

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, May 9, 1984

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. James Lane, St. Brendan Church, Dorchester, Mass., offered the following prayer:

Lord, in this moment of reflection and prayer, we turn to You seeking Your divine assistance and guidance. All of our earthly wisdom, our natural talents, our admirable achievements, count as nothing without Your enduring support and Your loving care.

We commend to You, Father, our Nation, its leaders, its legislators, as they meet to insure the liberties and address the needs of all its people. Give to them the time and the talent to accomplish the works You have called them to administer. Bless them with a faith and courage which no person or thing can eclipse or extinguish.

May the blessings invoked centuries ago by Your faithful witness Patrick be ours in abundance this day and every day:

That we may have God's power to guide us.

That we may have God's might to uphold us.

That we may have God's wisdom to teach us.

That we may have God's eyes to watch over us.

That we may have God's ear to hear us.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 361, nays 23, answered "present" 4, not voting 45, as follows:

(Roll No. 133)

YEAS—361

Ackerman	Donnelly	Kramer
Addabbo	Dorgan	LaPalce
Akaka	Dowdy	Lagomarsino
Albosta	Dreier	Lantos
Anderson	Duncan	Latta
Andrews (TX)	Dwyer	Leach
Annunzio	Early	Leath
Anthony	Eckart	Lehman (CA)
Archer	Edgar	Lehman (FL)
Aspin	Edwards (CA)	Leland
AuCoin	Edwards (OK)	Lent
Badham	English	Levin
Barnard	Erdreich	Levine
Barnes	Evans (IL)	Levitas
Bartlett	Fazio	Lewis (CA)
Bates	Feighan	Lewis (FL)
Bedell	Fiedler	Lipinski
Beilenson	Fish	Livingston
Bennett	Flippo	Lloyd
Bereuter	Florio	Loeffler
Berman	Foglietta	Long (LA)
Bevill	Foley	Long (MD)
Biaggi	Ford (TN)	Lott
Billakis	Fowler	Lowery (CA)
Billey	Frank	Lujan
Boehlert	Franklin	Luken
Boland	Frenzel	Lundine
Boner	Frost	Lungren
Bonker	Fuqua	Mack
Borski	Garcia	MacKay
Bosco	Gaydos	Madigan
Boucher	Gekas	Markey
Boxer	Gephardt	Marlenee
Breaux	Gibbons	Marriott
Britt	Gilman	Martin (IL)
Brooks	Gingrich	Martin (NY)
Broomfield	Glickman	Martinez
Brown (CA)	Gonzalez	Matsui
Brown (CO)	Gore	Mavroules
Broyhill	Gradison	Mazzoli
Bryant	Gray	McCain
Burton (CA)	Green	McCandless
Burton (IN)	Gregg	McCloskey
Byron	Guarini	McCollum
Campbell	Gunderson	McCurdy
Carney	Hall (OH)	McDade
Carper	Hall, Ralph	McEwen
Carr	Hall, Sam	McGrath
Chandler	Hamilton	McHugh
Chappell	Hammerschmidt	McKernan
Chapple	Hartnett	McKinney
Cheney	Hatcher	McNulty
Clarke	Hayes	Mica
Clinger	Hefner	Michel
Coats	Hertel	Mikulski
Coelho	Hightower	Miller (CA)
Coleman (MO)	Hiler	Mineta
Coleman (TX)	Hillis	Minish
Collins	Holt	Molinari
Conable	Hopkins	Mollohan
Conte	Horton	Montgomery
Conyers	Howard	Moody
Cooper	Hoyer	Moore
Corcoran	Hubbard	Moorhead
Coughlin	Huckaby	Morrison (CT)
Courter	Hughes	Mrazek
Coyne	Hutto	Murphy
Craig	Hyde	Murtha
Crane, Daniel	Jeffords	Myers
D'Amours	Jenkins	Natcher
Dannemeyer	Johnson	Nelson
Darden	Jones (OK)	Nichols
Daschle	Jones (TN)	Nielson
Daub	Kasich	Nowak
Davis	Kastenmeier	O'Brien
de la Garza	Kennelly	Oakar
Dellums	Kildee	Obey
Derrick	Kindness	Olin
DeWine	Kieciska	Ortiz
Dicks	Kogovsek	Oxley
Dingell	Kolter	Packard
Dixon	Kostmayer	Panetta

Parris	Schneider	Tauke
Pashayan	Schulze	Tauzin
Patman	Schumer	Thomas (CA)
Patterson	Seiberling	Thomas (GA)
Paul	Sensenbrenner	Torres
Pease	Shannon	Torricelli
Pepper	Sharp	Towns
Perkins	Shaw	Vandergriff
Petri	Shelby	Vento
Pickle	Shumway	Volkmer
Porter	Shuster	Vucanovich
Price	Siljander	Walgren
Pritchard	Simon	Watkins
Pursell	Sisisky	Waxman
Quillen	Skeen	Weaver
Rahall	Skellton	Weber
Rangel	Slattery	Weiss
Ratchford	Smith (FL)	Wheat
Ray	Smith (IA)	Whitehurst
Regula	Smith (NE)	Whitley
Reid	Smith (NJ)	Whittaker
Richardson	Smith, Denny	Whitten
Ridge	Smith, Robert	Williams (OH)
Rinaldo	Snowe	Wilson
Ritter	Snyder	Winn
Robinson	Solarz	Wirth
Rodino	Spratt	Wise
Roe	Staggers	Wolf
Rogers	Stangeland	Wolpe
Rose	Stark	Wortley
Rostenkowski	Stenholm	Wright
Roth	Stokes	Wyden
Roukema	Stratton	Wyllie
Rowland	Studds	Yates
Rudd	Stump	Yatron
Russo	Sundquist	Young (MO)
Sawyer	Swift	Zschau
Schaefer	Synar	
Scheuer	Tallon	

NAYS—23

Clay	Harkin	Roemer
Crane, Philip	Hawkins	Sabo
Dickinson	Jacobs	Schroeder
Durbin	Lowry (WA)	Sikorski
Emerson	Miller (OH)	Solomon
Evans (IA)	Mitchell	Walker
Gejdenson	Penny	Young (AK)
Goodling	Roberts	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4

Dymally	Ottinger
Oberstar	St Germain

NOT VOTING—45

Alexander	Fields	Martin (NC)
Andrews (NC)	Ford (MI)	Moakley
Applegate	Gramm	Morrison (WA)
Bateman	Hall (IN)	Neal
Bethune	Hance	Owens
Boggs	Hansen (ID)	Roybal
Bonior	Hansen (UT)	Savage
Crockett	Harrison	Spence
Daniel	Heftel	Taylor
Downey	Hunter	Traxler
Dyson	Ireland	Udall
Edwards (AL)	Jones (NC)	Valentine
Erlenborn	Kaptur	Vander Jagt
Fascell	Kazen	Williams (MT)
Ferraro	Kemp	Young (FL)

□ 1210

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

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3240. An act to authorize the President of the United States to present on behalf of Congress a specially struck medal to the widow of Roy Wilkins.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2100. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to sell ammunition for use for avalanche-control purposes;

S.J. Res. 258. Joint resolution to designate the week of June 24 through June 30, 1984, as "National Safety in the Workplace Week";

S.J. Res. 260. Joint resolution designating the week beginning on November 11, 1984, as "National Blood Pressure Awareness Week";

S.J. Res. 273. Joint resolution to designate the week of August 5, 1984, through August 11, 1984, as "Smokey Bear Week";

S.J. Res. 274. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate May 6, 1984, as "National Nurse Recognition Day";

S.J. Res. 279. Joint resolution to designate the week of November 11, 1984, through November 17, 1984, as "Women in Agriculture Week"; and

S.J. Res. 283. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate the week of May 7, 1984, as "National Arson Awareness Week."

FATHER JAMES H. LANE

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

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, today we welcome to the House, Father James H. Lane, who offered the prayer a moment ago.

Father Lane is the pastor of St. Brendan's Church in the Dorchester neighborhood of Boston.

This marks the eighth year that Father Lane has brought the graduating class of St. Brendan's Elementary School to Washington.

This annual visit to the Nation's Capital is just one example of the extra measure of effort and enthusiasm Father Lane has brought to his work on behalf of the youth, the poor, the troubled, and all segments of his parish and of our community.

He has served at St. Brendan's since 1969. Two years ago, an unprecedented outpouring of sentiment from the members of his parish led the late Cardinal Medeiros to name him pastor.

Father Lane also served for 10 years as the chaplain of the Boston Police Department.

On behalf of the Massachusetts delegation, it is a pleasure to welcome him today as our guest chaplain.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS TO SIT TODAY DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs be allowed to sit this afternoon during the 5-minute rule on foreign aid for the markup of H.R. 5336 and H.R. 5371, this having been cleared with the minority.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION TO SIT ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 9, AND THURSDAY, MAY 10, 1984, DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works and Transportation be permitted to sit during the 5-minute rule in the House on Wednesday, May 9, and Thursday, May 10, 1984.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on my special order yesterday concerning the late President Harry Truman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 498) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 498

Resolved, That Representative THOMAS J. BLILEY, JR., of Virginia, be and is hereby elected to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT OF THE NEW IRELAND FORUM

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Friends of Ireland in the Congress, I am encouraged by the report of the New Ireland Forum and we strongly urge the British Government as well as all political leaders in Northern Ireland to review its findings and recommendations with an open mind and an open heart.

We regard the report as the first real breakthrough on the complex issue of Northern Ireland since the collapse of the Sunningdale Agreement in 1974. For the first time since the present troubles began, the leaders of the diverse nationalist political parties in both parts of Ireland have spoken together in their condemnation of the violence, in their willingness to put aside past passions and divisions, and in their support for a new Ireland achieved by consent.

Above all, the report is a historic—and hopeful—document because of the unprecedented commitment made by nationalist leaders in Ireland, north and south, to provide full and fair protection for the rights and aspirations of the Unionist community in the north. By extending this olive branch and developing a specific agenda for peace, the forum has embraced an indispensable dimension in the process of reconciliation; we urge leaders on all sides to encourage this process by working together to create a framework for future progress.

As Friends of Ireland in the Congress, we believe that the United States has a constructive role to play in achieving lasting peace and stability in Northern Ireland. We renew our call to all Americans to reject the path of violence and those who advocate it.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished majority whip yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the distinguished Republican leader, the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my good friend the majority whip in bringing to your attention—and the attention of our colleagues—the publication of the report of the New Ireland Forum.

Two years ago I met in my office with a delegation of All-Party Parliamentarians from the Irish Republic. I listened to their informed and concerned presentation of the need for peace and justice throughout Ireland. I was impressed by their deep commitment to a process of reconciliation between the two great Irish traditions.

We in the United States have a legitimate interest in the Northern Ireland issue. There are serious questions of human rights. And there is a threat to European security we cannot ignore.

The New Ireland Forum presents a new agenda for discussion. I hope it

gets the attention it deserves. I commend the gentleman for bringing it to the attention of the Members of the House.

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentleman.

MARTIN FELDSTEIN'S DEPARTURE WILL LEAVE GAP AT THE WHITE HOUSE

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

Mr. RATCHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that groupthink has not set in at the White House. With the resignation of economic adviser Martin Feldstein, the administration has lost a lone voice sounding the call for reduction of the deficit, the one person who was willing to tell it like it is. He refused to ignore one of the Nation's most pressing problems—the ballooning Federal debt and the devastating impact it can have on interest rates and the economy.

Mr. Speaker, I just hope that honesty and integrity are not the reasons for Mr. Feldstein's departure. He attempted to bring balance and realism into the budget debate at the White House, and in doing so, fulfilled the mandate of the Council of Economic Advisers. If the Chairman of the Council is unable to speak freely, then frankly the Council might just as well be abolished, for it will no longer serve any real purpose.

Mr. Speaker, Martin Feldstein will be missed in Washington, but I am sure that we will be hearing from him again.

□ 1230

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, when Martin Feldstein urged Latin American countries to devalue their currencies yesterday, he made no mention of the scheduled devaluation that Mexico is undergoing already. He also skirted the obvious underside to this economically bitter pill by ignoring the tremendous suffering and dislocation that devaluation causes.

In the case of Mexico, this dislocation is not contained within its borders. It extends to the United States and can be felt in every border community from California to Texas. Mexico like many other Latin American countries, has made great efforts to come to terms with its debt, and is pragmatically undergoing devaluation and cuts in vital social services in order to meet its obligations to the international financial community.

Before we pronounce sentence on the reality of Latin American economics we should consider the human element, not just within those countries but inside our own. There are hundreds and thousands of people along the border of the United States that depend on a healthy commercial relationship with Mexico. When we make pronouncements about other countries economic problems in defiance of our own deficit and trade problems, we are ignoring the fundamental truth that our economy is the driving force behind those in Central and Latin American and that in some senses we are responsible for their difficulties. The administration would do well to take a closer look within its own borders for solutions to the problem of international debt.

INTRODUCTION OF THE AMERICAN PASSBOOK SAVINGS BILL

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

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, the prime interest rate rose another half point yesterday. High interest rates threaten our homes, our businesses, our farms, for all are heavily financed today. If home buyers cannot afford mortgage rates, homes are not built and countless thousands of Americans go unemployed. If small businesses cannot afford commercial loans, then small business, the largest provider of jobs in America, is handicapped in that great effort. If farmers cannot afford to finance their equipment, seed, feed, and stocks as well as the very land which produces America's bounty, then farmers are faced with financial ruin. We, all of us, need lower interest rates.

The American passbook savings bill, which I will offer next week, will provide a source of low cost money for America's savings and lending institutions. By allowing Americans to earn substantial tax free interest in passbook accounts, we can again permit American lenders to provide lower cost mortgages to our Nation's homeowners, farmers, and small businesses. America cannot afford high interest rates. Getting interest rates down ought to be one of our Nation's highest priorities.

THE SOVIET OLYMPIC NONSURPRISE

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

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat amazing to me that yesterday's announcement by the Soviets that they will not be sending a team to

the Los Angeles Olympics. It is a purely political move in retaliation for our decision not to go to the Moscow Olympics and a recognition of the sad state of United States-Soviet relations. In sum, it should have been the biggest nonsurprise of the week.

As far as a U.S. reaction, the best thing we can do is give them a nonresponse. We need to assume a position that makes their nonparticipation their loss, not ours. We need to let them know that the games will go on and we can only assume the real reason they are not coming is because they fear defeat or defections.

We also need to show we are big enough to recognize we made a mistake in 1980 by letting politics enter into the Olympics and we are serious about ignoring politics in the conduct of the games this summer.

The Olympics is not the real issue, however. The U.S.S.R. and the United States are locked in a dangerous, nonsensical cycle of hate and fear. This is yet another example of how much work is needed to break that cycle; until we do, it will continue to feed on itself.

THE RUSSIANS AREN'T COMING, THE RUSSIANS AREN'T COMING

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I fail to understand why there is so much concern about the Soviet Union's decision not to participate in this year's Olympic games. I feel badly only for the other athletes of the world who will not have the opportunity to face Russian athletes. I do not feel that anything else is lost by the Russians staying home.

What concerns me the most are statements by some Olympic officials and others who indicate that they will try to get the Soviets to change their minds. That is exactly what the Soviets want this country to do—kiss their hammer and sickle.

It has only been in recent years that the Soviet have even competed in the Olympic games. And the games in Los Angeles will still be a great event if the Communist athletes stay home.

Instead of begging the Russians to take part in the games, we should make certain that their wishes are respected and immediately move to deny visas to any Russian Olympic athlete. Such a move would prevent those who would seek to place the good of a 2-week sporting event above the interests of our country from playing into the hands of the Russians.

REPORT OF THE NEW IRELAND FORUM

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

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the 104-member Bipartisan Ad Hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs, I wish to express my support for the report issued last week by the New Ireland Forum, most especially its main recommendation, the call for a unitary state for Ireland.

While I do believe the report provides an important framework for a future political solution—I was and am troubled over the fact that the forum's composition was not fully reflective of all segments of political thought in either Northern Ireland or the Republic. This flaw must be remedied in any and all future steps which may be taken to implement the recommendations of the report.

I wish to salute the participants in the forum for their contribution to the final report. I wish to pay a special tribute to the Honorable Charles J. Haughey, T.D., the former Prime Minister of Ireland whose singular leadership insured that the call for a united Ireland emerged as the main recommendation of the report.

I also wish to strongly criticize the Reverend Ian Paisley for comments attributed to him yesterday in an article in the New York Times. In response to a question about the New Ireland Forum report, Paisley pledged "fierce resistance" to a united Ireland. When asked if he meant violence he was quoted as saying "it could come to that." This type of inflammatory rhetoric makes a mockery of the process now underway to move toward a political rather than a military solution. Reverend Paisley seems content to be forever part of the problem in Northern Ireland rather than the solution.

AN INVESTMENT IN DEMOCRACY

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, dodge a bullet to vote? Stand in long lines to vote? Walk 6 miles to vote?

We would not do those things in the United States, but it happened Sunday in El Salvador. I know, I was there.

A Sunday on the road to democracy. Not perfect, but as impressive a political demonstration as I have ever seen.

What should we do now to help El Salvador? Napoleon Duarte, the left-of-center President-elect, asks in a letter you received yesterday for adequate economic and military assistance from the American Government. He writes as follows:

I have pledged to establish peace and justice in El Salvador through dialogue with all citizens who wish to lay down their arms and their system of violence and participate in our new democratic process.

