make the contact in this country they become our leaders. They become the people we rely on.

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

(By unanimous consent, Ms. WATERS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, we train them and we send them back. Then we rely on them. We support them. Guess what? Members cannot be concerned about drug dealing and drug trafficking as long as they are supporting the very ones who are dealing the dope back to us.

When are we going to be serious about a war on drugs? Yes, we may be do-gooders over here, but we are do-gooders who are challenging Members to wake up and smell the roses and stop this nonsense, and get about the business of getting rid of drug traffickers. Get rid of the work and manuals and training of the School of the Americas, and that will go a long way toward getting rid of the real dope dealers in this hemisphere.

I challenge Members today to stop the nonsense of defense of a school that you can no longer defend. How can Members get up on the floor year in and year out and say they are going to do better, leave them alone for now, give them the American taxpayers' dollars.

It is shameful, it is unconscionable, and Members need to stop it and support this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, while I have great respect for all of the opponents as well as the proponents of this amendment, let me say that most of the debate is not taking place on what the true issue is. I do not think there is anyone in this entire House, this entire body, that condones human rights violations. I do not think there is a single person on either side of this aisle or either side of this debate that agrees with some of the atrocities that took place.

That is not the point. The point is because some people who are opposed to the School of the Americas today have brought to the attention of this body some misdoings, some wrongdoings that have taken place as a result of some of the graduates returning to their countries and creating some atrocities, no, no, we do not condone that, nor will we ever condone that.

The point is, we are now trying to educate, and this Congress and this subcommittee has dispatched people to the school, to Central America, to South America, to make absolutely certain that they are taught to respect human rights. When these graduates return, the percentile in the high nineties do exactly what we envision that they would do. They go back and they make themselves leaders in their communities. They respect human rights as a result of the education they have received at Fort Benning.

So the debate is not over whether or not we ought to continue teaching people to go back and commit atrocities, because that is not the debate. That is over with. The Secretary of Defense must confirm to the Congress before he can spend one dime that they are not going to teach anybody to go back and to do harm to any individual.

I took our subcommittee to Armenia and to Azerbaijan and to Georgia and to Turkey. On the way back we had conversations about, how fortunate we are in this hemisphere. We have wars that are taking place between Armenia and Azerbaijan, and happily they are at peace right now, trying to work out an agreement. We have problems in Cyprus, we have problems in the Middle East, we have problems in Africa, problems in Bosnia, but not one war is taking place in this entire hemisphere.

So we are working ourselves into a position of a peaceful community, where human rights are respected by all people.

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

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I beg to differ with the gentleman. There is a war going on in this hemisphere. Is the gentleman not aware of what is going on in Mexico? Is he not aware of the drug wars that are going on? Is he not aware of the war that is going on against our young people in our neighborhoods and our American cities?

I want to tell the gentleman, this is the war. The war is drug trafficking in this hemisphere that is killing thousands of people, that is causing our prisons to explode, that is causing people to be shot down on the streets of America.

It may not be, in the gentleman's estimation, sir, a war, but this is the most devastating kind of war. This is the worst kind of war. It is the kind of war that we are going to have to come to grips with and begin to see it as a war. As long as we think we are lucky——

Mr. CALLAHAN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the

gentlewoman's concern. The definition of war is maybe something we could debate one afternoon when we have more time. The debate that is taking place today is whether or not we are going to fund the School of the Americas.

When we have the President of the United States who sends me a message and tells me, Mr. Chairman, will you please continue to fund this; when we have the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who calls me and says, do whatever you can possibly do, because this will help to create a peace, this will help to solve the war on drugs that the gentlewoman is talking about; and when we have Mack McLarty call, all of these very distinguished people that the President of the United States has placed in a position of responsibility, pleading with me, a Republican, ''Sonny, go over there and convince your colleagues to continue to fund this school, because we have corrected every problem that they contend existed. They have made great progress. We have done everything this Congress has suggested that we do with respect to this school.''

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CALLAHAN was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, we have done every conceivable thing we can do to ensure that we do not permit any educational process that would lend to the availability of people going back to their country and creating any human rights violation.

Certainly, God forbid, even the University of Alabama, one of the greatest educational institutions in the world, has graduated some people, probably far below the national standard when we consider Alabama and California, but nevertheless, we, too, have probably graduated some people who have gone on to perform some heinous acts, but we do not close down the university.

Some of our educational institutions that we revere, such as our academies, have had some problems. When they had their problems, did we say, close down the institution? No, we said, correct the problems. That is precisely what the President of the United States has done. That is precisely what the professionals in Georgia have done. They have corrected it. They are not teaching these subjects that these people are referring to. We are doing it in a positive manner.

I know we have not resolved all the wars on poverty, all of the wars on crime, all of the wars on narcotics, but we are moving in the right direction, because we are bringing these people to America, we are teaching them the value of human rights, of civil rights, of free elections. We are instructing them how to go back and be leaders in their community, and we are doing it with the only vehicle we have, and that is the School of the Americas.

Mr. Chairman, I would plead with my colleagues to go along with their Commander in Chief, to go along with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, to go along with all of the people in the administration that have written to us telling us all of these problems have been addressed, we are moving in the right direction. Let us preserve the perceived peace that we have in this hemisphere.

□ 1600

Let us not turn into a hemisphere of wars. Let us educate our allies, our friends in this hemisphere. Let us continue this school, teaching democracy, teaching human rights, teaching men and women how to go back to their respective countries and to be great citizens.

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

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, let me make it absolutely clear that if the President of the United States wrote to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], called, and insisted on funding the School of the Americas, then I am opposed to the President and the President is wrong.

Let me make it abundantly clear that if Mr. McCaffrey called, he should be the first one to understand that it is a war. His life just got threatened when he was down in Mexico among the drug traffickers who sent him a message in no uncertain terms. I think he knows it is a war now.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Torres amendment and commend him for his leadership, as well as the leadership of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for his leadership, on this important issue. I commend the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES] for bringing this amendment to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard all different points of view about versions of the story of our interpretation of what the School of the Americas has accomplished. Whatever good it has done, it seems that it is more than just a coincidence that some of the worst violators of human rights in this hemisphere were educated at that school.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], our chairman, has made a very fine effort in the legislation to recognize that there is a problem that still exists at the School of the Americas, and I was very pleased to hear the gentleman say in his remarks that not one dime could be spent on the School of the Americas unless the Secretary of Defense confirmed certain things, which I would like to read into the RECORD, because I believe it is time for us to understand what the choice is before us today.

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

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, just to briefly say that not only is it in the RECORD, but if this bill passes as it is written, it is in the bill, in the bill on page 29 where it requires that before any money can be spent in violation of any of the efforts that my colleagues are contending, that the President must certify that it is not going to be used. It requires further that the Department of Defense do exactly the same thing.

So, we have for the first time in history in our bill, under title II on page 29, implemented into law the prohibitions against the teaching of anything that would lead to any type of atrocity.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman making that statement and for the work that the gentleman did to get that language in the bill. But I repeat again that that language in the bill recognizes that there is a problem. To those who say, ''What is the problem?'' There is a problem.

Because of the leadership of the gentleman from Alabama, the bill says that,

> None of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available to support grant-financed military education and training at the School of the Americas unless the Secretary of Defense certifies that the instruction and training provided by the School of the Americas is fully consistent with training and doctrine, particularly with respect to the observance of human rights.
>
> Further, that the Secretary of Defense certifies that the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, has developed and issued specific guidelines governing the selection and screening of candidates for the instruction at the School of the Americas; and, further, that the Secretary of Defense submits to the Committee on Appropriations a report detailing the training activities of the School of the Americas and the general assessment regarding the performance of its graduates during 1996.

The reason I part company with my chairman at this point is because we had the request for this study in last year's bill and, unfortunately, it took a great deal of time for us to get the report back to our committee. Indeed, it did not even show up until the day our subcommittee was meeting, and I think that that was long overdue.

We asked for a report on ethics to correct the problems. The report sat in DOD for months and was delivered the day of our subcommittee markup. The report itself failed miserably to address our concerns about the school.

Mr. Chairman, this leaves me no choice but to support this amendment. I say that with a great deal of respect for our colleagues on both sides of this issue. I do want to call to the attention of our colleagues that a problem exists and that this solution that the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES] is advancing is a reasonable one. It takes the leadership of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] one step further.

Mr. Chairman, I call this to my colleagues's attention. It is a letter from the Jesuit Conference. The Jesuit Conference calls for the closing of the School of the Americas. It does so because it says:

> Jesuits know all too personally the violence perpetrated by graduates of the School of the Americas. In 1989 six Jesuits, their housekeeper and her daughter were murdered on the campus of the Jesuit University in El Salvador. Nineteen of the Salvadoran officers whom the United Nations cited for these murders were graduates of the School of the Americas. This is a celebrated case. However, the death and disappearance of hundreds of ordinary civilians, such as those of the village of El Mozote in Salvador—

And I visited that location myself.

> Overwhelm our consciences and elicit outrage at the impunity of the School of the Americas graduates. Their families silently know, better than we, the effects of State sanctioned terror.

Mr. Chairman, that is why I agree with the statement in the Jesuits' letter that it is time to send a strong message that the United States will no longer sanction or tolerate militaries which declare war upon their own civilian populations.

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

(By unanimous consent, Ms. PELOSI was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, the point is that the Jesuits are calling for the closing of the School of the Americas. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] is asking for a study, a good faith request for a study and certification. The gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES] splits the difference, and I think it is a very wise proposal.

The amendment of the gentleman from California just cuts off the funding that is in this legislation. The School of the Americas receives about $4 million from the U.S. Congress. As the Chairman knows, $1.2 million comes out of foreign operations and the rest out of the DOD appropriations bill.

This is not about closing the School of the Americas. This is about cutting off this funding. It is about sending a strong message that when we ask for a report, we want it in a timely fashion and we want it to be appropriate.

I look forward to visiting, at the invitation of Mr. COLLINS and Mr. BISHOP, the School of the Americas to impress upon them that Congress does, as the gentleman from Alabama says, universally support human rights; that we do not associate ourselves with or condone any of the atrocities that have been performed by people who are graduates of the School of the Americas, but that indeed the terms that the chairman put forth in this bill are terms that we expect to be met.

Mr. Chairman, this is what we did last year and they did not come through. That is what made the Torres amendment necessary. So the choice that our colleagues have is the status quo, which I believe is unacceptable and unsatisfactory in light of the response that we received, or better yet did not receive from the School of the Americas, and even a better solution than calling for the closing of the School of the Americas. This is a compromise. This is a smart approach to it.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. And I say in good faith to my colleagues, I look forward to joining them to visit the School of the Americas to help in any way that we can to promote the education of people who will promote human rights in this hemisphere.

Indeed, even if the school were to be closed, there are many other institutions where military can be trained to promote human rights values and other democratic freedoms. Mr. Chairman, with that I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, let's decide here and now what we are going to teach the world.

We have so much to say. For little more than two centuries, we have shown the world the way to true democracy and most of the world has followed. In Denver, last month, our President had the opportunity to show the world's economic leaders the way to the economic boom we are enjoying.

That's the central message that our School of the Americas should be teaching.

I am one who believes that instead of the enduring message of the School of the Americas, we should be helping our Latin American neighbors follow the course of Oscar Arias and Costa Rica, where the people there live safely, securely, and economically prosperous with no military, with no military. I am concerned that this school, as it is constituted, encourages a culture of growing militarism instead of growing economies. Some of the students of nations of this school simply cannot afford its persistent lesson. I am one who believes that, when resources are scarce, we should be making more butter, rather than buying more guns. But I respect our disagreement on this issue.

But of course, our neighbors in Latin America are sovereign nations and it is within their province and power to decide on their own security needs and military training needs. It is good policy, then, to have a modest program to help their militaries professionalize and be respectful of human rights. The School for the Americas is not achieving that policy.

The lessons we taught in the baddest of bad old days of the School of the Americas—terrorism, torture, and strong-arm police tactics—were exactly the wrong ones for our hemisphere. Despite the laudable improvements of our chairman in the bill, I remain convinced that this school has no place in the Americas.

Yes, there have been improvements, but not enough.

The school still holds 47 weeks of courses on things like psychological operations, commando missions, and battle tactics, but added only two 2-hour lectures on human rights. When our subcommittee asked for a report on how the school screens applicants and monitors graduates, the school showed its disrespect with a meager 3-page report that was 6 months late.

The Torres-Yates-Foglietta amendment proposes to delete the bill's $815 million for the school. If we want to teach the right message to help professionalize their militaries, let's focus on that mission, and also help them grow their economies and fortify their democracies and teach the sanctity of human rights.

So, as I said at the beginning, we can decide today what America will teach the world, what message our people have to send to our neighbors. The mission of this school has flunked. Support the Torres-Yates-Foglietta amendment.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, many of the abuses in Latin America can be traced back to graduates of the School of the Americas.