Please help the people of El Salvador and contribute simultaneously to the security and stability of our hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues, do not turn your back on El Salvador. Support a reasonable balance of economic and military aid with conditions for human rights. It is an investment important to every American. It is simply an investment in democracy.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO PROHIBIT INTRODUCTION OF AMERICAN COMBAT FORCES INTO CENTRAL AMERICA

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

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 years, the Reagan administration has substituted force for diplomacy and negotiations in Central America. Senior administration officials acknowledge that contingency plans are being made for sending American combat troops to the region. U.S. aircraft provide combat support in El Salvador, and U.S. trainers have been shot at in recent months.

How long will it be before American young men are directly involved in combat? How long before the tragedy of the Vietnam war is repeated?

The majority of the American people oppose sending American combat troops into Central America. It is time that the Congress join the American people in telling the President that the conflict in Central America cannot become an American war.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California, (Mr. LEVINE) and I are introducing legislation today to accomplish that goal by prohibiting the introduction of American forces into Central America for combat purposes, as well as prohibiting the funding of covert military or paramilitary operations. We invite and urge our colleagues to join us in sponsoring this measure.

□ 1240

DR. FELDSTEIN HAS FINALLY HAD ENOUGH

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, it seems Dr. Feldstein has finally had enough. The Reagan deficits and the refusal of this administration to deal with them has been too much even for his conservative conscience to carry. The timing of Dr. Feldstein's an-

nouncement is exquisite. He has announced his resignation on the day the prime rate rose half a percent, but before the inevitable and crippling further rises have occurred.

Dr. Feldstein put out his palm, felt a few drops and because the administration's policy refused to afford him an umbrella, he is getting out before the storm arrives.

I AM NOT THE PRESIDENT

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, you would think President Ronald Reagan and his vast White House entourage have been roosting on the back bench these past 3 years.

Yesterday, the prime rate jumped to 12.5 from 12 percent. The howls from the White House were directed at Federal Reserve Board Chairman Paul Volcker, as if Mr. Volcker were the President and Mr. Reagan were the leader of the opposition party.

During the Lebanon crisis, Speaker O'NEILL was the President. On the deficit, Congress is the President. Now Mr. Volcker is the President.

It is only fitting that Mr. Reagan's reelection slogan should be, "I am not the President."

If Mr. Reagan does not want to be President, he certainly is not required to run again.

MUST JEWS CHOOSE BETWEEN THEIR FAITH AND THEIR COUNTRY?

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

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the U.S. Court of Appeals upheld the right of the Air Force to prohibit an orthodox Jewish officer from wearing a yarmulke while on duty. This decision is offensive to the basic constitutional rights guaranteeing the freedom of religion.

In the Capitol Rotunda, not too long ago, the Congress joined in marking the "Days of Remembrance," an annual ceremony commemorating the Holocaust. Many of the participants were survivors of the Holocaust who came to America because our land was then, and is now, recognized as a promised land of freedom.

Jews, as much as any ethnic group in the United States, cherish the freedom offered by America, and they are as eager as any group to fulfill the responsibilities demanded of us to protect that freedom.

Capt. S. Simcha Goldman, an orthodox rabbi who also happens to be a clinical psychologist in the Air Force,

is doing his duty by serving as a career officer. Until yesterday, I am sure that Captain Goldman never believed that serving his country was inconsistent with observing the traditional rites of his faith.

It should not be.

I will be introducing shortly a House concurrent resolution urging that the religious rights of individual servicemen be protected by the rules and regulations of the Armed Forces.

I encourage my colleagues to support it. I do not notice that wearing yarmulkas has hurt the Israelis when they have gone into battle.

Neither Jews nor the members of any religious faith should have to choose between their faith and their country.

FORTUNE IS WRONG ON PAY EQUITY

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

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, Fortune magazine featured an article in its May 14, 1984, edition entitled, "Pay Equity Is a Bad Idea." The author, Daniel Seligman, not only claims that the concept of pay equity—or to put it in his terminology, CW for comparable worth—is "revolutionary and loony," but that it will eventually "collapse of its own deadweight dumbness."

Tell that to women who are paid 62 cents for every dollar a man is paid. Tell that to the poorest person in the country who is a female over 65 whose pension is based on wages when younger.

Mr. Seligman questions the validity of equal pay for work of comparable worth and asks whether the doctrine makes economic, moral, or any kind of sense. And, rather than examining the persistent gaps that exist between the wages earned by men and women, and its impact on the Nation's businesses and the economy as a whole, he concludes that the issue is purely a political fabrication, an attempt to woo more women to the left.

Mr. Speaker, the Fortune magazine article's sarcastic and pessimistic tone is reflective of many opponents' attitude about pay equity: Why tamper with a perfect market in which all workers are paid the equivalent of their value?

I daresay that a free market, steered by supply and demand, is leading most female workers down a one-way street to the poor house. Our free market is clearly imperfect. The fact that, on the average, women earn 63 percent of what men earn—and have been earning about the same since the 1950's when their labor participation rates were half of what they are today—only scratches the surface of the problem.

First and foremost, the more an occupation is dominated by women, the less it pays. Teaching, nursing, clerical, and administrative occupations illustrate this important point. Despite the fact that women perform duties which are valued highly in our society, their wages are depressed by virtue of the fact that they are female workers.

Second, while it is true that career opportunities for women in traditionally male-dominated jobs are expanding further with each generation, female positions are still grossly underpaid. The traditional jobs that women perform are essential to our society. By opening up career options for women, the business community cannot believe that it is ridding society of sex-based wage discrimination in traditionally female occupations. Equal access and equitable pay need to go hand in hand.

Third, the move to eliminate sex-based wage discrimination is not just another "women's issue." It is a family issue. Ninety percent of all single parents are women. Thirty-five percent of these women fall below the poverty level. Women maintaining families average \$10,000 a year. Wives working full-time average \$13,070 compared with their husbands who earn an average of \$23,800 a year.

Fourth, the business community as well as the Government needs to take responsibility for eliminating this economic inequity. Mr. Speaker, to date, more than a dozen State governments are involved in pay studies or reevaluations of their civilian pay structures.

To date, the Federal Government has taken a much less aggressive approach. The Reagan administration is contemplating an appeal of a major pay equity decision in the State of Washington. Administration witnesses also denied, during congressional hearings, that the issue of sex-based wage discrimination is truly an issue it can pursue, and publicly stated that the concept is dangerous to the economy.

I firmly believe that the Federal Government needs to take a serious look and make a serious commitment to achieving pay equity. My legislation, H.R. 4599, the Federal Employees Pay Equity Act of 1984, and H.R. 5092, the Pay Equity Act of 1984, mandates the Government to enforce the laws that are on the books. As legislators, our first responsibility should be to insure that the Government is doing its job.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, if we were to look in our history books, we would find that during the struggle to abolish slavery and later to implement child care laws, opponents painted pictures of gloom and economic doom. Similarly, pay equity opponents are denouncing the notion. Eliminating slavery and implementing child labor laws did not break the bank. Eliminating sex-based wage discrimination will

not, either. Let us move on this issue with determination and dedication.

LOUISVILLE HOUSING BARGAINS

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to represent the Third District of Kentucky which is essentially the Louisville area, so as a representative from Louisville I have good news and bad news. The good news is yesterday's newspapers carried the word that you get in Louisville more housing for your dollar than anywhere else in the country. Half of all the housing units which were resold in Louisville last year went for under \$47,900.

By contrast, a similar home in Santa Anna, Anaheim, Calif., went for \$133,900.

So I would congratulate the Kentucky homebuilders, the Kentucky realtors and all the people who have accounted for this good situation.

The bad news, Mr. Speaker, is that yesterday's newspaper also carried the news that the prime rate has gone up another half a percent to 12½ percent. The bad news is that is going to translate into mortgage interest rates of 14 to 15 percent perhaps by the end of the year.

I would only say and I hope that somehow the Federal Reserve will expand the money supply within its range, but expand it nonetheless, so that interest rates do not go up, because maybe next year I will have to stand in the well and say that instead of Louisville giving you more housing for the dollar, we may give you the least housing for the dollar.

HOURLY OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to reconvene at 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

THE EVIDENCE ON EL SALVADOR

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

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, tonight the President of the United States will address the Nation and ask the Congress to approve more military assistance for El Salvador. I hope that before we make any decisions we pay due notice to facts that are coming to light, and allegations that are being made.

We are told time and time again that El Salvador is a nascent democracy that needs to be brought along, when all the evidence points in the other direction. Those whom we are asking to reform the military have been implicated in many of the killings and death squad activities. What has happened to the perpetrators of the murders of the four Maryknolls?

What has happened to the officers who launched the massacre against the Indians of Las Hojas?

What happened in the case of Commander Schaufelberger?

There is no human rights progress being made in El Salvador.

The President and the American people have to face up to that fact. President Reagan's policy in Central America is an exercise in self-delusion. We cannot let it go on. We have to stop it.

Tomorrow on the floor of the House of Representatives I hope that we will pass the Studds amendment and stop this dangerous and un-American policy that we are pursuing in Central America.

AN ARMED BUREAUCRACY

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that on Monday, May 7, the Assistant Attorney General for the Justice Department's Land Natural Resources Division has granted enforcement powers for a period of 90 days to employees of the Environmental Protection Agency; this means that during this time EPA agents will enjoy Special Deputy U.S. Marshal status and, by virtue of that status, enjoy the right to carry guns.

I think we can agree that this represents a breathtaking assumption of power on the part of the EPA and on the part of the Justice Department for giving into the EPA's demand for such privileges. After all, though the House last October voted, wrongly, I think to grant the EPA this power, the Senate has yet to take such a step, so the will of the people as expressed in the Congress has yet to be voiced.

Even if the Senate should consent, it will still represent a dangerous development. Allowing Federal bureaucrats to carry six-shooters constitutes a form of intimidation and harassment completely out of keeping with the traditions of a free society. Unfortunately, the precedents have already been set. Agents of the Internal Revenue Service, the Veterans' Administration, the General Services Administration, and even the food stamp program are already empowered to carry guns and make arrests and the administration is now conducting a government-wide review of this status for employ-

ees of various other Government agencies. It sounds to me like we are building a powerful national police force.

Frankly, I am kind of amazed at this mad passion of our Federal file clerks to stalk our streets, revolvers at the hip, and—for all we know—shooting it out at high noon with evildoers. I really do not understand this at all, except as yet another manifestation of the lust for power on the part of an armed bureaucracy.

Now given what the EPA insists are the extraordinary dangers inherent in its work, we may well conclude that extra police protection might be ordered for these public servants. But it is another thing altogether to turn these bureaucrats into Elliott Ness and the Untouchables, even if that is what in their dreams they would become.

Given the approval of this House and the apparent support of the administration, maybe such a thing is inevitable. Maybe, in time, even the good folks who run the elevators in the Capitol will be equipped with James Bond pistols and a license to kill. But at least you would think that the Justice Department would wait until the Senate took action on this matter, before issuing the ammunition and starting target practice.

□ 1250

HUMAN RIGHTS IN CENTRAL AMERICA

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

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States and my colleagues in this body have clear evidence to determine which nation in Central America supports human rights and which does not.

The people of El Salvador showed their strong desire for democracy in last Sunday's presidential election. The Communist guerrillas who shot at a helicopter carrying American election observers also made a rather straightforward statement about their view of democracy.

Contrasting sharply with El Salvador is the Government of Nicaragua. While everyone from President Reagan to the bishops of El Salvador say that El Salvador is improving its observance of human rights, we see just the opposite happening in Nicaragua.

The oppressed people of Nicaragua are now saddled with supporting the largest military machine ever seen in Central America. Not only is the people's property confiscated to pay for an army of 250,000 troops, but the draft and its implementation by squads of kidnapers is stealing the children of the peasants and turning them away from the Sandinistas in

growing numbers. The Miskito Indians are trying valiantly to escape from the guarded concentration camps that they have been forced to move into. The press and the Catholic Church are suppressed and vilified by the Communist overlords for speaking the truth and advocating freedom. I ask my colleagues to read the Easter pastoral letter of the bishops of Nicaragua to see the real views of the church rather than listen to half truths and propaganda. Just think back to how the Sandinistas and their controlled mobs treated the Pope and you will clearly see which country in Central America is really trying to improve human rights.

Long live freedom and liberty, and may America always support those who want to throw off the burden of totalitarian oppressors.

QUIET ON THE SET, LIGHTS, CAMERA, ACTION

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I read in the paper this morning the latest plans for politicizing the House.

As I understand it, we are now going to be practicing our profession in prime time—because some on your side of the aisle feel they are ready to compete with "Dynasty" and "Hill Street Blues" for the public's attention.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I guess I can understand why some on your side would want to be thinking about a career in entertainment.

What little has been done by the majority this year has certainly not been very productive but in all candor, it has been worth a laugh or two.

I know a former entertainer who made a successful transition to politics; possibly the gentleman from Arkansas and others would like to do the same only in reverse.

If its your intention to make a soap opera of this august body, why not go all the way and have Hollywood nominate you all for an Emmy next year.

They could even create a new category.

Best performance in a tragic comedy.

MONETARY POLICY

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the prime rate was raised by the major banks to 12½ percent, the highest level since October 1982. The Federal Reserve Board has, through its restrictive money policies, prompted these

higher rates. In pursuing the goal of noninflationary growth, the Federal Reserve has recently overemphasized inflation pressures to the exclusion of economic growth.

I believe that the Federal Reserve Board's policy is not only unbalanced, and disruptive, it is also political.

The economic warning signs do not, at this time, justify the tight money policies of the Fed.

This administration has a proven record in fighting inflation. Recent figures show the inflation level still under control. There is no reason to assume that this administration will relax its stand against higher inflation. Nor do signs of recent or future growth justify restrictive policies. Economic indicators show the economy growing at sustainable levels. Despite this, the money supply is not accommodating real economic growth. Instead of responding to the low levels of inflation, the money supply growth is at the absolute bottom of the target range. Three increases in the prime rate in recent weeks are the result of these restrictive Federal Reserve policies.

We are not asking for inflation nor are we asking for deflation. We want the optimum level of noninflationary growth. As the economy is growing at sustainable levels and indicators of inflation show no major pressures, we think the Federal Reserve Board should and would be justified in doing more to maintain future growth by easing up on its tight money policies. Eventually, Congress may have to create a more reliable index to which the Federal Reserve Board can base its policies. Until that time, the Fed should pursue a more balanced approach to achieve strong, noninflationary growth.

TRUE CONGRESSIONAL CONFESSIONS

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

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, it is time for true confessions.

On May 1, 1984, the House Democratic majority leader, JIM WRIGHT, confessed that—

Some of these Members don't seem interested, . . . they act like their sole purpose for coming to the Congress was to make sure they remain in Congress.

And then there is the confession of Senator PAUL TSONGAS, as reported in the Washington Post article by William Raspberry, entitled "Democrats' Weakness." Senator TSONGAS, a former Member of the House, confesses, why, as a Member of the House, he once voted against a bill to reduce the capital gains tax. Why? He said:

Because I was a Democrat. I considered the ethic in the House among my fellow col-

leagues that this was pro business and therefore we are against it. That bill, which I did not support, did more for the economy of my State than anything I did as a Congressman."

He went on to say that "If the Democratic Party were ever to show real concern, not rhetorical concern," as I parenthetically say that we have in 1 minute from the other side, "about the deficit, and did something about it, then I think we would do very well. . . ."

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the junior Senator from your own State, as well as your party's distinguished majority leader, have both revealed their hearts to the American public and may soon be facing a front-page story, complete with banner headlines in "True Congressional Confessions."

AN OLYMPIC-SIZE MISTAKE

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

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, there are many disappointed people across the United States right now, but I doubt that many are really surprised. It is ironic that the excuse the Soviet Union is giving for pulling out of the Olympics this summer is that we cannot provide adequate security. This, coming from a nation that shoots down stray passenger liners; where religious minorities and intellectuals disappear in the dark of the night.

The sad truth is that, in a way, they are right. There is no way a free society can guarantee security in the same calculated way a police state can. It is the price we have to pay for an open country. It is interesting, however, that the groups security officials in Los Angeles were most worried about—the PLO and the Libyans—are all supported by the Soviet Union. If they cannot control their own clients, I guess it is naive for us to assume we can.

Maybe it is another kind of terrorism the Soviets are worried about. I have read reports that several groups were planning on putting up billboards announcing where defectors could go for assistance. Now there is a true act of terrorism—striking fear in the hearts of all Communist officials.

Mr. Speaker, in behalf of athletes throughout the world, I sincerely hope that the Soviet Union changes its mind and comes to Los Angeles. Politics aside, this has always been a forum where the people of the world could gather for the competition of sport. As much as we may disagree with Soviet politics, they are an important part of the Olympic and international sporting community. I hope they reconsider. We genuinely want them to come.

BUDGET DEFICIT

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

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, Martin Feldstein will be sorely missed. His willingness to tell the people of America the truth about the Federal deficit made him a unique member of this administration. He understood that the source of our mounting annual deficits were the 1981 decisions to cut taxes for the wealthy and to dramatically increase military spending. He made that point repeatedly in statements to Congress and to the media.

His retirement as Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers should not obscure that truth of his statements, despite the objections from the administration.

As we see the interest rates rising month after month, let us remember that the budget deficits are the problem and that the source of that problem were the decisions made in 1981. We will have to reverse these decisions if we are to do something about the budget deficits.

MX DEPLOYMENT

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

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. The MX vote is coming up again in the next several weeks. One argument in favor of MX deployment has been its use as a bargaining chip.

There are a couple of answers to this argument.

First, it has not worked. That is, the bargaining chip theory has not worked at all.

Second, it disregards the fact that we already have major systems that deeply concern the Soviets and the Warsaw Pact. The recent Pershing and cruise missile deployment has dramatically demonstrated U.S. and NATO resolve to match force with force with the Soviet Union. It is of tantamount concern to the Soviet's Eastern European allies. This has been made quite clear in many ways, including in discussions with officials in Warsaw Pact countries that some of us in the House visited last winter.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Bennett-Mavroules amendment to delete the funds for the MX missiles.

WHAT MX CAN DO

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

Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the MX missile, we were told, was to bring somebody to the arms control bargaining table. But who was it supposed to bring? The Russians or the Reagan administration?

Last year, different Members of the House were given one story or the other or both at the same time as seemed expedient. This year, however, we know the answer. The MX does neither. We have the MX, but nobody is left at the bargaining table.

For the first time in a generation, we and the Soviet Union are no longer even talking about the control of strategic arms. We can argue about which side is more responsible for that, but the fact is the arms control part of the Scowcroft package is dead—stone cold dead.

And excuses are no substitute for results.

Here is another MX marvel: This thing was supposed to have deterred nuclear war by survival and retaliation. Now it cannot survive, it cannot retaliate, it cannot deter. It is a missile without a mission, but we are told we should go ahead and build it anyway. The MX may be a failure at arms control and a failure at deterrence, but it is a flaming success at one other thing, and that is running up the national debt and a new wave of high interest rates, fueled by this huge, bloated Federal deficit.

THERE IS PROGRESS UNDER THE REAGAN ADMINISTRATION

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

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, moments ago, we heard our colleague from Colorado explain to us that it was the Reagan administration's fault that interest rates went up a point recently. Well, the natural corollary of that is if it is not Volcker's fault and you cannot blame it on the Congress and the deficits and it is all Ronald Reagan's fault, then the corollary is, Ronald Reagan is responsible for bringing it from 22½ percent down to 12.

I know, it must be very, very frustrating to be a welfare state liberal nowadays. You find out inflation is at 17-year lows; investment at a 22-year high, savings increased 150 percent under this administration; employment is the highest it has ever been in history.

In fact, we created more new jobs in America in the last 36 months than have been created in Europe in the last decade. More Americans found new jobs in the last 18 months, than that same number would equal one-third of the entire work force of Canada.

So what do we hear? Those poor folks are looking for a little tick in the interest rates as the only peg upon which to hang their rhetoric. They understand what is happening in America: We are going back to growth, opportunity, and hope for the future, and they are very, very frustrated.

WHAT PRICE FREEDOM?

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

Mr. SILJANDER. What price freedom, Mr. Speaker? What price for freedom, are we as civilians in the United States willing to pay for our own freedom in terms of social and economic threat that Central America poses to us in the United States?

What price freedom for those who fight for freedoms that we take for granted? Freedom of religion, freedom of speech and press, freedom to organize labor unions and, yes, even the freedom to vote.

What price freedom for the Western Hemisphere? As there are 8,000 Cubans, 2,000 Soviet and Soviet-bloc advisers, PLO, Libyans, and Bulgarians in Nicaragua. What threat does that pose to our Western Hemisphere?

Today we deal with freedoms such as these. It is a matter of what price are we willing to pay, yes, in terms of dollars, in terms of politics, and in terms of moral convictions to the freedoms of all the peoples of all the Americas.

REAGANOMICS POLITICAL BOMBAST

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker what is happening with Reaganomics? Yesterday the prime rate jumped to 12½ percent, its third jump in 2 months and the Reagan administration spokesman blames the Federal Reserve Board. That is to say the least very curious, because the Federal Reserve Board interest rate policy, that had been adhered to with a vengeance by Mr. Volcker is exactly what President Reagan has demanded.

Why this obvious contradiction and political bombast—clearly it is election year politics, trying to shrug off bad economic policy.

Apparently, it is too much for Mr. Martin Feldstein, the Chairman of the President's own Council of Economic Advisors. Today he has resigned. Mr. Feldstein follows the former Chairman, Mr. Weidenbaum, who resigned less than 2 years ago.

Mr. Weidenbaum stated the reason clearly at that time, the major economic problems with Reaganomics; ex-

cessive unearned tax reductions, and excessive unsupported military spending.

President Reagan received the public policies that he asked for, much to the regret of this Member and many in Congress.

Now the results are coming home to roost, \$200 billion megadeficits year in and year out, the highest real interest rates in history, and a soft consumer recovery, a \$120 billion current year trade deficit, and the deepest recession since the 1930's.

President Reagan cannot run away from these facts so the Reagan political trick is to transfer the blame, the responsibility, to the Federal Reserve Board and/or Congress.

The contrast between a great President like Truman and the present White House occupant is all too obvious. President Truman whose 100th birthday we celebrate this week, had a plaque on his desk stating "The Buck Stops Here." Is not it about time that President Reagan came to grips with the reality, not just the illusion, of Reaganomics, and accept the responsibility that President Truman so adroitly recognized and epitomized.

THREE IMPORTANT ISSUES NEED CONSIDERATION

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

Mr. HUNTER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I might start off by answering the gentleman who just left who then asked when this country would take on some fiscal sanity? I would suggest that it may be when the Democratic leadership of this House allows us to bring up the line-item veto, the balanced budget.

And I would also remind the gentleman that these Reaganomics that he talks about have created some 4½ million new jobs in America in the last year, which is probably a reason why most of the Democratic candidates for President do not use the word Reaganomics anymore.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would hope to offer a unanimous-consent request calling for consideration of amendments to permit voluntary school prayer, balanced budget, and line-item veto.

The Chair has ruled that in order to make these requests I must have the clearance of the majority and minority leaderships.

This request has been cleared by the minority leadership.

I would now yield to a spokesman from the majority leadership for appropriate clearance.

Mr. Speaker, I hear no response. That should make it clear to the

American people who stands in the way of these three important issues—the democratic leadership in this House.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is the day of Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the committees.

The Clerk called the committees.

REQUEST TO MAKE IN ORDER AMENDMENT TO TITLE X OF H.R. 5119, INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AND DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION ACT OF 1984

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk an amendment to title X of the bill, H.R. 5119.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would rule that that is not a proper request at this time.

The gentleman will suspend, please. Is the gentleman from Virginia asking that an amendment which he would offer should be in order in the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the rule, I was asking permission that my amendment be in order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. WOLF. In the Committee of the Whole.

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to object whether it is in the House or the Committee of the Whole.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to be recognized at this point in the proceedings to explain my amendment and realize this is an unusual request under the rule for the consideration of the foreign aid authorization legislation before us. But I sincerely believe that the subject matter of this amendment is so important that it demands extraordinary consideration.

This amendment would authorize \$1 million to be used by the Agency for International Development to provide education in human rights in the country of El Salvador. This human rights education program would be provided for the military, security and police forces and the general public.

I offer this amendment because of my strong and firm conviction that an intensive human rights education program in El Salvador, a program that reaches all the people, can be an important step in bringing about a great-

er respect for humanitarian law in this nation.

Mr. Speaker, I offer this amendment at this point because I believe it transcends party lines and political beliefs and recognizes that even though there may be disagreement on how certain economic, social, or military reforms should be accomplished in this Central American country, that respect for human rights is the first and basic step which must be taken if progress toward individual freedoms and a democratic way of life is ever to be realized there.

I do not profess to be an expert on this country, but I do know from my visit to El Salvador last year, from speaking with the soldiers, the Government leaders, and with the people in the countryside, that the people there could certainly benefit from increased exposure to the importance of respect for the rights of their fellow man. That observations has been confirmed in my contacts since that trip with Government officials from both the United States and El Salvador, and with leaders from human rights organizations working now in Central America.

This amendment could signal to the Central American region that the United States believes so deeply in the importance of human rights that it is willing to provide funds to educate the people in countries where the need is greatest, such as El Salvador, that a basic understanding of respect for human rights is the crucial foundation upon which to build a nation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this effort to establish a human rights education program in El Salvador.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am very sympathetic to the gentleman's amendment. Obviously, I cannot agree to opening up the bill in this fashion contrary to the rule after we let everybody know what the limitations are, and so forth. But I can assure the gentleman that, as far as that human rights training is concerned, either with respect to the language and the money that is now in the bill or if the gentleman is successful in getting the matter added in the other body, that I, for one, will be very happy to accept both the amount and the theory and the purpose of the amendment.

□ 1310

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman very much. I will take it as a charge to go to the Senate side and get this language put in.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to also join the chairman, and I assure the gentleman from Vir-

ginia I also will join with the chairman in support of this.

I think the suggestion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) is the proper course, and we will work toward that end.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) withdraws his unanimous-consent request.

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AND DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION ACT OF 1984

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 497, 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. 5119.

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. 5119) to authorize international development and security assistance programs and Peace Corps programs for fiscal year 1985, and for other purposes, with Mr. AuCoin in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, May 8, 1984, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to the rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 5421 is considered by titles as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule, and each title is considered as having been read. The Chair may determine when title X of the substitute shall be considered for amendment. No amendments to the substitute are in order which change, include, or affect the subject matter of title X, funding and policies specifically relating to Central America or the countries of which it consists (Panama, Belize, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Honduras, Costa Rica, and El Salvador), except the following amendments to title X, which shall not be subject to amendment, shall be considered as having been read, and shall be considered only in the following order: First, the amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 3, 1984, by, and if offered by, Representative STUDDS which shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question but shall be debatable for not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by Representatives STUDDS and a Member opposed thereto; and second, the amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 3, 1984, by, and if offered by,

Representative BROOMFIELD, which shall be debatable for not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by Representative BROOMFIELD and a Member opposed thereto.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1984".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to section 1? If not, the Clerk will designate title I.

The text of title I is as follows:

TITLE I—MILITARY SALES AND RELATED PROGRAMS

AUTHORIZATION FOR FOREIGN MILITARY SALES FINANCING

SEC. 101. (a) Section 31(a) of the Arms Export Control Act is amended by amending the first sentence to read as follows: "There are authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out section 23 of this Act \$2,933,500,000 for the fiscal year 1985."

(b) Sections 31 (b) and (c) of such Act are amended to read as follows:

"(b)(1) The total amount of credits (or participations in credits) extended under section 23 of this Act shall not exceed \$2,933,500,000 for fiscal year 1985.

"(2) Of the aggregate total of credits (or participations in credits) extended under section 23 of this Act, not less than \$1,400,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985 shall be available only for Israel, and Israel shall be released from its contractual liability to repay the United States Government with respect to such credits (and participations in credits). Of this amount, up to \$150,000,000 shall be for research and development in the United States for the Lavi program and not less than \$250,000,000 shall be for the procurement in Israel of defense articles and defense services, including research and development, for the Lavi program.

"(3) Of the aggregate total of credits (or participations in credits) extended under section 23 of this Act, not less than \$1,175,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985 shall be available only for Egypt, and Egypt shall be released from its contractual liability to repay the United States Government with respect to such credits (and participations in credits).

"(c)(1) The principal amount of loans guaranteed under section 24(a) of this Act shall not exceed \$2,043,500,000 for the fiscal year 1985.

"(2) For the fiscal year 1985, the principal amount of loans guaranteed under section 24(a) of this Act with respect to Greece, Korea, Portugal, Somalia, Spain (so long as Spain is a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization), Sudan, and Turkey, shall (if and to the extent each country so desires) be repaid in not more than twenty years, following a grace period of ten years on repayment of principal.

"(3) Financing may not be provided under this Act for the Philippines for the fiscal year 1985.

"(4) The aggregate total of credits (or participations in credits) extended and of the principal amount of loans guaranteed under this Act for Tunisia shall not exceed \$43,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985.

"(5) Financing may not be provided under this Act for Zaire for the fiscal year 1985."

(c)(1) The principal amount of loans guaranteed under section 24(a) of the Arms Export Control Act for the fiscal year 1984 with respect to Korea shall (if and to the extent that country so desires) be repaid in not more than twenty years, following a grace period of ten years on repayment of principal.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

GRANT MILITARY ASSISTANCE

SEC. 102. (a) Section 504(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows: "(a)(1) There are authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out the purposes of this chapter \$587,250,000 for the fiscal year 1985."

(b) For the fiscal year 1985, the value of assistance provided under chapter 2 of part II of such Act—

(1) may not exceed \$4,000,000 for Zaire; and

(2) shall be \$15,000,000 for Tunisia.

INTERNATIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING

SEC. 103. Section 542 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by amending the text following the section caption to read as follows: "There are authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out the purposes of this chapter \$51,309,000 for the fiscal year 1985."

PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS

SEC. 104. Section 552(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows: "(a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out the purposes of this chapter, in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes, \$49,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985."

TERMS OF FOREIGN MILITARY SALES CREDITS

SEC. 105. Section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 23. SALES CREDITS.—The President is authorized to finance the procurement of defense articles, defense services, and design and construction services by friendly foreign countries and international organizations, on such terms and conditions as he may determine. The President shall charge interest at such rate as he may determine and shall require repayment in United States dollars within a period not to exceed twelve years after the loan agreement with the country or international organization is signed on behalf of the United States Government, unless a longer period is specifically authorized by statute for that country or international organization."

GUARANTY RESERVE FUND

SEC. 106. (a) Chapter 3 of the Arms Export Control Act is amended by adding the following new section immediately after section 31:

"SEC. 31A. AUTHORIZATION FOR THE GUARANTY RESERVE FUND.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1985 \$114,000,000 to maintain adequate reserves in the Guaranty Reserve Fund against defaults and rescheduling of outstanding loans guaranteed pursuant to the provisions of section 24(a) of this Act."

(b) Section 24(c) of such Act is amended by striking out the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Funds made available pursuant to section 31A of this Act shall be credited to such reserve, shall be merged with the funds in such reserve, and shall be available for any purpose for which funds in such reserve are available."

ADMINISTRATIVE SURCHARGE

SEC. 107. Subparagraph (A) of section 21(e)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act is amended by inserting "(excluding a pro rata share of fixed base operation costs)" immediately after "full estimated costs".

CATALOG DATA AND SERVICES

SEC. 108. Section 21(h) of the Arms Export Control Act is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(h)";

(2) by striking out "(1)" and "(2)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(A)" and "(B)", respectively; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) In carrying out the objectives of this section, the President is authorized to provide cataloging data and cataloging services, without charge, to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or to any member government of that Organization if that Organization or member government provides such data and services in accordance with an agreement on a reciprocal basis, without charge, to the United States Government."

REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL VOLUME OF ARMS TRAFFIC

SEC. 109. Section 25 of the Arms Export Control Act is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking out "No later than February 1" and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as provided in subsection (d) of this section, no later than February 1"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) The information required by subsection (a)(4) of this section shall be transmitted to the Congress no later than April 1 of each year."

SECURITY ASSISTANCE SURVEYS

SEC. 110. (a) Section 26 of the Arms Export Control Act is amended—

(1) in the section caption, by striking out "DEFENSE REQUIREMENT" and inserting in lieu thereof "SECURITY ASSISTANCE";

(2) by striking out "defense requirement" each place it appears in the section and inserting in lieu thereof "security assistance"; and

(3) by adding at the end of the section the following new subsection:

"(d) As used in this section, the term 'security assistance surveys' means any survey or study conducted in a foreign country by United States Government personnel for the purpose of assessing the needs of that country for security assistance, and includes defense requirement surveys, site surveys, general surveys or studies, and engineering assessment surveys."

(b) Section 26(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "grant that committee access to" and inserting in lieu thereof "submit to that committee copies of".

QUARTERLY REPORTS ON UNITED STATES MILITARY ADVISORS ABROAD

SEC. 111. Section 36(a)(7) of the Arms Export Control Act is amended to read as follows:

"(7) an estimate of—

"(A) the number of United States military personnel, the number of United States Government civilian personnel, and the number of United States civilian contract personnel, who were in each foreign country at the end of that quarter, and

"(B) the number of members of each such category of personnel who were in each for-

ein country at any time during that quarter, in implementation of sales and commercial exports under this Act or of assistance under chapter 2, 5, 6, or 8 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, including both personnel assigned to the country and personnel temporarily in the country by detail or otherwise."

INCREASE IN CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR CERTAIN VIOLATIONS OF THE ARMS EXPORT CONTROL ACT

SEC. 112. (a) Section 38(c) of the Arms Export Control Act is amended by striking out "not more than \$100,000 or imprisoned not more than two years, or both" and inserting in lieu thereof "for each violation not more than \$1,000,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both".

(b) Section 38(e) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding section 11(c) of the Export Administration Act of 1979, the civil penalty for each violation involving controls imposed on the export of defense articles and defense services under this section may not exceed \$500,000."

(c) This section shall take effect upon the date of enactment of this Act or October 1, 1984, whichever date is later. The amendments made by this section apply with respect to violations occurring after the effective date of this section.

OFFICIAL RECEPTION AND REPRESENTATION EXPENSES

SEC. 113. Section 43 of the Arms Export Control Act is amended—

(1) in subsection (b) by inserting "and official reception and representation expenses" immediately after "administrative expenses"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Not more than \$72,500 of the funds derived from charges for administrative services pursuant to section 21(e)(1)(A) of this Act may be used each fiscal year for official reception and representation expenses."

LIMITATION ON USE OF THE SPECIAL DEFENSE ACQUISITION FUND

SEC. 114. (a) Section 52 of the Arms Export Control Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) The Fund may not be used for research and development activities, including such activities as re-engineering the engines of F4 aircraft."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

WAIVER OF NET PROCEEDS FOR SALE OF MAP ITEMS

SEC. 115. Section 505(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "In the case of items which were delivered prior to 1975, the President may waive the requirement that such net proceeds be paid to the United States Government if he determines that to do so is in the national interest of the United States."