The opposition has circulated dear colleagues highlighting quotes from several Latin American officials, but we have also heard from the people. Their voices are smaller and their speeches not as polished, but these are the people who have suffered from this scandalous school and they deserve to be heard.

The fact that there are provisions that call for the Secretary of Defense's approval should not make us feel secure but suspect.

I would hope that we would only fund 50-year-old programs that have already proven themselves, not ones that need special scrutiny.

We spend billions of dollars on our defense interests, and when that money is used to keep our military strong and our troops safe, it is money well spent. But we mock our brave men and women in uniform who work for peace and justice in our world when we spend even one penny on this scandal.

The school is not a creative solution to downsizing our military and it is more than just a waste of taxpayer dollars. Many graduates have been involved in some of the most brutal atrocities in Latin America and it is a national disgrace and a blotch on our military history.

If we are to support democracy we must stop the killing of those people whose welfare we claim to support and the School of the Americas must fall into the oblivion it so richly deserves.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, 50 years ago, the U.S. Army School of the Americas opened its doors in Panama to a class of Latin American and Caribbean military officers to receive training in the art of war.

Half a century later it's time to shut the school down.

Last September, the Pentagon revealed what activists opposed to the school have been alleging for years—that foreign military officers were taught to torture and murder to achieve their political objectives.

According to the Pentagon's own excerpts, School of the Americas students were advised to imprison those from whom they were seeking information; to ''involuntarily'' obtain information from those sources—in other words, torture them; to arrest their parents; to use ''motivation by fear''; pay bounties for enemy dead; execute opponents; subvert the press; and use torture, blackmail, and even injections of truth serum to obtain information.

These tactics come right out of an SS manual and have no place in a civilized society. They certainly have no place in any course taught with taxpayer dollars on U.S. soil by members of our own military.

These practices, which as we know too well have, in fact, been used by graduates of the School of the Americas, are part of a totalitarian playbook. They show complete disregard for the rule of human law and violate every tenet of basic human rights.

Yet nowhere in this report was there any apology for the horrific misdeeds tied to this training.

Nor was there any mention of the poor—any mention of all those who have suffered so much at the hands of those who were taught to torture and murder by elements within our own Government.

What about Archbishop Oscar Romero, gunned down in cold blood by SOA graduates because he stood up for the powerless against the powerful? What about the Jesuit priests and their housekeeper and her daughter, murdered in El Salvador because their hope for the poor clashed with the interests of dictators? What about the four Ursuline nuns, ravaged and mutilated and thrown into a ditch for the crime of teaching children to read? What about the children at El Mozote—machine gunned by School of Americas alumni for the sin of living in the wrong place at the wrong time?

These manuals are the smoking gun. They provide direct evidence that the school has not only failed to serve its mission, but has subverted its mission.

It's time to close down the School of the Americas.

Ms. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Torres amendment, which would help us close the U.S. Army School of the Americas once and for all.

The School of the Americas has taught some of the most ruthless dictators in Latin America to torture their opponents, censor the press, and intimidate their citizens. It must be shut down. But the issue of what to do with the School of the Americas goes well beyond the deplorable actions of the school, and right to the heart of U.S. foreign policy.

The question before us today is whether the United States has the moral responsibility to encourage other governments to respect human rights and democracy. Are human rights and democracy just catch phrases we use, or are they basic principles that we demand of every nation?

We must demand human rights and democracy—in name and in practice—from our own military and all of our neighbors. That is why the School of the Americas is an affront to everything that U.S. foreign policy should be about. That is why we must close this school.

Fifty years ago, the School of the Americas was opened with the goal of improving U.S. ties to Latin American militaries. The idea was to educate our neighbors to the South about democratic civilian control of the military. But over the last few decades, we started to hear reports of what was actually being taught there. Words like torture, beating, and execution were increasingly being associated with the school's courses.

Then some of the school's more distinguished graduates started to turn up in high positions in Latin American governments. People like Panama's drug-dealing dictator Manuel Noriega—now serving time in a United States prison on a drug conviction—and Roberto D'Aubuisson, who organized many of El Salvador's notorious death squads.

In response, many of us have been calling for the school to be shut down and for disclosure of the school's curriculum. Well, we got our second wish last year. In September 1996, the U.S. Army released portions of a training manual used at the school during the 1980's. The manual revealed what we have suspected all along: Latin American military officers were taught to intimidate, torture, and kill to achieve their political objectives.

According to the Pentagon itself, School of the Americas students were taught to imprison and execute their opponents. To use motivation by fear. To subvert the press. And to use torture, blackmail, and truth serum to obtain information.

This is unacceptable. U.S. foreign policy should not promote these tactics. And they have no place in a school funded by our tax dollars and taught by U.S. instructors on U.S. soil.

The United States stands for democracy and respect for individual rights. Its foreign policy must always be conducted with a commitment to these principles. The School of the Americas violated this fundamental tenet. It is time to close down the school for good.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES].

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 24, 1997, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES] will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. STEARNS:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING COSTS OF THE PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE PROGRAM AND NATO EXPANSION

SEC. 572. It is the sense of the Congress that all member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) should contribute their proportionate share to pay for the costs of the Partnership for Peace program and for any future costs attributable to the expansion of NATO.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] and a Member opposed will each control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] that simply, frankly, expresses the sense of Congress that all member countries of NATO should be responsible for paying their fair share for the cost of the Partnership for Peace Program and to future NATO expansion.

Mr. Chairman, let me read my amendment specifically just for those Members who wish it to be clarified. It says that, ''It is the sense of Congress that all member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) should contribute their proportionate share to pay for the costs of the Partnership for Peace program and for any future costs attributable to the expansion of NATO.''

Mr. Chairman, many of us are concerned with recent statements by Mr. Chirac of France that his nation would be unwilling to contribute to the expansion of NATO. Now, as all my colleagues know, NATO agreed to invite Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic into the organization last week in Spain. Mr. Chirac is apparently upset that the nations of Romania and Slovenia will not yet be admitted into NATO and is, therefore, threatening not to pay for this current expansion.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is our responsibility to send Mr. Chirac and our NATO allies in Europe a strong message that they must pay their proportionate share of the defense of Europe. If they do not, the Congress must look at various options in response. One option would be refusing the reentry of France into NATO's unified military command structure, from which France unilaterally withdrew in 1966.