STOCKPILING OF DEFENSE ARTICLES FOR FOREIGN COUNTRIES

SEC. 116. (a) Section 514(b)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows:

"(2) The value of such additions to stockpiles in foreign countries shall not exceed \$125,000,000 for the fiscal year 1984 and \$248,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

SECURITY ASSISTANCE ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 117. Section 515(c)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended in the last sentence by striking out "For the fiscal year 1982 and the fiscal year 1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "Pakistan, Tunisia, Yemen, Lebanon, Venezuela".

EXCHANGE TRAINING

SEC. 118. Chapter 5 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 544. EXCHANGE TRAINING.—In carrying out this chapter, the President is authorized to provide for attendance of foreign military personnel at professional military education institutions in the United States (other than Service academies) without charge, and without charge to funds available to carry out this chapter (notwithstanding section 632(d) of this Act), if such attendance is pursuant to an agreement providing for the exchange of students on a one-for-one, reciprocal basis each fiscal year between those United States professional military education institutions and comparable institutions of foreign countries and international organizations."

TRAINING IN MARITIME SKILLS

SEC. 119. (a) Chapter 5 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended by section 118 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 545. TRAINING IN MARITIME SKILLS.—The President is encouraged to allocate a portion of the funds made available each fiscal year to carry out this chapter for use in providing education and training in maritime search and rescue, operation and maintenance of aids to navigation, port security, at-sea law enforcement, international maritime law, and general maritime skills."

(b) Section 660(b) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "or" at the end of clause (1);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of clause (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "; or"; and

(3) by adding the following new clause after clause (2):

"(3) with respect to assistance, including training, in maritime law enforcement."

SPECIAL WAIVER AUTHORITY

SEC. 120. Section 614(a)(4) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows:

"(4)(A) The authority of this subsection may not be used in any fiscal year to authorize—

"(i) more than \$750,000,000 in sales to be made under the Arms Export Control Act;

"(ii) the use of more than \$250,000,000 of funds made available for use under this Act or the Arms Export Control Act; and

"(iii) the use of more than \$100,000,000 of foreign currencies accruing under this Act or any other law.

"(B) If the authority of this subsection is used both to authorize a sale under the Arms Export Control Act and to authorize funds to be used under the Arms Export Control Act or under this Act with respect to the financing of that sale, then the use of the funds shall be counted against the limitation in subparagraph (A)(ii) and the portion, if any, of the sale which is not so financed shall be counted against the limitation in subparagraph (A)(i).

"(C) Not more than \$50,000,000 of the \$250,000,000 limitation provided in subparagraph (A)(ii) may be allocated to any one country in any fiscal year unless that country is a victim of active Communist or Communist-supported aggression, and not more than \$500,000,000 of the aggregate limitation of \$1,000,000,000 provided in subparagraphs (A)(i) and (A)(ii) may be allocated to any one country in any fiscal year."

WESTERN SAHARA

SEC. 121. (a) The policy of the United States shall be to support a negotiated political solution to the conflict in the Western Sahara taking into account the principle of self-determination as outlined in the 1981 Nairobi Resolution, to encourage a peaceful internationally recognized settlement, and to maintain direct contacts with all the parties to the conflict. As part of this policy, the United States should carefully consider each type of military assistance it furnishes to any of the parties to the conflict and should seek to insure that the furnishing of such military assistance is consistent with United States policy which seeks a negotiated settlement.

(b) Members of the United States Armed Forces may not perform defense services under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or the Arms Export Control Act or conduct international military education and training activities under chapter 5 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 in the Western Sahara so long as the military conflict between Morocco and the Polisario Front continues in the Western Sahara.

FOREIGN MILITARY SALES FOR JORDAN

SEC. 122. (a) The foreign military sales financing authorized by this Act for Jordan is provided in the hope that Jordan will enter into direct negotiations with Israel, based on United Nations Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 and the Camp David Accords, in order to resolve the state of war between those two countries.

(b) No foreign military sales financing authorized by this Act may be used to finance the procurement by Jordan of United States advanced aircraft, new air defense weapons systems, or other new advanced military weapons systems, and no certification may be made pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act with respect to a proposed sale to Jordan of United States advanced aircraft, new air defense weapons systems, or other new advanced military weapons systems, unless the President has certified to the Congress that Jordan is publicly committed to the recognition of Israel and to prompt entry into direct peace negotiations with Israel under the basic tenets of United Nations Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 and the Camp David Accords.

CONVENTIONAL ARMS TRANSFERS

SEC. 123. The President shall submit to the Congress a report which examines and analyzes United States policies concerning the export of conventional arms, especially sophisticated weapons, and possible approaches to developing multilateral limitations on conventional arms sales. This report shall examine and analyze—

(1) the lessons of earlier efforts to negotiate restraints on the export of conventional arms;

(2) the evolution of recipient country attitudes regarding conventional arms transfers;

(3) the prospects for engaging the Soviet Union in serious discussions concerning

arms transfers, both globally and as they relate to regional security problems;

(4) possible measures by the United States and Western European suppliers to control levels of sophisticated weapons sales, both regionally and globally;

(5) the relationship between arms exports by Western European countries and the needs of those countries to support their domestic military procurement programs; and

(6) the timing and phasing of international conventional arms control negotiations.

This report should be unclassified to the extent possible, with classified addenda if necessary.

CEILING ON MILITARY ASSISTANCE AND FINANCING FOR TURKEY

SEC. 124. The aggregate total of—

(1) the funds obligated for assistance under chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961,

(2) the amount of credits (or participations in credits) extended under section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act, and

(3) the principal amount of loans guaranteed under section 24 of the Arms Export Control Act,

with respect to Turkey may not exceed \$716,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985.

CONDITIONS ON MILITARY ASSISTANCE FOR TURKEY AND GREECE

SEC. 125. (a) The Congress reaffirms the statements concerning United States policy toward the eastern Mediterranean which are contained in section 620C of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, in particular its concerns over the lack of progress toward a just and equitable settlement of the Cyprus dispute and a withdrawal of all foreign troops from the Republic of Cyprus except those permitted by treaty or agreement. The Congress further reaffirms that it shall be the policy of the United States to take full account of the observance by all parties directly involved in the Cyprus dispute of their applicable obligations under international law and treaties and that such observance shall be a factor in determining appropriate levels of military assistance for Greece and Turkey.

(b) For the fiscal year 1985, military assistance may be provided for Turkey or Greece only if the President submits to the Congress a certification with respect to that country stating that—

(1) such assistance for that country is necessary to enable it to fulfill its obligations as a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and will not upset the current balance of military strength among the countries of the eastern Mediterranean region; and

(2) that country is taking steps, including good faith support for the intercommunal talks conducted under United Nations auspices, to achieve a settlement of the conflict on Cyprus and is publicly committed to the prompt withdrawal of all foreign troops from the Republic of Cyprus as part of a settlement, except for those permitted by treaty or mutual agreement; and

(3) in the case of Turkey, that country is continuing to return to democratic rule and to improve its observance of internationally recognized human rights.

(c) As used in this section, the term "military assistance" means assistance under chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, credits under section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act, and loan guaranties under section 24(a) of the Arms Export Control Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROOMFIELD

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROOMFIELD: Page 3, line 24, strike out the quotation marks and the last period;

Page 3, after line 24, insert the following:

"(6)(A) Of the aggregate amount of financing provided for Greece for the fiscal year 1985 in the form of credits (or participations in credits) extended under section 23 of this Act and loans guaranteed under section 24 of this Act and loans guaranteed under section 24 of this Act, that portion of the financing which is providing in the form of credits (or participation in credits) shall not be less than that amount which bears the same ratio to the aggregate amount of financing provided under sections 23 and 24 for Greece as the amount of credits (or participations in credits) extended for Turkey bears to the aggregate amount of financing provided under sections 23 and 24 for Turkey for the fiscal year 1985. Credits (or participations in credits) extended under section 23 of this Act for Greece for the fiscal year 1985 shall be at a rate of interest equal to the rate of interest charged on such credits extended for Turkey for the fiscal year 1985.

"(B) In addition to amounts otherwise available to carry out section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act for the fiscal year 1985, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to provide the credits (or participations in credits) for Greece required under subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, and the aggregate ceiling on credits (or participations in credits) extended under section 23 for the fiscal year 1985 is hereby increased by such amount as may be necessary to permit the provision of credits (or participations in credits) for Greece required under subparagraph (A) of this paragraph."

Mr. BROOMFIELD (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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment which would allow Greece to receive the same ratio of direct concessional credits—at 5 percent—to its overall amount of FMS financing in fiscal year 1985 as Turkey does.

In short, if Turkey receives 50 percent of its FMS financing as concessional credits, my amendment would allow Greece to also receive 50 percent of its overall FMS financing as concessional credits.

Moreover, my amendment would provide Greece with the same concessional interest rate financing as Turkey receives in fiscal year 1985.

I believe that my proposal will provide a more balanced approach to eastern Mediterranean matters, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana, the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. HAMILTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we have had the opportunity to examine the amendment on this side. We have also discussed it with the gentleman from Michigan. We have no objection to the amendment and support it.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GEKAS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this is a step in the right direction as the gentleman from Michigan has stated. That it is the beginning, if not the culmination, of an evenhanded policy toward those two vital links in the NATO chain.

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I am happy to yield to the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. WINN).

Mr. WINN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROOMFIELD) for offering this amendment to H.R. 5421 and for the thoughtfulness and many hours that he spent on this. As one of those who has been deeply involved in the discussions on aid to eastern Mediterranean countries the last couple of weeks, I want to commend the gentleman and say that those on this side of the aisle are in agreement and we accept this.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROOMFIELD).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FEIGHAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FEIGHAN: Page 2, line 8, strike out "\$2,933,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,923,000,000"; and line 14, strike out "\$2,933,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,923,000,000".

Page 3, line 8, strike out "\$2,043,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,008,000,000".

Page 17, strike out lines 12 through 23 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

CEILING ON MILITARY ASSISTANCE FOR TURKEY

SEC. 124. For the fiscal year 1985, the aggregate total of assistance provided for Turkey under chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and under sections 23 and 24 of the Arms Export Control Act may not exceed \$670,000,000. Of this amount, not to exceed \$217,000,000 may be assistance provided under chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, not to exceed \$226,500,000 may be

credits extended under section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act, and not to exceed \$226,500,000 may be loan principal guaranteed under section 24 of the Arms Export Control Act.

Page 19, after line 15, insert the following:

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR CYPRUS

SEC. 126. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated \$250,000,000 to provide additional assistance for Cyprus if the President certifies to the Congress that an agreement has been concluded by the Greek and Turkish Cypriots which is supported by Greece and Turkey and which achieves substantial progress toward settlement of the Cyprus dispute. Such an agreement should include an agreement on Varosha/Famagusta, foreign troop levels in the Republic of Cyprus, the disposition of the international airport on Cyprus, or other significant steps which are evidence of substantial progress toward an overall settlement of the Cyprus dispute.

(b) Assistance under this section shall be provided under chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, is in addition to amounts otherwise authorized, and is authorized to remain available until expended.

Mr. FEIGHAN (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.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN) is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, the proposal on assistance to Greece, Turkey, and Cyprus that I am offering along with the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. WINN), is consistent with past action by Congress and it also provides an incentive for all parties to the Cyprus dispute to break the diplomatic deadlock on Cyprus.

Specifically, this amendment—which is a bipartisan compromise worked out in negotiations led by the able chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East, Mr. HAMILTON—does two things:

First, it sets a ceiling of \$670 million on foreign military sales and credits to Turkey. This is \$89 million below the administration's request, and almost \$50 million below the amounts approved by the Foreign Affairs Committee in March.

Second, it establishes a special fund of \$250 million that will be available to Cyprus if the parties on Cyprus—with the concurrence of Greece and Turkey—conclude an agreement which achieves real progress toward a settlement on Cyprus.

The amendment does not reduce Turkish aid as much as many of us would like. Others believe it goes too far. But all of us can agree with the basic thrust of the proposal, which is a new, creative and—I believe—neces-

sary approach to solving the conflict on Cyprus.

First, by capping military assistance to Turkey at \$670 million as I said, an \$89 million cut from the administration's request—we are telling Turkey in no uncertain terms that we expect them to help resolve the conflict on Cyprus.

It has been nearly 10 years since 40,000 Turkish troops invaded and divided that tiny island; 10 years since 200,000 Greek-Cypriots were driven from their homes; 10 years since thousands more were killed and captured by Turkish soldiers who were using American weapons in a manner prohibited by American law.

Today, Cyprus remains divided. Over 20,000 Turkish troops continue to occupy Cyprus, and they have been joined by 50,000 Turkish colonists who were lured from the mainland by the promise of land that had belonged to Greek-Cypriots. The Turkish lire is now the official currency of Cyprus, and the Turkish Government in Ankara subsidizes over half of the Turkish Cypriot budget.

These unhelpful actions have been taken despite an increasingly generous program of U.S. foreign aid to Turkey. Since our aid embargo was lifted in 1978, we have sent close to \$3.5 billion to Turkey. And administration officials have estimated that future assistance could top \$1 billion a year for the next 10 years. All of this aid has been—and will be—provided under the clearly expressed condition that Turkey would cooperate fully in efforts to bring about a solution on Cyprus.

Today, we have to ask if our taxpayers' dollars have been well spent. I submit that they have not. Turkey is working hard to partition Cyprus permanently and consolidate its control over the northern third of that island.

To get a clear picture of this process, we can look back to last November 15 when the Turkish-Cypriots unilaterally declared their part of the island an independent republic. This act—done with the full advice and consent of the Turkish Government—occurred only hours after President Reagan signed a foreign aid bill granting nearly \$1 billion to Turkey. Since then Rauf Denktash—the Turkish Cypriot leader—has consistently rejected U.N. efforts to salvage a settlement with a number of provocative actions. In February, he unfurled a new flag; last month, he called for a constitutional referendum and elections; and a short time later, his so-called republic exchanged ambassadors with the Turkish Government in Ankara. Today, Turkey stands alone in its recognition of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

This Congress, President Reagan and the international community have all condemned these moves by Denktash and his patrons in Ankara. But

this administration's actions have failed to match its tough words. The State Department proposed to increase military aid to Turkey this year, rejecting the legislative mandate linking aid to Turkey to progress on Cyprus.

We in the Congress cannot accept such an increase in the face of continued Turkish intransigence. When the Foreign Affairs Committee considered this bill, we did not reduce Turkish aid below last year's levels because it was hoped that there was a good chance of progress in Cyprus negotiations being conducted under the auspices of the United Nations. We know now that this was not the case. The situation has deteriorated sharply, and the Republic of Cyprus has been compelled to take its case to the U.N. Security Council. The cap on military assistance, which has been agreed to by Members on both sides of the aisle, is a clear expression of congressional frustration over the deadlock on Cyprus.

But expressions of frustration and cuts in assistance, while necessary and useful, are not the only way to achieve progress. We also must focus constructive energy on ways of encouraging the parties on Cyprus itself to work out their differences.

That is why this amendment also authorizes the establishment of a special peace and reconstruction fund for Cyprus. It authorizes \$250 million that will be available to Cyprus if the divided parties on that island conclude an agreement which achieves substantial progress toward settlement of the Cyprus dispute. We do not want to dictate the terms of such an agreement, but we envision that it should include agreement on the abandoned city of Varosha, an agreement regarding foreign troop levels in the Republic of Cyprus, and an agreement regarding the disposition of the international airport in Nicosia.

Let me also emphasize that this money will not be provided to Cyprus until both the Greek-Cypriots and the Turkish-Cypriots—with the approval of both Greece and Cyprus—have signed a settlement. Vague demonstrations of progress in negotiations are simply not enough. No money will be provided unless there is a tangible agreement among all parties to the dispute.

Before I conclude I would also like to emphasize the bipartisan nature of this amendment. It has been worked out in the spirit of constructive compromise during negotiations led by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East, Mr. HAMILTON, and the ranking minority member of that subcommittee and cosponsor of the amendment, Mr. WINN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. YATRON) and the gentleman from

New York (Mr. SOLARZ) also devoted substantial time and energy to hammering out an agreement. And of course, without the consistent leadership of our chairman, Mr. FEIGHAN, this compromise would have been unlikely.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the amendment.

□ 1320

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

Mr. Chairman, first, I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN) for his very substantial and clarifying remarks dealing with the Feighan-Winn amendment.

This amendment is a hard fought compromise among Foreign Affairs Committee Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives and Members on both sides of this difficult, sensitive issue.

The fact that both Mr. FEIGHAN and I are offering this amendment today signals that all forces are joining together. This amendment is supported by and was drafted with the help of Chairman FASCELL and ranking Republican BILL BROOMFIELD, LEE HAMILTON, GUS YATRON, STEVE SOLARZ, and ROBERT TORRICELLI. Without the help of those gentleman in the many, many meetings we have had, we would probably not be able to put together this agreement and compromise.

Our primary objectives in this amendment are to assure the U.S. national security interests and to stimulate a settlement of the Cyprus dispute.

In trying to achieve these objectives, we had to reconcile in the committee differing approaches to those ends.

I personally believe and agree with the administration that deep cuts in United States aid to Turkey will not stimulate a Cyprus settlement. To the contrary, deep cuts such as that voted by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will only antagonize Turkey and the Turkish-Cypriots and drive them away from the peace process. But I also share the feelings of those who express great disappointment, frustration, and anger over the November 15 unilateral declaration of independence by the Turkish-Cypriots and ensuing events. Congress has an obligation to express its concern that the UDI was not helpful to the peace process.

In approving aid levels for this region, we must also, of course, consider U.S. national security interests and NATO concerns.

We are also trying a novel approach in this amendment by authorizing a \$250 million fund to promote a Cyprus settlement. The President would use moneys provided in this fund for Cyprus in the event that an agreement has been concluded which achieves substantial progress toward a settle-

ment of the Cyprus dispute. Such an agreement could include—but as Mr. FEIGHAN said, we did not specify—and we would hope that it would include an agreement on Varosha, or a reduction of the foreign troop levels or an agreement on the international airport. All of these are important issues which could lead to a comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus dispute.

This fund parallels the \$250 million fund proposed yesterday by President Reagan.

At this time I enter into the RECORD the statement of the President:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

At the end of this month I will meet with the Foreign ministers of all the NATO countries to mark the thirty-fifth anniversary of NATO's founding. The alliance is sound. But continuing disagreements between two vital members of the Alliance, Greece and Turkey, are of great concern. Because our friendship with each country is so important, and because their need for one another is so great, special efforts must be made to reduce disagreements and promote harmony—particularly on the island of Cyprus, which has become a focal point of tension.

Successive administrations have tried unsuccessfully to solve the painful dispute which has divided Cyprus into separate Greek and Turkish communities. Over the last several years the Secretary General of the United Nations has worked painstakingly to keep the parties talking to one another. In November, after the Turkish Cypriot declaration of independence, the U.S. condemned the action and called for its reversal, while also working to encourage the parties to move forward in making real progress. On January 2, the Turkish Cypriots responded by proposing a series of good will measures, offering among other things to turn over part of the coastal city of Varosha to the U.S. for eventual Greek settlement. A few days later the Government of Cyprus proposed new guidelines for a comprehensive settlement. Turkey itself announced the removal of 1,500 troops from Northern Cyprus. And the Secretary General of the United Nations was preparing to meet with the parties to discuss his own plan. We welcomed these developments as positive steps. Movement was at last occurring.

At this point, less than two months ago, Secretary Shultz wrote leaders of the Congress to caution that cuts in the Turkish assistance program could risk endangering this progress. Unfortunately, important NATO-related funding for Turkey was nonetheless cut in Committee, no doubt in the mistaken hope that this would somehow stimulate progress on Cyprus. As a result, diplomatic efforts quickly ground to a halt.

We are now working to get diplomacy back on track. We have assured U.N. Secretary General Perez de Cuellar of our continuing support for his efforts to bridge the gaps between the Greek and Turkish communities of Cyprus.

I understand the frustration in the Congress and elsewhere about the need for progress. Indeed, I believe the time has come to try a new and more positive approach. Rather than punishing Turkey, let us focus constructive energy on ways of encouraging the parties on Cyprus itself—for it is here, ultimately, that differences must be resolved. The Administration and the

Congress need to work together to recreate conditions conducive to successful diplomacy. We ask the Congress to work with us by supporting my request for security assistance for our Greek and Turkish allies, and by removing punitive conditions on that assistance. In return, I am prepared to work with the Congress in committing now to a special Cyprus Peace and Reconstruction fund of up to \$250 million. Specific authorizations would be requested at such time as a fair and equitable solution acceptable to both parties on Cyprus is reached, or substantial progress is made toward that end. I intend this commitment to be a symbol of the shared concern of the Administration and the Congress for promoting genuine results on Cyprus.

Peace cannot be bought. But peacemakers should know that the U.S. is prepared to go to great lengths to ensure that their labors are transformed into an enduring achievement. A reunified, stable and secure Cyprus would be such an achievement.

We need to recognize, however, that our security assistance to Greece and Turkey is not given as a favor, but rather to deter aggression upon NATO. U.S. national interests are at stake. Greek security needs deserve to be fully met. And Turkey—working to strengthen democracy, curb terrorism, and defend NATO along its vast common border with the Soviet Union—also deserves every penny we have requested.

The path ahead will not be easy. But bringing harmony to NATO's southern flank and to the troubled island of Cyprus is a goal worthy of our most special efforts.

This initiative is receiving strong positive action. I would like to read, for example, the reaction of the British Government to the proposed fund and the initiative:

Her Majesty's government welcomes the initiative announced yesterday by President Reagan to establish a Special Cyprus Peace and Reconstruction Fund of up to dollars 250 million. We understand that this can be drawn on when an equitable solution acceptable to both parties on Cyprus is reached or substantive progress made towards the end. We continue to hope for a peaceful, just and lasting settlement to the Cyprus question and fully support the Secretary General of the U.N. in his efforts to this end. We are in close contact with him in New York as the Security Council debate proceeds. We believe that President Reagan's proposal should give further encouragement to the parties most directly concerned to find a solution to the problems which so tragically divide the island.

□ 1330

Here we are trying a positive incentive approach to the Cyprus conflict. This amendment, in brief, offers a carrot and a stick. I believe that this approach carries with it a greater promise of stimulating significant progress toward a Cyprus settlement than any approach that we have tried to date, and any other that might be considered here today.

So I urge my colleagues' support for the Feighan-Winn amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address several inquiries to the gentle-

man from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN) who has offered us this amendment, if he is agreeable.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Certainly.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Thank you.

If I understand the gentleman's amendment correctly, it will involve a potential increase in foreign assistance of \$160 million? Would that be correct?

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio for his response.

Mr. FEIGHAN. That is correct in terms of the overall impact, but it is in fact a potential, because the special fund, the peace and reconstruction fund that we are creating under this amendment, if progress is made toward a solution to the conflict that exists in Cyprus, would be a fund that we are appropriating up to \$250 million.

So it would be within the administration's discretion to determine how much of that \$250 million would actually flow. If we find that we have a partial peace process that is underway in northern Cyprus or on Cyprus the determination may be made in the administration that \$25 million should flow for specific purposes.

We may find, for example, that there is an agreement reached on the resettlement on the city of Varosha Famagusta, and in order to allow for the resettlement of that community, the administration may release another portion of the money. So it does have the potential impact that you identify, but it is within the exclusive judgment finally, of the administration.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Chairman, I like to make three points with regard to this amendment. I know the Members involved in offering this amendment and I have the highest respect for them. They have labored to bring a proposal of merit to this committee.

I am going to oppose this amendment for three reasons: First of all, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 2, 1984, the voting record within the United Nations was listed for a number of countries around the world. The record of Cyprus is a very clear, distinct record. Cyprus voted against the U.S. position 82 percent of the time. It would be difficult to imagine how they could have voted against us more. What we are doing is providing a massive potential amount of foreign aid to a country that has opposed the position of the United States consistently.

It says to those in the United Nations that intense opposition to the position of this country may well result in an enormous reward in terms of foreign assistance.

Second, I am going to oppose this amendment because it does involve a

potential increase in foreign assistance of \$160 million.

Third, I am going to oppose this because I believe the money can be far better spent in terms of reducing our deficit; in terms of lowering interest rates in this country. If we are really sincere about straightening out the economic problems of this country and countries around the world, we cannot overlook the impact this amendment will have in increasing our deficit even more; increasing interest rates even more.

I would hope that we as a body would begin to set priorities. If indeed, this objective is a good one, I would hope they would fit it into the massive amount of foreign assistance that is already in this bill.

This bill includes an enormous increase in foreign aid. Surely we do not need to increase it beyond that. If we are really serious about the value of this pot of money put forth for Cyprus, I believe that money should come out of existing funds that are in the bill already, not in an additional amount to be levied on the taxpayers of this country.

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

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GEKAS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I was interested in the report that the gentleman rendered as to the voting record of Cyprus in the United Nations. I wonder if the gentleman has researched the voting record of Turkey?

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. I have here the report out of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 2, 1984, and I will be happy to find Turkey for you.

Turkey's record, I am told, is 40.5 percent in agreement with us, whereas Cyprus voted with us 18 percent of the time.

Mr. GEKAS. So Turkey voted 60 percent against the United States in the United Nations, is that correct?

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Yes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio's enduring commitment to bring about a just and lasting solution to the Cyprus dispute. I salute the chairman of the Europe and Middle East Subcommittee, Congressman HAMILTON, and the ranking minority member, Congressman WINN, for the leadership they have shown in crafting this amendment. I also commend Chairman FASCELL and other members for their support of this initiative.

Mr. Speaker, I would have preferred deeper cuts in the administration's military assistance request for Turkey. However, in the interest of forging a bipartisan consensus on what has been

one of the most contentious issues in the international community, I felt it prudent to support a \$50 million reduction in the Foreign Affairs Committee recommendation which is an overall \$85 million cut in the administration's request.

Mr. Speaker, 10 long years have passed since the Turkish invasion of Cyprus and still there is no settlement. The Greek Cypriots, unwavering in their commitment to a just and peaceful resolution to a conflict which has divided their country, are continually frustrated by Turkish intransigence and the occupation of northern Cyprus by thousands of Turkish troops. Mr. Denktash, the leader of a Turkish Cypriot community which comprises approximately 18 percent of the Cypriot population, continues to control 40-percent Cypriot territory. His demands are extraordinary: He wants 50 percent of the government and 50 percent of all the land in Cyprus. These ludicrous demands make the proposals by the guerrillas in El Salvador seem reasonable in comparison. But as long as he enjoys the support of Ankara and thousands of Turkish troops, it is doubtful Mr. Denktash will negotiate a settlement. Moreover, given the steps the Turkish Cypriot community has taken to consolidate its control over northern Cyprus, I can only conclude that Turkey is closer to achieving its ultimate goal: the annexation of northern Cyprus.

To those who argue that our security interests in Turkey override events in Cyprus, let me simply say that it is because of U.S. security interests that we must press for a solution and the withdrawal of Turkish forces. Should the conflict in Cyprus prevail, we risk a military exchange between two NATO allies: Turkey and Greece. At a time when Soviet aggression throughout the world is on the rise, can we afford to have escalating tensions in NATO's southern flank? Must there be new bloodshed in Cyprus before the United States seeks to effectively address this 10-year tragedy? And to those who would contend that this conflict is not a concern of the United States, let me simply remind our colleagues that it was the Congress which appropriated the military assistance for Turkey which was used in an illegal act of aggression against Cyprus. As the leader of freedom and democracy, the United States must stand square behind a Cyprus settlement and the withdrawal of all Turkish forces.

This amendment recognizes that, yes, we have important security interests in Turkey but it also sends a clear message to Ankara that the American people will not passively comply with Turkey's aggression in Cyprus.

□ 1340

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, and I would like to commend my colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio, the gentleman from Kansas, the gentleman from Indiana, the committee chairman, and the ranking member of the committee, for reaching this compromise on what is a very difficult issue.

Frankly, I do not think it goes far enough, and I am not optimistic that this compromise will resolve the situation that has existed for more than a decade and has only gotten worse.

Mr. Chairman, in considering the proper U.S. position on this issue, I believe we should begin by asking ourselves two simple questions:

Does the present impasse on Cyprus endanger U.S. interests in the eastern Mediterranean? If so, do we have a duty to provide incentives for positive action on Cyprus?

I believe the answer to both questions must be "Yes."

I recognize that there are two schools of thought on this issue. Some people still cling to the belief that the United States can best encourage settlement on Cyprus by separating that issue from broader U.S. interests in the region. But now, after 10 years of discussion, I can no longer believe that Turkey will show a genuine interest in ending its illegal occupation of Cyprus unless it is given a reason to do so.

This issue is not whether it is constructive to offer incentives for Turkey to seek progress on Cyprus. The two are already linked. Since 1978 we have provided Turkey with aid totaling \$3.5 billion, aid conditioned upon Turkey's full cooperation in the effort to achieve a solution on Cyprus. Each year Congress hears promises. We are told that the prospects are good for substantial progress in some ongoing negotiation. But, if there is always some imminent breakthrough in negotiations during foreign aid season in Congress, I am puzzled why—year after year—the situation only gets worse.

As each year goes by, Mr. Denktash, the Turkish-Cypriot leader, takes new steps to entrench Turkish occupation of northern Cyprus. Last fall, just 3 days after Congress approved the foreign aid appropriation which provided more than \$1 billion for Turkey, Mr. Denktash declared unilateral declaration of independence for his enclave on Cyprus. This action was followed by a number of curiously timed actions. In March the Foreign Affairs Committee accepted only minor cuts in military aid for Turkey, deferred final action, out of concern that we not upset seemingly promising negotiations. We were told that Mr. Den-

tash was willing to freeze implementation of his unilateral declaration of independence. We were told that he was willing to return the vacant town of Varosha/Famagusta to its Greek-Cypriot inhabitants, as requested by the Secretary-General of the United Nations. After the action of the committee, however, an independent flag was raised over northern Cyprus; northern Cyprus and Turkey exchanged ambassadors; and Mr. Denktash denied any intention of returning Varosha even as a goodwill gesture.

Now, as we consider this bill, not surprisingly, Mr. Denktash is responding once again—after a delay of several months—to the diplomatic efforts of the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Hints are coming out of Turkey and northern Cyprus that Mr. Denktash has offered the return of Varosha in secret proposals recently made at the United Nations.

I want to feel optimistic about the negotiations which, once again, have become suddenly active just as Congress considers foreign aid legislation. But given the history of the last 10 years, I am wary of rewarding, in advance, recycled promises.

This amendment offers a new approach. I believe the modest cuts in military aid to Turkey are more than justified, and will send the message that Congress will no longer accept inaction on Cyprus. The positive incentive of a \$250 million development fund, however, will outweigh this punitive measure if Turkey is willing to seek a settlement on Cyprus—as we are so often told.

My greatest fear, Mr. Chairman, is that if we do not act, Cyprus will become permanently partitioned. This would be a tragedy for the people of Cyprus, who have already suffered so much. But we should be concerned for more reasons than our belief in the worth of international law and the sovereign rights of nations. Permanent partition would mean de facto annexation of northern Cyprus by Turkey. The entity on northern Cyprus exists today only through the presence of Turkish troops. Even now, the budget of northern Cyprus comes mostly from Ankara, and residents of northern Cyprus use Turkish currency, Turkish passports, and Turkish mail service. Given the realities of Cyprus, Turkey's claim to have no influence with Mr. Denktash rings hollow.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) has expired.

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

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Chairman, the situation in the eastern Mediterranean may seem bad now, with Greece questioning the worth of its NATO alliance due to inaction over Cyprus, and with Turkey concentrating so much of its

military resources on Cyprus and the Aegean coast. But imagine the situation a few years from now if there is no progress on the settlement in Cyprus. Permanent partition of Cyprus would almost certainly lead to a military buildup by both Greece and Turkey on opposing sides of the island. An increasingly militarized Aegean would bring with it the constant threat of confrontation, and would further undermine NATO strength along its southern flank in the eastern Mediterranean.

As we consider this amendment, we should all remember that the issue is not just Cyprus. Nor is it just a matter of choosing between Greece and Turkey. We must also recognize the great damage the impasse on Cyprus has already done to United States security interests in the eastern Mediterranean. We must recognize that we cannot vote to continue the status quo. We cannot allow the perpetuation of the status quo. The current situation is one of unfulfilled promises and steady deterioration. We can, however, vote for incentives to reward progress. That, certainly, should be the intention of this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, there is no way, in response to what the gentleman from Colorado said, that we can precisely measure one's loyalty to the United States. For example, Cyprus was the only country in the area that was willing to take our wounded marines in Beirut. In fact, Turkey refused to allow the United States to land on our American bases in Turkey with our wounded marines.

So, I do not think there is any question here as to who is more loyal than the other. It is in our interest to resolve the conflict in Cyprus. It has been 10 long years, and the situation has deteriorated. It is our responsibility to interject with our policy what we think is best, and what would best represent the U.S. foreign policy in Cyprus.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentlelady from Maine and share her concerns.

I reluctantly support this bipartisan agreement proposed by Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. WINN, and Mr. YATRON on military assistance to Turkey because of my deep concern about the lack of significant progress on the Cyprus problem, and in particular, the continuing Turkish military presence on the island.

Nearly 10 years ago, Turkish troops invaded Cyprus using American weapons to occupy the island. To this very day, nearly 20,000 Turkish troops on Cyprus continue to operate 300 U.S.-made tanks, 250 U.S. armored personnel carriers, 500 U.S. artillery pieces, as well as American antiaircraft and antitank weapons. All of this is U.S. equipment given or sold to Turkey for

defense and not for use in an offensive operation apart from Turkey's NATO responsibilities.

Since the invasion, thousands of innocent Cypriots have been killed, many remain missing, and families have been traumatically forced from their homes and villages. This forced occupation by the Turks has imposed political, economic, and military hardships on the people of Cyprus, enacting heavy social and cultural burdens as well.

About 40 percent of Cyprus is under Turkish Cypriot control, and in particular, the Turks, who control the Famagusta (Varosha) area, will not permit the people to return to their homes, let alone their very birthplaces. In a sense, the Turkish military has created an iron curtain between the people of Cyprus and the towns they once lived in. Despite the many Turkish promises, Famagusta remains a ghost town with an uncertain future.

Furthermore, with nearly 20,000 troops on the island, Turkey is violating the 1959 treaty which was designed to insure the sovereignty of Cyprus and limit the number of troops for both Greece and Turkey. This agreement limits the total number of Turkish troops to 650.

I fully recognize that efforts to demilitarize the island have been attempted, especially within the United Nations. Turkey's recognition of the newly independent Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, and the exchange of ambassadors between Turkey and the so-called independent state, only aggravates the situation.

While many say that progress on Cyprus is being made through Turkish promises to return Famagusta, it has not happened. While the Secretary-General of the United Nations has worked painstakingly to keep the parties talking to each other, northern Cyprus recently declared itself an independent Turkish-Cypriot republic apart from the Greek-Cypriot community on the Mediterranean island. I am especially angered and saddened by the recent insensitivities of this illegal action as well as Turkey's complicity in the unilateral declaration.

After so many years of waiting for a settlement, I am truly disappointed that so little progress on this matter has been made. As a result, I firmly believe that continued delays on the part of all parties will only serve to weaken relations with NATO and the United States.