Or perhaps we should adhere to a cap in spending on NATO expansion, as other Members have suggested. Congress may even debate whether we should force nations that do not pay for the current expansion to incur all the costs for the next round of NATO expansion.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, whatever we choose to do in the future, I believe this is a good amendment for right now that will send a clear message to certain European allies in NATO that Congress will not allow the United States to continue paying a larger share of Europe's defense, while other nations opt out of contributing their fair share.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to be a coauthor with the gentleman from Florida on this amendment. I appreciate the gentleman's leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, the American taxpayers have been paying for the protection of the free world and there was a time when that was absolutely necessary. But we have rebuilt most of Europe; we brought Japan back to its feet. Every time there is a problem, there is a phone call, 9–1–1 and America sends our young people over to fight and our dollars and our American Express card.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that Europe and NATO members in this expansion should not only pay their fair share, they should be paying the bulk of it. We are the major support for freedom and we, in fact, ensure that freedom through a tremendous military appropriation.

So I stand strong for this, but I just want to tell my colleagues that it is the sense of the Congress.

Now, at some point I am going to offer a very simple amendment that will either be stricken by a point of

order or it will have to be defeated. But the amendment that I plan to offer in conjunction with the efforts here of the gentleman from Florida will say that none of the funds in this act may be used to pay for NATO expansion not authorized by law.

Unless there would be some existing law that would authorize the use of the funds, there could not be an appropriation account that could be created to provide NATO expansion funds.

Mr. Chairman, that could be a little controversial and I do not want to do that. But my people have paid taxes all these years and we keep having all of these accounts, billions and billions of dollars. I think it is time that these countries who benefit from our taxpayers' commitments start to pay their fair share.

So, Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Florida, and I am proud to be associated with the gentleman.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the substance of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS]. I would note, however, that this authorization language should not even be in our bill. But since the amendment was made in order under the rule, I will accept his amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time having expired, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

□ 1615

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 24, 1997, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 79 OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 79 offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds in this Act may be used to pay for NATO Expansion not authorized by law.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama reserves a point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, this is the exact language that was placed in the defense appropriations bill. There is not a chairman of the House that I have any more respect for. And when I offered this amendment originally, the bill was to have been scheduled on a particular day and it had not been printed in the RECORD at that time. I printed it in the RECORD in a timely manner, and it was printed in the RECORD, and I guess we will have to now debate the germaneness and whether or not it is subject to a point of order.

It is straightforward, as it was in the defense appropriations bill. It should not be controversial. This appropriations bill has taken pains to try and remove authorization from, in fact, its line item.

The Traficant amendment basically says none of the funds in this bill may be used to pay for NATO expansion not authorized by law. This does not tie the hands of the appropriators. The appropriators could provide whatever money is necessary, but that money that is provided must have been authorized by law. If it was not authorized by law, that appropriation cannot appear.

I would like to talk some business about NATO here. We talk a good game about NATO. Members go home and campaign about all the money our taxpayers are putting into NATO and how we have got to stop that and let everybody else pay their own way. But when we come down to the real fine print of the law, we continue to leave open an opportunity for funds to go for NATO expansion.

This is, in my opinion, a strict appropriations bill. It is germane. It is the right thing to do. If it is authorized by law, we can give it all the money that you want.

I want to say one other thing: We collect taxes from hard-working people. We are paying for troops that are stationed all over the world, falling out of chairs without armrests, regarding borders in Bosnia and the Middle East.

We just had a debate on the war on drugs. We have got open borders in America. We have yet to in fact have a reasonable military program and a responsible drug program in this country. But when we are talking about NATO expansion, I will go along with what the rule of Congress is, but I would say this to the distinguished chairman of the authorizing committee: What Congress authorizes for NATO expansion should be what is appropriated for NATO expansion.

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

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order, and I accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] withdraws his reservation of a point of order.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 38 offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE IN INDIA

SEC. 572. Not more than $41,775,000 of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act under the heading ''Development Assistance'' may be made available for assistance in India.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment be limited to 15 minutes, divided between an opponent and proponent.

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

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we have several speakers on this side who would like to speak for 5 minutes each. We think we have three. So we think we need 15 minutes on this side.

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

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I will amend my request to say 30 minutes divided 15 minutes for proponents, 15 minutes for opponents.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, is it my understanding there are two amendments or one?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, this unanimous consent is on this first amendment, 15 minutes on each side.

Mr. ACKERMAN. We have three speakers on this side. We have two Members on the gentleman's side who would like to speak on our time.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, may I suggest to the gentleman, could not the Members take 4 minutes each instead of 5?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, does that apply to the gentleman from Indiana as well?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Well, Mr. Chairman, the time limitation applies to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] as well. If he wants to take all of it, he can take all of it.

Mr. PALLONE. My question, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, is whether the speakers who are speaking against the gentleman from Indiana's amendment would be taking up the time on our

side as opposed to the time on the gentleman's side?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, it would determine who yielded time to them.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, what we need on our side for our Members is 15 minutes on each amendment.

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

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, in light of that and in light of the congressional schedule with the House going in at 5 p.m., I think that it is only appropriate that we take up one of the Burton amendments today if we are going to have a time constraint at 15 minutes, half an hour or 15 minutes; or why do we not just go under the 5-minute rule until 5 p.m. and end at a time certain?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of it is in order that we could get through today with the debate on the Burton amendments, then leave tomorrow only the Smith and the Gilman amendments for debate.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman's goal and I think that is a good try, but clearly there is more interest in the Burton amendments, and it appears that with the interest we are only going to be able to get through one amendment if we are going to abide by the House schedule of going back in at 5 p.m., so we will have one more amendment tomorrow if Mr. BURTON decides to offer it.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, my unanimous consent is then 20 minutes on each side, and then if there is an objection, there is an objection.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, continuing my reservation of objection, 20 minutes on each side on each amendment, 20 minutes on each side?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York continue to reserve the right to object or does he withdraw his reservation?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman says ''on our side,'' I understand there are several Republican Members who want to speak against the amendment. If that 20 minutes is limited to everyone who wants to speak against the amendment, we probably do not have enough time, unless I am missing something.

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

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, we have two on this side that I know of. How many does the gentleman have on that side?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, we have three that we know of.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, so we could do it in 25 minutes, 4 minutes each. We could do it in 20 minutes.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Would the gentleman from Indiana Mr. BURTON be limited by those same restraints as the rest of the Members of the House of Representatives?