Something must be done to remedy the current tragic situation. I believe that this compromise, which includes a \$90 million cut from the administration's request for Turkey, is at least a symbolic first step to resolve the Cyprus situation, and I reluctantly support it.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I, too, rise in support of the amendment and to commend my colleague from Ohio and our very able chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON), for his help in bringing us to this important day in this critical statement.

This amendment achieves several important objectives for our country. First, it is an unmistakable message that America has not forgotten. We remember Cyprus, and we recognize our responsibility to work toward a just solution. It is a reminder to the world that the issue of Cyprus will not go away. It is with us, and America will continue to watch and work for a just solution.

Second, this amendment is a message delivered without compromising American or NATO security in the region. It is fair to each of our NATO allies, and recognizes our primary responsibilities. It is a message that includes part of the President's concept of reward for progress toward settlement. But mostly, it is a statement and it is a compromise that recognizes that the principal danger to the United States in the region is to allow the problem on Cyprus to continue.

NATO knows no greater threat today than the continued tension and potential conflict, indeed danger, that conflict between Greece and Turkey would mean to the United States. The United States is not a bystander in the Eastern Mediterranean. Any threat to NATO security is a threat to our own security as well.

I urge support for this amendment because it is simple justice on Cyprus, it is a simple and a fair message to Greece and Turkey, and I urge all Members to join in support.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of the Feighan-Winn compromise amendment addressing the issue of assistance to Turkey, Greece, and Cyprus offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN) and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. WINN), and I want to commend them and the entire negotiating team consisting of Chairman FASCELL, our ranking member, Mr. BROOMFIELD, our subcommittee chairman, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. SOLARZ, for working so hard in hammering out this compromise proposal.

This amendment reduces by \$85 million from the administration's request down to \$670 million the level of U.S. military assistance to Turkey. More important, this proposal offers an incentive to Turkey, Greece, and Cyprus for economic assistance in the amount of \$250 million if and when the President determines that the parties to

the conflict on Cyprus demonstrate good faith efforts in equitably and fairly resolving the territorial and other issues that comprise this dispute.

Mr. Chairman, many of us in the Congress have long been concerned by the dismal lack of progress that has bedeviled that attractive island-nation ever since Turkey, in 1974, sent in its occupation troops. Estimates place the number of Turkish troops on Cyprus at 20,000, with more than 200,000 Greek Cypriots remaining as refugees since the Turkish incursion into the northern part of the islands.

Since 1984, 2,500 U.N. peacekeeping troops have manned the green line dividing the Turkish and Greek Cypriot areas. The United Nations has also used its good offices over the years to produce an acceptable settlement of divisive issues. However, assistance from Turkey to the Turkish Cypriots and the continuing presence of Turkish troops on Cyprus have scuttled efforts to secure a workable peace on Cyprus.

In November 1983, the situation on Cyprus was exacerbated when the leader of the Turkish Cypriot community, Rauf Denktash, unilaterally declared an independent Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. That act, which was deplored by the United Nations Security Council, risks an expanded deterioration in relations between the United States NATO allies, Greece, and Turkey. Indeed, Turkey's lone decision to recognize and to assist the newly declared government was widely criticized and can only be seen as a major impediment to sincere peace efforts.

Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that passage of the amendment before us will be perceived by Turkey as a signal that while the United States is willing to authorize a reasonable sum of military assistance to bolster our NATO ally, our Nation insist that Ankara assign a top priority to ending the conflict on Cyprus. It is our intention also that the additional \$250 million Cyprus peace and reconstruction funding provided by this amendment will provide an incentive which will help lay the groundwork for promoting cooperative initiatives among the Turkey, Greece, and Cyprus parties to the Cyprus disputes.

Accordingly, I urge colleagues to support this amendment.

□ 1350

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

Mr. Chairman, I must confess to having somewhat mixed feelings about this amendment.

On the one hand, I literally stand in awe of the achievement of my very

good friend and colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, who, together with the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. WINN), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. YATRON), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN), and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI), was able to shape this compromise. Not since Henry Clay sat in that chair and facilitated the so-called Great Compromise which avoided a civil confrontation in our country over a century ago has there been an example of such fine legislative craftsmanship as the proposal which we have before us today. And I should also add that I have a profound sense of admiration for the willingness on the part of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. YATRON) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN) who have very deep feelings about this issue, to cooperate in the effort to construct a broad bipartisan consensus on this issue.

I know it was not easy, and I think they acted in the best traditions of constructive statesmanship in the House of Representatives.

On the other hand, however, I must confess to a deep sense of disappointment that it was not possible at this stage of the legislative process to secure broader support for a larger authorization of funds for Turkey, because it seems to me that there is very little doubt that Turkey is a country of enormous importance to the West in general and to the United States in particular.

Together with Greece, it is the key to the defense of the Southern flank of NATO. It has the second largest army in the Western Alliance. It ties down 26 Warsaw Pact divisions that might otherwise be shifted to the critical central front.

Through its possession of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles, together with its early warning and antiaircraft system, it is the key to the survival of the 6th Fleet and its control of the Mediterranean, which in turn is a necessary condition if we are going to preserve the rest of our European friends from what otherwise could be a cutoff of a large part of the petroleum supplies on which they depend for their very existence. And there is equally little doubt that Turkey desperately needs substantially more military assistance. The equipment on which it relies is by and large of Korean war vintage. They fight with 1950 generation aircraft. They need new, advanced combat aircraft, and they need upgraded tanks. It would be very easy to justify a substantially greater level of aid to Turkey in purely military terms than the amount authorized in this amendment.

But we are told by some of the Members who are deeply concerned about the failure to achieve any progress on Cyprus that it is important to send a

message to Turkey in order to get some progress in solving the Cyprus problem.

I share their concern about the inability of the parties concerned to get a Cyprus settlement.

I would like to see the Turkish forces withdrawn from Cyprus. I would like to see a reunited Cyprus. I would like to see a Cyprus in which Turks and Greeks can live and work together. But I cannot really understand how anybody can seriously believe that this modest cut in the level of our assistance to Turkey is going to produce progress on Cyprus. If we were unable to produce progress on Cyprus by beating the Turks over the head with a baseball bat when we adopted the embargo almost a decade ago, I do not see how we can possibly achieve progress on Cyprus by slapping the Turks on the wrist with a wet noodle, which is in effect what the cut in this amendment is attempting to do.

I think the lesson we have learned over the last decade is that the problem on Cyprus is not going to be solved by additional American pressure with respect to Turkey. To be sure, lifting the embargo did not solve the problem either. So as it turned out, neither putting pressure on them nor not putting pressure on them was adequate to do the job. Therefore, I think it is a mistake to link the two.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLARZ) has expired.

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

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Chairman, I think it is a mistake to link the two even implicitly, and in that sense I am disappointed that we could not have a more generous level of funds for Turkey in this bill.

Nevertheless, to the extent that there may be some signals emanating from this Chamber, I hope that those who are looking at what we do today will recognize that this is but the beginning of the process. It is not the end of the process. There is still a way to go, and I am hopeful we will be able to improve on this otherwise constructive amendment, which I gather we will soon be adopting on the floor, when we go to conference.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLARZ) has expired.

□ 1400

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

Mr. Chairman, I do rise in opposition to this amendment and in doing so I commend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON) and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. WINN) for their very best effort to find a compromise on an issue about which people feel so strongly and an issue on which

opinions are quite diverse. Nevertheless, I do support the emphasis that is placed on finding a solution to the continuing severe problems of Cyprus which splits our NATO allies and creates all kinds of concerns for Americans.

While I expressly support that emphasis, I must oppose the amendment, because I think, first of all, an issue of this gravity on which the participants are all members of the Foreign Affairs Committee should have been presented and thoroughly debated first in the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Second, and most importantly, I do not believe that the amendment as now drafted is even-handed, despite the best efforts of the two gentlemen.

Third, a few moments ago my colleague from New York pointed out the importance of Turkey as a NATO ally. I would emphatically endorse his comments on that subject.

Earlier the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BROWN) presented information to you about the level of support given by Cyprus to the United States during the 38th plenary session of the United Nations. I believe it was 18 percent. In response to a question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania as to the support for the United States by Greece, he said that figure was only 28.8 percent. Sometimes one should know the full answer to the question before asking the questions. For example, the level of support for the United States from Turkey, for what any of this means to our debate here, was 40.5 percent, more than Cyprus or Greece by substantial margins. I actually have doubts whether these figures are not really the most relevant factors to consider on the important issue here today. Yet this member does share some of the concerns the gentleman from Colorado expressed.

It takes two sides to find a solution to the thorny problems that plague Cyprus—that means both Turkey and Greece.

This member and four other Members of this House were in Istanbul the day the new, democratically elected President of Turkey took office.

It is my understanding, based, I believe, on an accurate report that an offer was made by the new President of Turkey to begin negotiations. It was rejected out of hand by the Government of Greece as being insincerely offered. Indeed, there are two sides that must be considered on the problems that we see exhibited in Cyprus and in the relationships between these two great NATO allies. Criticism can be directed toward actions by Greece and Turkey. We must emphasize, therefore, the responsibilities that weigh heavily on the leaders of both these nations.

I have here a collection of strident anti-American, anti-Israeli and anti-

Semitic statements and actions by the Papandreou government in Greece. I do not intend to use them here unless provoked. They are shocking. I think they would shock and anger the American public.

I have asked for unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, Mr. Chairman, and I do not expect to have to use these Papandreou statements and actions, nor to offer the two amendments that I have ready to the Feighan amendment. It really depends on what happens in the course of debate and especially on the uneven or strident criticism that might be directed only against Turkey. It is my understanding that my colleagues will not provide such comments through a revision of their remarks.

I want to do the responsible thing and to keep our allies working together as much as possible.

There are difficulties in Greece. We know about them. They spring in part from the policies of the Socialist government in Greece, but it is wrong and devious for the NATO alliance and for Mr. Papandreou to use anti-Turkey and anti-American statements to distract Greek attention and opinion from those domestic difficulties.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very serious matter that we are considering here today. It is a matter that I think should have been handled in committee. It is a matter of unequal approach favoring Greece that we must not continue from year to year. We should expect to exert every kind of possible reasonable pressure and influence on the Governments of both these two NATO allies to find a solution to the problems of Cyprus. The Government of Greece does not feel the urgency of our concern and certainly will not after the passage of this one-sided amendment. I stand behind an approach to find an equitable solution to the problems in Cyprus, but I must out of a sense of fairness and a concern for the integrity of NATO, oppose this amendment.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I rise in support of the amendment.

Just a few very quick observations about the amendment, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I want to commend my colleagues who have worked on this issue and discussed it here today. We all understand it is a very divisive topic and that feelings on it are strong.

I am impressed by the responsible and civil manner in which this difficult problem has been discussed on the floor.

I want to say a word of special appreciation to our colleague from Kansas, Congressman WINN, the ranking member of the Europe and Middle East Subcommittee, because the incentive package was really his idea and that is the basis of this amendment.

He deserves credit for that. Others have certainly contributed to the amendment and they have proceeded in a most constructive and responsible way.

The gentleman from Kansas (Mr. WINN), of course, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLARZ), also, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) and others as well deserve commendation.

Three very quick comments, Mr. Chairman. The first is that this amendment really does represent a new approach to seeking progress toward a Cyprus settlement by trying to induce the parties to achieve progress.

In the past we have always sought only to punish the parties. This time we have also put an incentive package out in front of them, and, if an agreement is concluded which brings about substantial progress, Cyprus will lay claim to that incentive package.

The approach of trying to punish the parties has not worked in the past. These positive incentives may work and should be given a chance.

The second point I would make is simply that this amendment does indeed represent a compromise among many members of the committee. It is not all that several Members wanted, but it represents a consensus among the members of the committee who seek to avoid a divisive fight here in the House.

The final point simply is this, that the United States has very important relations with Turkey, with Greece, and with Cyprus. Those interests have been spelled out in the course of this debate.

We need to take into consideration each of those interests as we look at the eastern Mediterranean today. We need to preserve the delicate ties that we have with each of these three countries and that is exactly what this amendment seeks to do.

So I would urge the Members to approve the Feighan-Winn amendment.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMILTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of the amendment, although I wish it went further.

Do not accept that we can compromise these principles for expediency and strategic concerns and long maintain an effective foreign policy. We have a serious responsibility to recognize that if we provide weapons and funds for defensive purposes and these weapons are used for aggressive purposes we share in the responsibility for these acts. We cannot claim that we do not know the cold reality of the uses to which our assistance program for Turkey have been put. If we continue to fund this program and do not

at least make a gesture of reduction, there will be a blot on the honor of our country that we did nothing to protect the people of a tiny friendly nation of Cyprus from the dark designs of a powerful neighbor.

We have before us a clear choice of principle. We must not reward aggression and conquest of neighbor's territory with increased assistance and military credits. We must always remember that in the long run the security of our country rests on our honoring the principles and ideals of human rights, international law, and simple justice on which our foreign policy must rest.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this compromise which has been worked out. I have asked to revise and extend to set forth the full extent of what I would like to say.

I would like to remind those who have stood up and opposed this compromise and talked about the problems of these countries as they relate to the interests of the United States that we have these continuing problems, but that does not mean that we must not continue to do what we must to bring those countries into line with what the United States sees as their best interests and our best interests. This compromise continues that ability of this country to do that and through the good offices of the people who worked so hard to do that, to allow for some forward progress.

There are human rights involved. There are issues on a daily basis of our security and the security of the Western World. We cannot hamper the efforts to bring these to an appropriate conclusion by taking out after some specifics of an issue when in fact the overall goal is one that everyone subscribes to.

I personally would like to commend the people who were mentioned by the chairman of the subcommittee as those who have worked so hard to forge this compromise which was not at all easy to do.

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

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

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

I rise to say I support this compromise wholeheartedly.

I want to extend my commendation to both the ranking member and the chairman of the subcommittee and the others who have worked so diligently to bring this to the House on a very sensitive subject.

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the amend-

ment offered by the gentleman from Ohio. This attempt to reduce by \$45 million the level of U.S. military grant aid to Turkey, as contained in H.R. 5119, the foreign aid authorization bill, is not only contrary to the best interests of the United States but could damage current efforts at good-faith negotiations between Greece and Turkey, in conjunction with the United Nations, to resolve the situation in Cyprus.

Certainly, it is no secret that Turkey has long been a valuable political ally of the United States, providing strategic listening posts for U.S. Government intelligence needs and offering an effective defense for the United States against actions by Soviet Union in that region. Indeed, the Turkish Armed Forces are currently tying up several Russian divisions on their common borders, thereby keeping the Russians in check, and acting to reduce Soviet adventurism in the Middle East.

In addition, Turkey represents a valuable NATO ally with a population of 50 million. Turkey has well-disciplined armed forces, and maintains the largest standing army in NATO after the United States with forces numbering over 500,000. However, the Turkish Armed Forces need modernization with the help of the United States and its foreign aid program.

U.S. grant aid to Turkey, the most useful portion of that assistance program, is essential to Turkey's NATO force modernization program. Any crippling of this integral part of the package will severely erode Turkey's critically important military responsibilities and duties undertaken in support of the Western Alliance. Thus, United States and Middle Eastern security interests would also substantially suffer as the result of passage of this amendment.

The Feighan amendment also contains a provision to establish a \$250 million incentive fund for the purpose of resolving the dispute over Cyprus. While the intent of such a provision is indeed admirable, the effectiveness of this particular provision would, I believe, be severely limited. Under the provision, the Government of Greece, Turkey, and Cyprus would split the \$250 million if mutually agreed upon progress was made toward resolving the dispute. This effort would likely backfire, however, none of the Governments involved would accept the money since it would be interpreted by their press and public opinion as accepting money for land concessions under pressure from the United States. As a result, the \$250 million fund would fail in its goal of settling the dispute, and could, in fact, further hamper existing efforts to reconcile the differences.

There are presently underway major efforts by the United Nations as well

as efforts by the newly elected Turkish Government under Prime Minister Turgut Ozal to settle the dispute. In fact, shortly after the new Turkish Government took over in January 1984, it announced the withdrawal of 1,500 troops from Cyprus as a first step toward good-faith negotiations with the Greeks. A reduction in U.S. military grant aid to Turkey by \$45 million at this time would only discourage rather than encourage further attempts by the Turkish Governments to find a solution to this problem.

Rather, it seems that the best interests of the United States and this Middle Eastern region would be better served by maintaining friendly relations with both Greece and Turkey and by working with both Governments to resolve their problems. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment and to support instead the amount of aid to Turkey as proposed in the original language of the foreign aid authorizations bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 376, noes 27, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 134]

AYES—376

Ackerman	Burton (CA)	Donnelly
Addabbo	Byron	Dorgan
Albosta	Campbell	Dowdy
Alexander	Carney	Downey
Anderson	Carper	Dreier
Andrews (TX)	Carr	Duncan
Annunzio	Chandler	Durbin
Applegate	Chappell	Dwyer
Archer	Cheney	Dymally
Aspin	Clarke	Dyson
AuCoin	Clay	Early
Barnard	Clinger	Eckart
Barnes	Coats	Edgar
Bartlett	Coelho	Edwards (AL)
Bateman	Coleman (MO)	Edwards (CA)
Bates	Coleman (TX)	English
Bedell	Collins	Erdreich
Bellenson	Conable	Evans (IL)
Bennett	Conte	Fascell
Berman	Conyers	Fazio
Bethune	Cooper	Feighan
Bevill	Corcoran	Fiedler
Biaggi	Coughlin	Fields
Bilirakis	Courter	Fish
Bliley	Coyne	Flippo
Boehlert	Crane, Daniel	Florio
Boggs	Crockett	Foglietta
Boland	D'Amours	Foley
Bonior	Daniel	Ford (MI)
Bonker	Darden	Ford (TN)
Borski	Daschle	Fowler
Bosco	Daub	Frank
Boucher	Davis	Franklin
Boxer	de la Garza	Frenzel
Breaux	Dellums	Frost
Britt	Derrick	Fuqua
Brooks	DeWine	Garcia
Broomfield	Dickinson	Gaydos
Brown (CA)	Dicks	Gejdenson
Broyhill	Dingell	Gekas
Bryant	Dixon	Gephardt

Gibbons	Martin (NY)	Scheuer
Gillman	Martinez	Schneider
Gingrich	Matsui	Schroeder
Glickman	Mavroules	Schulze
Gonzalez	Mazzoli	Schumer
Goodling	McCain	Seiberling
Gore	McCloskey	Sensenbrenner
Gradison	McCollum	Shannon
Gramm	McCurdy	Sharp
Gray	McDade	Shaw
Green	McEwen	Shelby
Gregg	McGrath	Shuster
Guarini	McHugh	Sikorski
Gunderson	McKernan	Siljander
Hall (OH)	McKinney	Simon
Hall, Ralph	McNulty	Sisisky
Hall, Sam	Mica	Skeen
Hamilton	Michel	Skelton
Hammerschmidt	Mikulski	Slattery
Harkin	Miller (CA)	Smith (FL)
Harrison	Mineta	Smith (IA)
Hartnett	Minish	Smith (NE)
Hatcher	Mitchell	Smith (NJ)
Hayes	Moakley	Smith, Robert
Hefner	Molinari	Snowe
Heftel	Mollohan	Snyder
Hertel	Moody	Solarz
Hightower	Moore	Spratt
Hiller	Moorhead	St Germain
Horton	Morrison (CT)	Staggers
Howard	Morrison (WA)	Stangeland
Hoyer	Mrazek	Stark
Huckaby	Murphy	Stenholm
Hughes	Murtha	Stokes
Hunter	Myers	Stratton
Hutto	Natcher	Studds
Hyde	Neal	Studds
Ireland	Nelson	Sundquist
Jacobs	Nichols	Swift
Jeffords	Nowak	Synar
Jenkins	O'Brien	Tallon
Johnson	Oakar	Tauke
Jones (OK)	Oberstar	Tauzin
Jones (TN)	Obey	Taylor
Kaptur	Olin	Thomas (CA)
Kasich	Ortiz	Thomas (GA)
Kastenmeier	Ottlinger	Torres
Kemp	Owens	Torricelli
Kennelly	Packard	Towns
Kildee	Panetta	Traxler
Kindness	Parris	Udall
Klecza	Pashayan	Vander Jagt
Kogovsek	Patterson	Vandergriff
Kolter	Paul	Vento
Kostmayer	Pease	Vucanovich
LaFalce	Penny	Walgren
Lagomarsino	Pepper	Walker
Lantos	Perkins	Watkins
Leach	Petri	Waxman
Lehman (CA)	Porter	Weaver
Lehman (FL)	Price	Weber
Leland	Pritchard	Weiss
Lent	Pursell	Wheat
Levin	Quillen	Whitehurst
Levine	Rahall	Whitley
Levitas	Rangel	Whittaker
Lewis (FL)	Ratchford	Whitten
Lipinski	Regula	Williams (MT)
Livingston	Reid	Williams (OH)
Lloyd	Richardson	Wilson
Loeffler	Ridge	Winn
Long (LA)	Rinaldo	Wirth
Long (MD)	Ritter	Wise
Lott	Robinson	Wolf
Lowery (CA)	Rodino	Wolpe
Lowry (WA)	Roe	Wortley
Lujan	Roemer	Wright
Luken	Rose	Wyden
Lungren	Rostenkowski	Wylie
Mack	Roukema	Yates
MacKay	Rowland	Yatron
Madigan	Rudd	Young (AK)
Marlenee	Russo	Young (MO)
Marriott	Sabo	Zschau
Martin (IL)	Sawyer	

NOES—27

Badham	Evans (IA)	Ray
Bereuter	Holt	Roberts
Brown (CO)	Hopkins	Rogers
Burton (IN)	Hubbard	Roth
Chapple	Kramer	Schaefer
Craig	Latta	Shumway
Crane, Philip	Miller (OH)	Smith, Denny
Dannemeyer	Nielson	Stump
Emerson	Patman	Volkmer

NOT VOTING—30

Akaka	Hansen (UT)	McCandless
Andrews (NC)	Hawkins	Montgomery
Anthony	Hillis	Oxley
Boner	Jones (NC)	Pickle
Edwards (OK)	Kazen	Roybal
Erlenborn	Leath	Savage
Ferraro	Lewis (CA)	Solomon
Hall (IN)	Lundine	Spence
Hance	Markey	Valentine
Hansen (ID)	Martin (NC)	Young (FL)

□ 1420

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Markey for, with Mr. Hance against.

Messrs. PHILIP M. CRANE, ROTH, and BURTON of Indiana changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1430

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LAGOMARSINO

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAGOMARSINO: Page 3, line 8, strike out "\$2,043,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,058,500,000".

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment on behalf of Mr. PEPPER and myself. Our amendment increases the fiscal year 1985 ceiling on the total of FMS loan guarantees to permit an additional \$15 million in loan guarantees for Peru. As the committee changed this category to an off-budget account, the increase will not affect the overall foreign aid budget.

The increase in FMS loan guarantees for Peru is a small, but needed step toward reducing Peru's dependence on its Soviet military relationship, which has meant military equipment and supplies as well as Soviet presence and influence in Peru.

By increasing U.S. security assistance to Peru, we demonstrate our support for the continuation of a stable, democratic government which is friendly to the United States. President Belaunde's government is faced with severe financial pressures as well as threats from the organized terrorist group known as Sendero Luminoso, "the shining path." Increased U.S. support can help combat that threat.

Without U.S. assistance at greater levels, the Peruvian military is most likely to pursue major hardware purchases from the Soviets, such as aircraft like the MIG-23 or MIG-25. The Soviets have already offered several different classes of naval vessels. Reportedly, the Peruvian Navy does not want to accept the Soviet offer. The Peruvian Navy is the only branch of the military that has not purchased Soviet equipment, and we should do everything we can to encourage them not to do so in the future.

Peru is also seeking to reduce illegal drug trafficking in its country and

needs additional equipment like air traffic control radar to detect drug traffickers and helicopters for their antidrug campaign.

Without adequate funding for U.S. security assistance to Peru, we will be unable to break the influence of the Soviet military over Peru. Even with this additional funding it will be difficult to turn around a dependence that has developed over two decades. But we must begin now. I urge my colleagues to support this request for an increase in the off-budget account for FMS loan guarantees.

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

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

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we are familiar with this amendment. The gentleman has discussed it with us and with the chairman of the subcommittee. We agree with the purpose of it thoroughly, support it, and are prepared to accept it.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BARNES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to echo the chairman's words. I think this is an excellent amendment. I want to commend my friend from California and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) for their leadership in bringing this issue to the floor.

We ought to be doing a lot more for the democracies in Latin America than we have been doing. This is the right step.

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

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO) for this amendment.

We join in support of that amendment.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I warmly support the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague and coauthor, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and his able remarks in support of our amendment to provide more military aid to Peru. I was in Peru early this year with several colleagues from this House and we learned from our own Ambassador and Embassy officials, and from Peruvian officials, the very grave danger confronting Peru today from its economic distress and from

the present practice of the Soviet Union of furnishing most of the materiel and equipment required by the Peruvian Army and Air Force due to the United States having not offered for some years such defense materiel to the Peruvian Government upon terms it could afford to accept.

Today the Soviet Embassy in Peru has some 600 personnel which speaks for itself. The Soviet Union today is moving upon that great Republic of Peru like a snake upon a bird. It has been a gross error on the part of our country to have allowed this situation to come into existence. The best summary of the situation as it now exists and of the increasing power of the Soviet Union upon Peru has been afforded me by the Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. John W. Vessey, Jr., whom I asked to supply me such information. I submit herewith the point paper prepared for me by the Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, dated March 7, 1984, and ask that it be incorporated at this point in the RECORD following my previous remarks.

POINT PAPER

SUBJECT: SOVIET INFLUENCE AND INVOLVEMENT IN PERU

II. MAJOR POINTS

A. *The growth of Soviet involvement in Peruvian military assistance has increased steadily since the early 1970's while U.S. influence has fluctuated at a much lower level*

Soviets have made significant inroads in Peru with their weapons and military packages.

Since 1974, U.S. security assistance to Peru has been substantially less than Soviet aid. The U.S. security assistance program in South America, Central America, and the Caribbean is only 4 percent of the U.S. worldwide program for fiscal year 1985.

Peru, frustrated in its efforts to obtain modern U.S. military equipment, turned to the U.S.S.R. as its primary supplier, receiving an estimated \$1.4 to \$1.6 billion of equipment between 1973 and present.

Major acquisitions have been ground weapons, fighter-bombers, transport aircraft, helicopters, and air defense weapons.

Peruvian Navy has bought from the West rather than from the Soviets. The U.S.S.R. nonetheless, continues to court the Peruvian Navy.

Major Soviet influence is with the Peruvian Army and Air Force.

Several thousand Peruvian Army and Air Force personnel have been trained in the Soviet Union, and most were trained on a non-reimbursable basis. 150 Soviet Military Advisors are in Peru providing technical assistance, maintenance, and doctrinal advice.

Soviets have targeted the junior officers, tomorrow's leaders, with their military education and propaganda courses in the Soviet Union. Courses have given the Peruvian junior officers a largely positive view of the Soviet system and serve as a seed program for Soviet ideals.

The Peruvians are presently the only recipients of large amounts of Soviet military aid in South America. However, Soviets' long-term goals are to influence favorably the South American armed forces and set

up dependency patterns for military hardware and training, thus breaking the largely western orientation of the region's military equipment purchases and doctrine.

B. Peru has become dependent upon the Soviets for equipment and training

U.S. is viewed as an unreliable supplier, and U.S. and Western sources cannot compete with Soviet terms or delivery time in sales.

Mr. Chairman, the money our Government would expend in supplying necessary military aid to Peru would be infinitesimal compared to what we might have to spend if the Russians took over that great country deep in the heart of the Western Hemisphere. The loss of Peru to the democratic and free world would be an immeasurable catastrophe to democracy and freedom in the Western Hemisphere. It inevitably would have a very dangerous impact upon the democracy which is flourishing today in Argentina and Brazil. It would gravely endanger the interests of our country and cause, I believe, the most serious complications our country has experienced in Latin America.

Mr. Chairman, a bit ago I appeared before the subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee chaired by our distinguished colleague, MICHAEL BARNES, and urged that subcommittee to report out more substantial economic aid and much more substantial military aid to Peru than we have been providing. That subcommittee made favorable recommendations upon those subjects and the Committee on Foreign Affairs has brought forth those subcommittee recommendations to this House. I commend the committee upon what it has done to increase the adequacy of our effort in aiding Peru, but my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO) and I think that it is imperative that we increase the amount of the military aid we shall give Peru by the amount we have provided in this amendment. It is relatively a small sum, but it may mean so much to our devoted friends, the Republic of Peru, and its great President, so nobly and bravely fighting the battle of freedom in Peru and the Western Hemisphere today. So I join my coauthor and colleague in the warmest way in urging the adoption of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HALL OF OHIO

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALL of Ohio: Page 4, line 13, strike out "\$587,250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$562,250,000"; and after line 18, insert the following:

(c) Assistance may not be provided for the Philippines for the fiscal year 1985 under chapter 2 of part II of such Act.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering would cut from the foreign aid authorization bill \$25 million in grant military assistance for the Philippines. It would not affect the \$155 million in the bill for economic support fund aid.

The Reagan administration has pledged to President Marcos that it will make its best effort to provide the Marcos regime with a security aid package totalling \$900 million over 5 years. The aid is in exchange for U.S. utilization of the Clark Field and Subic Bay bases in the Philippines.

The first installment of the funding would total \$180 million for fiscal year 1985. The administration wanted to send \$95 million in economic support fund aid, \$60 million in foreign military sales credits, and \$25 million in grant military assistance. However, the House Foreign Affairs Committee decided to defer the \$60 million in foreign military sales financing to 1 of the 4 remaining years of the agreement, but added \$60 million to the administration request for economic support fund aid. As a result, under the bill before the House today, the Marcos government still is scheduled to get \$180 million, but it will consist of \$155 million in economic support fund aid and \$25 million in grant military aid.

In the committee report to accompany the foreign aid authorization bill, the Foreign Affairs Committee made the following observation about its decision to repackage the security assistance requested by the administration:

It is the committee's view that the severe economic crisis presently confronting the Philippines is potentially far more dangerous than any present external military threat. Therefore the committee felt it would better serve the interests of both the Philippines and the United States to provide a higher level of economic assistance to the Philippines this year than the level requested by the executive branch.

I share the committee's view that the economic crisis facing the Philippines is more critical than any external military threat. While the United States has a security agreement with the Philippines, I am not aware of any immediate outside threat posed to that country by any hostile neighbors.

I think our colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee are on the right track and deserve to be commended for the action they have taken in repackaging the bases related aid. However, I believe that a stronger action is needed at this critical juncture in United States-Philippines relations. Therefore, I am proposing that we cut from the bill before us the \$25 million for grant military aid for the Philippines.

Like the FMS funding deferred by the committee, the MAP funding can be restored in 1 of the 4 remaining years of the agreement if conditions regarding human rights and democrat-

ic processes improve. In this regard, let me again cite the Foreign Affairs Committee's report:

In reviewing requests for future aid under the agreement, the committee will continue to take account of a number of factors, including economic conditions, the military needs of the Philippine Armed Forces, and the political situation in the country, including whether there has been significant progress in restoring democratic government and in curtailing human rights abuses.

The \$25 million in military aid I am proposing to defer would be subject to the same conditions and considerations cited by the committee with respect to the foreign military sales financing it has deferred.

The deferral I am offering will no more affect the bases agreement than the action already taken by the committee. President Reagan's letter to President Marcos in which he pledged the best effort of the administration to obtain the \$900 million security package for the Philippines did not specify that any particular amounts would be sought in any specific fiscal year. The President also made it clear to President Marcos that the U.S. Congress would have the final say on the funds appropriated. The President said in that letter to the Filipino leader, and I quote:

As you are aware, under our constitutional system, the Congress has sole authority to appropriate funds.

The administration, as it pledged to President Marcos, has made its best effort this year. It has sought a total of \$180 million in bases related aid, and that amount has been granted, but repackaged, by the Foreign Affairs Committee. I am proposing that we further exercise our constitutional authority and reduce that package for fiscal 1985 to \$155 million by deferring the \$25 million sought for grant military aid. My colleagues should be aware that this amount, even with my reduction, would be \$55 million more overall than the \$100 million provided in fiscal 1984.

In reality, it comes down to a question of exactly how much more we are going to give Marcos this year, not how much we are going to cut his aid.

The Members of this body are keenly aware of the need to hold down Federal expenditures. In particular, our constituents are asking us to take a careful and critical look at requests for foreign aid.

I am proposing a modest reduction in the aid for the Marcos government. Quite frankly, I think many of our constituents would wonder why Marcos deserves \$155 million, let alone \$180 million in bases related aid.

Since the other body's Foreign Relations Committee has voted to defer \$30 million of the foreign military sales financing sought by the administration and converted that amount into ESF aid, it is likely that some

form of aid repackaging with respect to the Philippines will be enacted this year. Nevertheless, since the overall funding level of \$180 million has not been reduced, the impact of any signal sent by the repackaging to the Philippines will be slight.

I would urge my colleagues to vote to send the strongest possible message to Marcos, to the opposition, and to the Filipino people. My amendment provides the best available vehicle for that message.

The amendment I am offering will indicate that there is concern in the U.S. Congress about human rights abuses by the Marcos regime and concern about the lack of civil and political liberties.

The timing of our vote is especially important in view of the upcoming May 14 parliamentary elections in the Philippines. While there is division in the opposition over participation in the elections, the opposition is united in its call for free and fair elections. Already, there have been charges of fraud in the registration of voters. Moreover, Marcos maintains concurrent legislative powers with the National Assembly, and he wanted to increase his appointments to the legislature from 17 to 35. Marcos appears to be doing everything he can to insure that he maintains his control over the National Assembly, notwithstanding the elections.

Because he is viewed as the key to maintaining U.S. access to the bases in the Philippines, Marcos has enjoyed uncritical U.S. support. Confidence of strong American backing emboldened Marcos since his red-carpet reception in the United States in 1982. The result was a wave of crackdowns on labor organizers, religious workers, journalists, and opposition leaders. Indeed, it was not until the disruptive aftermath of the Aquino assassination that the administration made any public effort to indicate uneasiness with the Marcos regime. As the Lawyers Committee for International Human Rights wrote in a December 1983 report on the Philippines:

Military abuses in the Philippines are undoubtedly the subject of "quiet diplomacy." But quiet diplomacy is not heard by Filipinos. Growing numbers of Filipinos interpret the quiet as silence, and the silence as support.

Strategic security is the predominant consideration in this administration's policy toward the Philippines. Long-term Philippine-American relations in the post-Marcos era are being sacrificed now in the interest of maintaining short-term access to the bases. Absent any strong indication of U.S. concern about the human rights abuses by the Marcos government, it is likely that a successor government will only recall that the United States consistently stood behind Marcos—regard-

less of his treatment of the Filipino people.

In my opinion, a strong case has yet to be made concerning why the Marcos regime needs such a high level of security assistance. The immediate external threat has yet to be established.