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

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I think the Rules of the House on division of time, like this is, the proponents and the opponents have an equal amount of time.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, we are trying to work it out equitably so that we can accommodate everybody who would like to speak.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has five Members against one. I think that is fair odds. But I do not want to give up time.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am sure there are others who would like to agree with the gentleman.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my unanimous consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] has withdrawn the request.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I read Cyrano de Bergerac as a boy. And when I read Cyrano de Bergerac, at one point in the play he is challenged by what he thought were 100 of the opponents. He was in the bakery shop and his friends came in. There were 100 of the enemy trying to kill his friends. And he said he thought the lovely Roxanne was in love with him. And he pulled out his sword and he ran to the door and said, only a 100. I do not mind if it is five or ten of my colleagues against me, as long as we have a fair distribution of the time. I feel kind of honored that I would be put in the same category as Cyrano de Bergerac.

Let me get to the point of the debate, talking about on this particular issue.

Mr. Chairman, we talk about tragedies and human rights violations all over the world. Right now, in the news today, they were talking about digging up possibly hundreds, maybe thousands of bodies in Bosnia. And that is a tragedy. That is something we should be very concerned about because human rights violations, wherever they occur, should be brought to the attention of the world and should be stopped.

We reprimand China for its draconian abortion policies and we threaten to stop international military and educational training, IMET, from Indonesia for abuses in East Timor. We talk about the struggles in Bosnia, Croatia, and Serbia that I just alluded to. We even criticize longstanding allies like Turkey for its treatment of its Kurdish citizens without addressing the brutal murders carried out by the PKK, a Kurdish Marxist terrorist organization.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, there is one human rights issue that continues to escape the attention of this administration and this country and some Members of the Congress and especially the media. And that issue involves India and its human rights abuses and the violations against the Sikhs and the Kashmiris and the Christians in Nagaland and the plight of the untouchables, the lowest caste in India's caste system.

Mr. Chairman, the Indian Government is one of the world's worst human rights abusers. You may ask, if that is true, why does not the world know? It is because Amnesty International and the International Red Cross is not allowed into the places where they are perpetrating these atrocities.

□ 1630

In Punjab, in Kashmir, in Nagaland. Let me just tell my colleagues, since 1947, over 200,000 Christians have been killed in Nagaland. I know it is horrible what is going on in Bosnia, and what has gone on in Bosnia. But 200,000 Christians have been killed since 1947 by the Indian Government and their troops in Nagaland since 1947. A quarter of a million, 250,000 Sikhs, have been killed in Punjab between 1984 and 1992, and more since then. Those are the latest numbers we have that we think are accurate. Fifty-three thousand Muslims have been killed in Kashmir since 1988.

For the past 15 years, I have been coming to this well to call attention to Punjab, where the Indian military receives cash bounties for the slaughter of innocent children and, to justify their action, these people are labeled terrorists, these kids. According to our own State Department, the United States State Department, India paid over 41,000 cash bounties to police for killing innocent people from 1991 to 1993 alone. Also in Punjab, Sikhs are picked up in the middle of the night only to be found floating dead in canals with their hands and feet bound together, and there is documentation to that fact, and many are never found.

Recently India's Central Bureau of Investigation, the CBI, told the Supreme Court that it had confirmed nearly 1,000 cases of unidentified bodies that were cremated by their military. They just happened to find 1,000 bodies and burned them up. Where did they come from? I submit they came from the same source that I was talking about just a moment ago, from the Indian troops in Kashmir and Punjab and Nagaland.

It does not get any better in Kashmir. Women, because of their Muslim beliefs, are taken out of their homes in the middle of the night and are gang-raped by Indian troops while their husbands are forced to stay in the House at gunpoint. This is a fact. This is not just me talking. It is a fact.

It was hoped that the new government in Delhi and Punjab would stop the repression which the Indian Supreme Court describes as worse than a genocide. The Indian Supreme Court

describes what is going on as worse than a genocide.

Mr. Chairman, opponents will say that the recent election in Punjab of a Sikh-dominated coalition and the fact that an untouchable is now the President of India is evidence of the new democratic process. But I can tell my colleagues that this new government in Punjab is closely aligned with the authoritarian Prime Minister Gudjaral of India and India's untouchable President is merely a figurehead.

Mr. Chairman, would democracies continue the rampant campaign of genocide? There are 550,000 troops, Indian troops in Punjab and 550,000 Indian troops in Kashmir.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has expired.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, people are afraid to go outside at night and they worry about that knock on the door that we remember back during the horrible perils of Hitler in World War II when the Jews were taken out in the middle of the night, never to be seen again. That is going on today in Punjab and Kashmir and Nagaland in India. It is not the Indian people. We are not taking issue with the Indian people. It is the repressive policies of the Indian military and the Indian government.

On July 12, 1997, just about a month ago, a month and a half, in Bombay, 33 Dalits, those are called black untouchables that I would say to my friends in the Black Caucus, they ought to listen to this, black untouchables, were killed by the Indian police during demonstrations. Thirty-three of them were killed. On July 8, 1997, 36 people were killed in a train bombing in Punjab and 2 ministers of the Punjab government have blamed the Punjab police. The bombing occurred a day after 9 policemen were convicted of murder. Nine policemen were convicted of murder a day after this bombing occurred.

On March 15, 1997, a death squad picked up Kashmir Singh, an opposition party member. He was thrown in a van, tortured and murdered. Finally his bullet ridden body was dumped on the roadside. These military forces operate beyond the law and with complete impunity and the world does not know because they will not let human rights groups in there, they will not let the international Red Cross in there, they will not let TV in there because they do not want the world to see. We heard about Bosnia, we heard about Somalia, we heard about Ethiopia when Mengistu was there, but we do not hear about what is going on over there because they will not let us in.

The Indian lobby has a lot of friends in the Congress who are going to be their spokesmen today and they will be speaking up for them. I presume I will be the only one speaking for the people in Kashmir, Punjab and Nagaland, but I do not mind that. We should not support a government that condones widespread abuses with our tax dollars. All I am asking for is to send a signal. Cut 25 percent of the development aid we are sending to India. We probably should not be sending it there anyhow, any of it. But at least cut 25 percent to send a very strong signal that we do not support a government that allows those human rights abuses to take place.

Mr. Chairman, the Sikhs, the Muslims, the Christians, the untouchables, and the women of India are desperately looking to this Congress for help. The time has come for action. It is time for America to take a stand and to pass this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Clinton administration has requested $56 million this year for development aid to India. India already receives $51 million. That means a $4.5 to $5 million increase from last year. My amendment would not allow more than $42 million to go. That is a 25-percent cut. That is a fair figure, and it sends a strong signal.

I would like to point out one more thing. We have here a picture, and this is the latest picture of what is going on in India. This is the tortured body of an unidentified Sikh. The Indian police have literally scalped this man. It is a young fellow, the police have seared his body with a hot iron rod and they cut off his fingers. That is what is going on today and that is what my colleagues are going to be saying does not occur. But I am telling Members it is here, it is happening. Women are being gang-raped in Kashmir because they are Muslim and they know if they are defiled, they will not be married, because of their religion and they take them out and gang-rape them and hold their husbands inside. It is a horrible thing that is going on over there and we keep giving aid to this country. This country has not been a friend of the United States in the past. During the cold war they supported the Soviet Union. They do not vote with us in the United Nations. Yet we continue to give them support. We ought to send a signal to them, at least on this one issue. Human rights violations, for God's sake, should not be tolerated anyplace in the world, and it is going on by the hundreds of thousands over there. We need to send them a signal.

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

Mr. Chairman, the previous speaker, the gentleman from Indiana, asked the question, who will speak for the people who are the victims of violence in Punjab and Kashmir and other places. Let me assure the gentleman that I do and we all do because we decry violence and we decry the abuses of human beings anywhere for any reason. But what the gentleman seeks to do is to punish an entire nation, the largest democracy in the world collectively, for random acts of a few that take place. He brings us one picture and cites hundreds of thousands. How do we condemn a whole nation because of that? That is nothing but India bashing, Mr. Chairman. Do we condemn our own Government because people put a bounty on people's heads in Arizona and people moved in and murdered them? Is that the fault of the whole American Government and the American people?

I would like to cite an article that appeared in the Hill newspaper. It is a quote by a gentleman of the House who shows an unbelievable amount of understanding when talking about the Government of Turkey and he says, ''When you have military conflicts,'' and the gentleman here is talking about insurgencies taking place against existing governments, he says, ''When you have military conflicts, you're bound to have unfortunate things happen,'' he said. Continuing the quote, ''People get killed, they're bombed and shot. These things happen,'' he said understandingly and justified, ''incidental and anecdotal things that happen during these times of conflict.'' Who was the gentleman who said that, so understanding of the Government of Turkey? It is the very same gentleman from Indiana who just took the well and offered this amendment. How can he justify it in the case of one country and oppose it when it comes to another country?

The gentleman offers up four amendments. Dr. Alukh mysteriously appears in the Halls of the House, in the gallery, it happens each and every time, and the India bashing begins. This, Mr. Chairman, is totally unacceptable. This is not the way two great democracies view each other or treat each other. The gentleman complains of human rights abuses, but he ignores the genuine progress that India has made on this question. According to the State Department report which he only quotes in part, it says ''India made further progress in resolving human rights problems.'' The same report notes that newspapers and magazines ''regularly publish investigative reports and allegations of government wrongdoing, and the press as a whole champions human rights and criticizes'' whenever there is a government lapse. Beyond this, the Indian Government has appointed a National Human Rights Commission with powers to investigate and to recommend policy changes and punishment and compensation in cases of incidental police abuse wherever it might happen to take place. Again in the State Department report that the gentleman quoted only in part, ''The NHRC continued to enlarge its useful role in addressing the patterns of abuse, as well as specific abuses.''

In particular, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is concerned about human rights in the states of Punjab and Jammu and Kashmir. Last year there was an election in Punjab where 65 percent of the eligible voters turned out in a Sikh-dominated government. This is the very minority that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]

claims the Indian Government oppresses. There were also elections in Kashmir which restored elected government there for the first time in 6 years.

I think, Mr. Chairman, what we have discovered, with the unwitting help of the gentleman from Indiana, is that India is a fully functioning, mature democracy with a free press, with civilian control of the military, with an independent judiciary, and very active political parties and civic associations. It seems to me that the oldest democracy in the world should not be sanctioning the largest. That is not the way democracies treat each other.

In addition to India's thriving democratic institutions, the current united front government led by Prime Minister Gudjaral has pledged, as has the finance minister with whom the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and myself met with only a week ago, has pledged to continue the economic reforms of the past 6 years. These reforms have provided enormous opportunities for United States business and, in fact, the United States is now India's largest overseas investor, its biggest trading partner and its preferred source of high-technology.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a deliberate and specific attempt to stigmatize India at a point where the relationship between the world's two great democracies has flowered. I urge all of my colleagues to stand and to defeat this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I listened to the comments by the gentleman from Indiana. I do not know if he is going to be the only speaker in favor of the amendment. I certainly hope he is. But if he is the only one, it is because he is basically giving the House outdated, exaggerated, and inaccurate information about the situation in India. He said that India is not a friend of the United States. Just the opposite is true. India is the world's largest democracy. India, last year, had the largest democratic election, the largest number of people participating in a democratic process in the history of the world as far as we know. He talks about the signal that this might send. What signal is sent by this body if we were to pass an amendment that chastises the world's largest democracy, a country that seeks every day to be our friend more and more, and which at the same time over the last few years has established a National Human Rights Commission that has been seeking out any violations of human rights, that has brought people to trial, that probably now sets an example not only for South Asia and for Asia but for the rest of the world in terms of its going after and fettering out human rights violations. It would send a terrible signal to the rest of the world if this body, the greatest democracy in the world, if this House of Representatives, were to chastise India for the things that it has accomplished in the last few years.

I just want to say, in the past the gentleman from Indiana has criticized India on human rights. Let me give my colleagues some information. The independent National Human Rights Commission with unprecedented powers has been in operation now for 3 years. Some of the members have been here to talk to us as Members of our House of Representatives. The commission has been lauded by many international agencies, including our own State Department, for its aggressiveness and independence. The chairman of India's National Human Rights Commission has met with representatives of Asia Watch, Amnesty International and the International Red Cross. The steps taken by India to remedy human rights problems is far superior to any of the efforts of India's neighbors, in particular, Pakistan and China which I think the gentleman from Indiana mentioned.

□ 1645

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana is suggesting that his amendment would put pressure on the Government of India to improve its record on human rights. In fact, if this amendment were to become law, it would greatly reduce America's ability to positively influence the Indian Government in any way. Punitive measures like this amendment only serve to isolate the Indian Government, give aid and comfort to political forces in India who oppose closer ties with the United States, and ultimately set back the process of political and economic reform in India.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned that this debate over human rights in India is focusing entirely on one side of the issue, and what is lost is the fact that terrorist organizations operating within India's borders pose a constant ongoing threat to peace, stability and, yes, to human rights.

Militant separatist groups often operate with no accountability. Calling themselves freedom fighters, these organizations reserve onto themselves the right to strike at civilian targets in India with impunity. Furthermore, many of the militant organizations receive support, both moral and financial, as well as arms and training, from other nations, specifically Pakistan which has frequently been linked to terrorist organizations in India in a direct attempt to destabilize its neighbor, and under these conditions imposing punishment by this House on the Government of India will have the unmistakable effect of encouraging and emboldening these groups which seek by violent means to pursue their separatist agenda. This is not the type of behavior that this House of Representatives should be condoning.

I visited India earlier this year, Mr. Chairman, and I had the opportunity to see firsthand why this amendment would be a disaster. First, my colleague from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN] talked about the situation in the Indian State of Punjab. Earlier this year the people of Punjab held elections in which the Sikh-dominated Akali Dal Party was swept into power. Voter turnout was 67 percent, better than we generally do here in the United States in most of our elections.

In the Punjabi capital of Chandigarh, I met with the newly elected Chief Minister of the State of Punjab, Mr. Prakash Singh Badal. He is a staunch defender of the Sikh people, but he is also deeply committed to working within India's democratic political system to advocate the political, economic, and social interests of his state and of the Sikh people.

He expressed his rejection of the separatist movement which has caused so much violence in recent years. His governing coalition includes a predominantly Hindu party, an indication that the Indian people want to work across ethnic and religious lines for the betterment of their entire society. This is the reality in today's Punjab. This is the reality in today's India. Everyone is working together to try to improve the situation. Human rights violations are being fettered out.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana's statements are not based on the accurate information of India today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the people of India have just celebrated their 50th anniversary of independence and democracy. It takes a special effort for Americans to imagine when our democracy was only 50 years old and the great hurdles we had to overcome to perfect our legal, political, economic, and social system.

India today is the world's largest democracy—950 million people. India is a multireligious, multiethnic society actively seeking to build a common national identity and overcome religious and ethnic conflict. In that half century India has struggled to overcome the legacy of feudalism followed by colonialism and all of the problems of underdevelopment and unequal development, including problems of population growth, capital formation, technology development, and infrastructure. They have shaped all of the basic institutions of a democratic system including, perhaps most significantly, many independent, nongovernmental institutions and organizations dedicated to involving and empowering people.

I rise here today in support of aid to India. Throughout my public career, I have worked with the Asian-Indian community.

My strong relationship with the Asian-Indian community in Chicago has afforded me the opportunity to meet with Indian officials who have visited Chicago and this interaction has helped me to understand how important democracy, economic development, and human rights are to India.

While the cold war no longer exists, our relations with South Asia must not be tainted by the cold war legacy.

There is a constant state of tension with neighbors like China and Pakistan—who have large and powerful militaries. Several states in India including Punjab and Kashmir have, in essence, been involved in a low-intensity war involving terrorism with foreign support as evidenced by the recent bombing of a train in Punjab resulting in 36 deaths. Despite the difficulties, India has proven that she will not tolerate violations of democracy and has acted to punish those guilty of violations of law and to reduce any such violations in the future.

The United States has become India's largest trading partner—now approaching $9.5 billion per year—and her largest investor. India has adjusted her tax policies to further encourage trade and has become a significant player in many fields including computer science.

Yet India is still a country in need of assistance and development especially in the most underdeveloped regions needing assistance with health and educational programs. These programs involve financial and technical support from the United States which is matched by volunteer equity on the part of the people of India. These program have proven themselves to be successful in addressing the problems of underdevelopment and also as powerful instrument of international understanding, communication, and trust.

It makes sense to continue our commitment to India. India is proving a success in its economic development and is a role model for other developing countries. We can take this opportunity now to improve our foreign policy relations with India. We can illustrate how the United States is a reliable friend and model.

A vote against India in this House, is not in the best interest of the United States and its reputation as a world leader. Therefore, I urge that we oppose any and all amendments that would single out India for a limitation on development assistance.

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

Since its independence 50 years ago, India has made tremendous progress in a number of key areas of United States foreign policy interest. First of all, it shares with the United States the values and institutions of free and democratic nations. Just last year, India held the largest democratic election in world history, an election that was universally regarded as free and fair, was contested by multiple political parties, and was scrutinized by an extensive free press.

Since the end of the cold war, India has embarked on an ambitious program of economic liberalization and market reforms. These reforms have helped bring the United States and India closer together in a cooperative spirit and have helped the United States to become India's largest trading partner.

In addition to progress at home, India also continues to improve its relations with its neighbors. Over the past year, Prime Minister Gujral, in an outreach effort begun during his tenure as Minister for External Affairs, has been at the forefront of initiatives to improve bilateral relations between India and its neighbors Bangladesh, Nepal, and Sri Lanka.

There also has been an important breakthrough this year in improving bilateral relations between India and Pakistan, a major goal of United States foreign policy in South Asia. In March, the Prime Minister of each country agreed to resume high-level talks which had been cut off since 1994. I was pleased that Prime Minister Gujral took the initiative to embark on such discussions so soon after assuming office. The two Prime Ministers met during the Asian summit in May of this year and agreement has already been reached on the establishment of working groups to explore solutions to the outstanding disputes between the two countries. Instead of undermining this important progress, U.S. foreign policy ought to be aimed at extending support for and encouraging the efforts being made by the prime minister of each nation to seek solutions to longstanding bilateral disputes.

Far from withdrawing from our growing cooperation and increasingly improving relations with India, as the Burton amendment would have us do, now is the time for the United States to deepen its commitment to strengthening relations between our two countries. As we commemorate the 50th anniversary of India's independence this year, United States relations with India should move forward, not backward. I urge all Members to vote against this amendment.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise against the Burton amendment, which would limit development assistance to India.

Mr. Speaker, it is 1 year later and we are still fighting the same fight. We defeated a similar amendment last year by an overwhelming margin—296 to 127.

I am proud to be a member of the Congressional India Caucus, and was pleased to travel to India recently.

On August 15, we celebrated India's 50th anniversary of democratic self rule. Passage of this amendment will have a devastating effect on the growing relationship between India and the United States.

The United States is now India's largest overseas investor and its biggest trading partner.

Since 1991, major Fortune 500 companies have invested in India. The Commerce Department has designated India as one of the most important ''Big Emerging Markets.''

Mr. Speaker, American businesses recognize the importance of a strong relationship with India.

The gentleman from Indiana appears to have a noble purpose—to focus the attention of the House on human rights abuses. But despite his intentions, the amendment will do great harm to the very people it purports to help.

Yes, India has had problems with human rights in the past. But this nation—this great democracy—has taken exceptionally strong steps forward.

In fact, India's Human Rights Commission, headed by a former Supreme Court Justice, has been hailed by the State Department for its ''significant progress in resolving human rights problems.''

Freezing developmental assistance would hurt the poorest of the poor in India. The amendment would directly undermine the stated objectives of India's democratically elected Prime Minister to improve the living conditions of the country's poorest citizens. And finally, this amendment would be an enormous blow to United States-Indian relations at the very moment when we should be strengthening ties between our two democracies.

Last year, India held a critical and historic election—300 million people went to the polls in what the New York Times' William Safire called ''the most breathtaking example of government by people in the history of the world.''

The world's most populous democracy proved that its most powerful weapon is the ballot, not the bullet.

We must not pass a punitive anti-India amendment on the heels of this election.

United States-India relations are strong. American businesses are flourishing in India.

Let's send the world's most populous democracy the right message.

Let's vote for progress in India.

Let's vote for democracy.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the Burton amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition today to the amendment offered by my colleague from Indiana. I must admit that I fail to understand why this esteemed Member, who has not even taken the time to travel to India to see her progress first hand, insists on demonizing an important ally.

I was fortunate, over the August recess, to join Chairman GILMAN on a House International Relations Committee Codel to Asia. We were in India on the 50th anniversary of her independence. I saw first hand India's thriving democracy, independent, nongovernmental institutions, a raucous free press, an independent judiciary, a welcoming, albeit suspicious economic sector, and a friendly, English-speaking people who are schooled in democratic values and who both value and demand their personal liberties. I saw a country of almost a billion people virtually begging for closer ties and friendship with the United States.

I realize that India is not perfect. I continued to be concerned with India's nuclear proliferation, human rights abuses, strife in Kashmir, and the occasional lack of hospitality toward foreign investment and infrastructure-building projects.

But as I have said many times in the past, we can have more influence using a carrot with the Indians than with a stick. Considering some of the other countries in the region with whom we are seeking better ties, India looks like a bargain to me. Oppose the Burton amendment.

Ms. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I rose before this committee over a year ago and I now stand before you today, once again to strongly urge a vote against this amendment.

The Burton amendment, whether it freezes, cuts, or caps foreign assistance to India, is a step in the wrong direction. The new Government of India is moving at a rapid pace to strengthen its ties with the United States and the world.

The economic and diplomatic relationship between the United States, the world's oldest democracy, and India, the world's largest democracy, would receive a harmful blow with successful passage of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, Government of India has been on a constant pace of change since

1991. The 1996 election featured the world's largest voter turnout, practically free of violence. The 1997 election featured the victory of Prime Minister I.K. Gujral, who is of Punjabi descent, the very region that Mr. BURTON claims human rights violations are taking place.

On the subject of the State of Punjab, the Sikh minority dominated the ruling party in open democratic elections. Voter turnout was 65 percent.

Prime Minister Gujral, in his first month of leadership, engaged in direct talks with newly elected Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif of Pakistan. A hotline phone system was established in a commitment to bring peace to the two nations.

So let us as Members of Congress not view the Government of India as being callous to these alleged human rights violations. India has made great strides in their battle to bring together the States of Kashmir, Jammu, Nagaland, and Punjab.

Recent reports by the U.S. State Department declare that India has ''made further progress in resolving human rights problems.''

It would be false and misdirected to say that India is not our friend. U.S. business in India has grown at an astonishing rate of nearly 50 percent a year since 1991, with the United States becoming India's largest trading partner and largest investor.

As India prepares to celebrate its 50th anniversary of democratic self rule, let us not break the ties that we have so diligently strived to assemble. Vote ''no'' on the Burton amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2159) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

FURTHER LIMITATION OF AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2159, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2159, no further amendments shall be in order in the Committee of the Whole except the amendment Number 1 in House Report 105–184, and the amendment to that amendment, under the terms of the order of the House of July 24, 1997, and the pending amendment, Number 38, offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], and the amendment, Number 40, offered by Mr. BURTON.

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

Mr. ACKERMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is it my understanding that under the two Burton amendments there is no limitation on the time? We will be under the 5-minute rule?

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

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to double check amendments 38 and 40. Now 38 is the one that we are on?

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, that is the one we are on now, and 40 is the one the gentleman from Indiana indicated he wanted to introduce.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

VACATING REQUEST FOR RECORDED VOTE ON BEREUTER AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2159, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the request for a recorded vote on the Bereuter amendment, Number 53, on H.R. 2159.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] prevails by voice vote.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2209, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill, H.R. 2209, making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. SERANNO

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SERRANO moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H.R. 2209, be instructed to agree to the position in Senate amendment numbered 1 with respect to the account ''Joint Committee on Taxation'' providing not more than a 4.64 percent increase for the Joint Committee on Taxation compared to an 8 percent increase in the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO] and the other gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH] will each control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO].

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my motion would simply direct the House conferees to do the fiscally responsible thing when we take up the funding level for the Joint Committee on Taxation and agree to the Senate position. The Senate bill would give the Joint Committee on Taxation a tidy 4.6-percent increase over last year. We think that it is more than fair.

The House bill, in my view, was overly generous in providing an 8-percent increase for this office. In comparison, in the name of fiscal discipline, both bills provide increases of only 3.6 percent for the operation of the House and less than 2 percent for such vital agencies as a Congressional Budget Office and the Government Printing Office [GPO]. The House bill actually cuts funding for the General Accounting Office by $8 million below last year.

In light of these funding levels, it is inappropriate and inconsistent to turn around and reward one office with an 8-percent increase. Moreover, the justification for this increase does not stand up to any reasonable level of scrutiny. I think the American people could question why we would increase the staff of this office the year after work is completed on a major tax bill, especially when at the same time we are cutting GAO whose main purpose is to look for wasteful Federal spending and save taxpayers money. If the existing staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation could operate effectively this year when they worked on what we are told over and over again was a major historic tax bill, one would think they could manage the work load during a more routine year without all this extra staff.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are simply calling on the House to be more consistent in imposing fiscal austerity within the legislative branch. We should treat all offices the same, not give special treatment to a favored few.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this motion.

The intent of the motion is to eliminate the five additional full-time