It is clear, however, that U.S. military aid helps to oil the military machine that keeps Marcos in power. Cardinal Jaime Sin of the Philippines has been quoted as saying that U.S. military aid "only goes to slaughter Filipinos." Is this the image we wish to have with the Filipino people?

There is no doubt about the poor human rights record of the Marcos government. Here are some statements about human rights conditions under Marcos from the State Department's "Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1983":

In 1983 there were human rights abuses by Government security forces, particularly members of the Philippine Constabulary and the Civilian Home Defense Forces, including harassment of civilians, arbitrary arrest, detention, disappearances, torture, and "salvaging," or summary execution of suspected insurgents or sympathizers.

Task Force Detainees, a Catholic Church-related group which investigates and compiles statistics on human rights violations and is often critical of the Government, reported that 146 persons were summarily executed by Government security force from January to June 1983, compared with 125 such killings for all of 1982.

The Task Force Detainees human rights group listed 79 persons as having disappeared from January to July 1983, compared with 29 persons for all of 1982.

While the most reliable source of human rights statistics, Task Force Detainees in Manila, had no figures on the number of cases of torture, Amnesty International's 1983 report called torture during incommunicado detention of persons arrested on national security grounds "so prevalent as to amount to standard operating procedure for security and intelligence units."

Some similar points were made in "The Philippines: A Country in Crisis", a December 1983 report of the Lawyers Committee for International Human Rights:

Persons seized as alleged subversives are beaten, suffocated, choked with water devices, subjected to electric shocks, burned, raped and mutilated.

Church leaders, labor activists, journalists and human rights workers have been specially targeted for military abuses.

A system of one-man rule supported by military force provides the context in which these violations occur. Vital safeguards inherent in a system of checks and balances no longer operate.

Reports of political killings by government forces have sharply increased in the three years since martial law was lifted. The rate of such murders continues to escalate.

In recent years, hundreds of civilians have been arrested and detained under presidential orders that the courts declare themselves powerless to review. Many who are arrested pursuant to presidential orders languish in jail for months or years after charges are dismissed or their sentences

served, awaiting an order for their release that can come only from President Marcos.

These findings were confirmed by the report of a delegation representing five U.S. medical and scientific organizations, which visited the Philippines from November 28 to December 17, 1983. The five medical and scientific organizations, working in conjunction with the American Committees for Human Rights, were: the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), the American College of Physicians, the American Nurses' Association, the American Public Health Association, and the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Science.

This delegation concluded that "there has been a continuing pattern of gross violations of human rights carried out by certain elements within the government and the military forces of the Philippines." The group went on to state:

On the basis of interviews with several past and present detainees who alleged that they were tortured while in the custody of military personnel or paramilitary groups, we are firmly convinced that torture and other forms of cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment are real and pervasive problems.

Without a strong signal of U.S. concern about these human rights violations, it is unlikely that the Marcos government will feel compelled to reform these practices. Indeed, absent such a signal, Marcos may perceive that he has tacit U.S. support to increasingly apply state-approved terror as a means of internal control and suppression of dissent.

Unfortunately, our military aid, which is supposed to be used to counter external aggression, can be used by the Marcos government against the Filipino people. For example, the Philippines Constabulary, or police force is integrated into the command structure of the armed forces. In practice, there is little distinction between the armed forces and the Philippines Constabulary with respect to internal suppression. Section 660 of the Foreign Assistance Act prohibits "the use of funds available under the act to provide training or advice or provide any financial support for police, prison or law enforcement forces of any foreign government." However, the Philippines Constabulary is the recipient of direct military aid to the Philippines. State Department has said that to the extent that the constabulary receives military aid, it is considered to be part of the armed forces. However, this is not a real distinction since it operates as a police force as well. There is no guarantee that the \$25 million provided under this legislation will not be sent for use by the Philippines Constabulary in perpetrating human rights violations upon the Filipino people.

Uncertainty and instability in the Philippines were brought to a head last year by the assassination of opposition leader Benigno Aquino. At this important and sensitive time, we need to let the Filipino people know that the United States is concerned about the future of democracy in the Philippines. Those hoping to restore democracy in the Philippines need an indication that the United States is seeking to place some distance between itself and the abuses of the Marcos regime.

I believe that actually cutting, not just repackaging, the amount requested for the Philippines is needed. I urge my colleagues to join with me in reducing foreign aid and sending an important message to the Philippines.

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

Mr. Chairman, certainly this is a difficult question, and there are a variety of views as to how we should meet our base agreements that our Government in good faith signed with the Philippine Government. I think all of us recognize the importance of the bases, and I doubt that there is any Congressman in this body who wants to break the base agreement and lose the bases. The question is: How much adjustment can we make sending a signal to the Philippine Government without breaking our word?

Now, our judgment was that in the committee we were free to make some changes between military and economic aid, and we did that. We switched \$60 million from military to economic aid.

I believe, and I think most people who have covered this situation believe, that if you strike \$25 million from the agreement, you are breaking our word and you are breaking the base agreement.

We are sending a strong signal. And obviously it was a compromise. Certainly not all people on this side of the aisle are enthusiastic about this agreement. The administration opposed it and thought we were making a mistake. Certainly the Marcos government is not happy with the adjustments we made in committee. But we have sent a signal, we have switched some money, but we have not broken our word.

Let us remember one thing: There is going to be an election in the Philippines. After this election, if we want to make some changes, we will have an opportunity to do it. But we should not cut out this \$25 million. I would only urge the Members to remember we have an agreement with the Philippine Government for our bases, and to reduce the amount of money would violate that base agreement.

So I would urge the Members, even though I know they are bothered, deeply bothered, by the conditions in

the Philippines, to allow the bill to go through as it is.

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

Mr. Chairman, I share the concerns which were so eloquently expressed by my good friend from Ohio, who offered this amendment. But I must say that I think this is the wrong time and the wrong place for such an amendment.

The gentleman from Ohio seems to feel, for very understandable reasons, that we need to send a strong signal to the Government of the Philippines that the U.S. Government favors a restoration of democracy and greater respect for human rights in that country.

I think all of us can agree that a restoration of genuine democracy in the Philippines and a greater respect for human rights in that country are very much in the interest not only of the Filipino people but of the American people. We do, after all, have an historic relationship with the Philippines. It was our only colony. We bequeathed it a legacy of democracy which has tragically been honored more in the breach than in the observance.

So I fully agree with my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, that we need to make it clear that the Congress of the United States favors a restoration of democracy and greater respect for human rights in that country.

But I would submit that that signal has already been sent, as the gentleman from the State of Washington pointed out.

Last October we adopted by a vote of 413 to 3 in this House a resolution calling upon the Government of the Philippines to conduct a genuinely independent investigation of the assassination of the late Filipino leader Benigno Aquino and to hold genuinely free and fair elections. There was no mistaking the signal we sent on that occasion. There was overwhelming bipartisan support in favor of that resolution.

Then, a short while ago, first the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, which I chair and on which the gentleman from Washington serves as the ranking minority member, followed by the Foreign Affairs Committee as a whole, once again voted overwhelmingly in support of a broadly based bipartisan approach to this problem in which we decided to reduce by \$60 million the level of our military assistance to the Philippines for the next fiscal year and to increase by a commensurate amount the level of our economic assistance.

There is no doubt that that signal was received in the Philippines. The Government of the Philippines was not at all pleased with it. President Marcos has delivered speeches don-

ouncing it. Your humble servant from New York is on the enemy's list of the Malacanang Palace for the role that he played in formulating that amendment. General Custodia, a Senior Philippine Defense Ministry official, denounced me as a rabid critic of the Government.

I now find out that I did not go far enough.

Well, I say to the gentleman from Ohio that I think we did go far enough, under existing circumstances. The bases at Clark Field and Subic Bay are very important to us. Continued American access to them is essential in order for us to maintain an adequate balance of power and to preserve the peace in Asia. I think that if the gentleman's amendment were adopted at this time, whether it in fact constituted a violation of the agreement, it probably would be interpreted as such by the Government of the Philippines, and they might in turn take actions which were incompatible with our continued access to these facilities.

Let me say to the gentleman that the reason I think that this amendment is offered at the wrong time is that next week the Philippines are scheduled to hold elections. If those elections are genuinely free and fair, there is no need for this amendment. Indeed, we might be able to restore the \$60 million in military assistance we already cut. If it should turn out, however, that those elections are not free and fair—and I do not want to sound excessively glib or unduly optimistic; based on past experience in the Philippines it is not very likely that those elections will meet the high standards which we set here in our own country—if those elections are characterized by fraud, if they are shot through with corruption, if the opposition is denied a fair opportunity to contest for political power in the Philippines, we will have another opportunity to reduce the level of our aid to the Philippines when the appropriations bill comes to the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLARZ) has expired.

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

Mr. SOLARZ. I say to my friend from Ohio that if those elections are fraudulent rather than fair, when the appropriation comes up, if he believes that we ought to take additional action, I might very well support him at that time. This is not the end of the process. It is simply a stage in the process. But we hammered out a broad bipartisan compromise on a very complex and controversial issue. I think it would be very unfortunate if that compromise unraveled. I think it sends a very strong signal to the Philippines

to have not only a great majority of Members on our side of the aisle but a great majority on the other side of the aisle support the language in the committee bill which does call for a \$60 million reduction in the level of our FMS to the Philippines next year.

Let me say, finally, that given the precarious health of the President of the Philippines, there is a continuing possibility that at any moment there could be a transition in that country, at which point the Filipino military may have a critical role to play. There is an argument to be made for our maintaining at least a minimal continuing aid relationship with them so that we can have a constructive influence should there be a transition in the Philippines.

For all of those reasons I ask my colleagues to support the bipartisan compromise in the bill and to reject at this time, in this place, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, realizing we may have another opportunity in a month or two to vote for it or perhaps even deeper cuts if the elections have not been genuinely free and fair.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVINE).

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLARZ) has expired.

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

□ 1450

Mr. LEVINE of California. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to serve as a member of the subcommittee that the gentleman from New York chairs, and I am very sympathetic to the purpose of the amendment from our colleague from Ohio, who I think very well stated the reasons for the amendment.

The human rights situation in the Philippines is totally unsatisfactory and the motives and intent of the gentleman from Ohio are highly commendable.

I would simply like to make one point in the course of this debate. In the course of the subcommittee deliberations on this issue, our colleague from New Jersey, Mr. TORRICELLI, and I were considering offering an amendment quite similar to the one that we are debating at this point. I definitely support the intent of this amendment. But, after listening to the subcommittee debate, and after hearing all of the arguments in the subcommittee, we were dissuaded from offering that amendment in the subcommittee. We concluded that the arguments that the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee made were very clear and communicated the message

that we do wish to communicate to the Government of the Philippines.

It is for those reasons that I, as a member of the subcommittee, would like to commend both the author of the amendment and also the chairman of the subcommittee for the compromise that he reached and to urge the Members to support the subcommittee and the committee language.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, if I may make a few comments on some of the things that have been said in the past few minutes. For too long I think many of us have sat on this floor and have heard that this is the wrong time and the wrong place, and I have been hearing it for 6 years; wait until next week; wait until next year; things are going to get better. Marcos is going to lift martial law, he is going to put back martial law; we never know what he is going to do.

Every year, in my opinion, and according to human rights reports, according to our own State Department, things continue to get worse. I would like to use the gentleman from New York's comments, the comment that the gentleman used about the Turkish amendment, and he said that this amendment is a little bit like slapping this person on the wrist with a wet noodle. I would say that the amendment, even though in the right direction, that he offered in his subcommittee, is on the right track, it is a little bit like using two noodles on the wrist.

All it does, in my opinion, is shift funds around. That is all that has been done. I think Marcos is going to continue to laugh all the way to the bank. He is getting \$80 million more this year than he did last year. It is an 80-percent jump. If we were to increase domestic items like this on the floor of this House, we would have a \$500 billion deficit rather than a \$200 billion deficit.

I think it is time that this Congress, speak to the people of the Philippines and put some distance between us and President Marcos. I think that this amendment is a right start; it is a deferral. There was nothing in the agreement or the letter that President Reagan had sent to President Marcos relative to how much in each year. Therefore, if certain conditions are met, this deferral that I am talking about in the next 4 years can be added to the Foreign Affairs bills in the future.

Mr. FASCELL. I appreciate the gentleman from Ohio's views on this matter; I know how sincerely held his convictions are, and I regret that I must rise to oppose his amendment.

Given his interest, I am sure he will recall that human rights was a congressional initiative started in the Foreign Affairs Committee. It is a matter of deep concern for members of our committee. It is an issue which is followed very, very carefully not only with respect to the Philippines, but with respect to other countries, including our own, by the way.

In reviewing the needs that we have in our relationships with the Philippines, with regard to Subic Naval Base and Clark Air Field, and the other relationships that we have, we must all admit that there are times when a balance of needs and requirements has to be struck. Doing so sometimes does not necessarily satisfy all of those who might feel very strongly on one side or the other.

I think the compromise that has been reached by the subcommittee is an excellent one, and I think that we should support it very strongly, and vote down this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me say first that the subcommittee is to be applauded for keeping the aid levels on the total package for the Philippines up to the figures requested by the administration. I am also encouraged by the subcommittee's continuing support for the 5-year assistance plan that was worked out with the Philippines last year as part of the basing rights agreement.

President Reagan has made good faith assurances to the Government of the Philippines that our country will live up to our side of the bases agreement. Congressional action that shifts around the various accounts does not contribute to stability in our country's bilateral relations with the Philippines. And if there has ever been a time when America needs to be speaking with one voice to the Philippines, that time is now.

I am also concerned about how congressional actions—however well-intentioned—may affect the political climate within the Philippines itself. Our goal in the Philippines should focus on the development of democratic institutions in that country. To take a more politicized and punitive approach, which I am afraid this amendment leads to, runs the risk of sending misleading signals to any number of political factions in the Philippines who can interpret these signals according to their own desires and not necessarily in the broader interests of their country.

The House of Representatives spoke loudly and clearly last fall when we passed a resolution expressing our dismay at the assassination of Benigno Aquino and our unalterable support for the development of democratic in-

stitutions and processes in the Philippines. Let us not prejudice the outcome of the investigation of the Aquino assassination or the results of the forthcoming parliamentary elections by tinkering with the foreign aid program that has been promised by our Government.

You know, the Clark Air Force Base and the Subic Naval Base are the two largest installations outside of the soil of the United States of America. If we are going to pass this amendment, we not only are going to jeopardize a very strategic link in that very strong chain of mutual defense that we have with our allies in the Asian-Pacific area. The last thing that we should be doing is wiping out all military aid to the Philippines, and with all good intentions of the sponsor, that is exactly what the amendment does.

Those of us that believe strongly in the support of the Philippines have agreed to the compromise. Now let us defeat the amendment and go along with the compromise that we all may not be happy with, but which the chairman recommended and which we are going to support today.

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL). As my colleagues are aware, the Hall amendment would reduce by \$25 million the amount in the foreign aid authorization bill for grant military assistance for the Philippines. I believe that such a reduction is justified in light of the current situation in that country.

The Foreign Affairs Committee took an unusual and important step in deciding to repackage aid to the Philippines by front loading economic assistance included as part of the renegotiation of the Philippines bases agreement. In practice, this means that the committee approved the \$180 million aid level for the Philippines requested by the administration. However, the mix of aid was changed by increasing economic aid from \$95 to \$155 million, and by cutting the military aid from \$85 to \$25 million. As the committee wisely stated in its report on this bill, "It is the committee's view that the severe economic crisis presently confronting the Philippines is potentially far more dangerous than any present external military threat."

While this is an important change in our traditional attitude toward the economic and political problems facing the Philippines, I agree with my colleague from Ohio that we must send an even stronger signal to President Marcos at this critical time in United States-Philippine relations. Since the brutal assassination of opposition leader Benigno Aquino last year the movement for the restoration of democracy in the Philippines has gained strength. Despite physical intimidation, the Filipino people have made

clear their desire for a return to democratic government. Although President Marcos has called national assembly elections for next week, the campaign has been marred by reports of attacks on opposition campaign workers and accounts of election fraud; many opposition politicians are calling for a boycott of the election.

Today we have an opportunity to exert pressure to bring about the truly democratic elections desired by the Filipino people and to rebuild democratic institutions in this country. By supporting the Hall amendment, we do not abandon the Filipino people in their battle for economic stability. The Hall amendment leaves intact the \$155 million in economic support fund aid. It cuts out only the \$25 million in grant military aid, aid that the Filipino people know is employed in the abuses committed by the Marcos security forces. I should note at this point that the Hall amendment will not violate the United States bases agreement with the Philippines. President Reagan pledged to President Marcos that his administration would attempt to persuade Congress to approve a \$900 million, 5 year security aid package. However, no specific amount was pledged for any year, and President Reagan made it clear that the Congress must approve appropriations under the bases agreement. In front loading the economic aid, the committee has already significantly altered the administration request. The Hall amendment is one further way to work our will on this request.

Mr. Chairman, our national security is not advanced by blindly giving military aid to Mr. Marcos, who merely uses it to oppress his own people while further delaying his country's return to democracy. In the long term our interests are best served by working in tandem with the people of the Philippines, who are true friends of the United States and have repeatedly voiced their preference for a return to democracy in their country. By acceding to their wishes, rather than those of Mr. Marcos, we remain true to our own democratic principles as well as add to our own and Philippine security.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Ohio for his years of leadership on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to support his amendment.●

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman from Ohio for moving to cut \$25 million from military aid to the Philippines.

If we want democracy in El Salvador, and we should; and if we want democracy in Cuba, and we should; if we want democracy in Nicaragua, and we should; then we should want democracy in the Philippines.

The people of the Philippines need elections in the Philippines and they

deserve a free and open press. They also deserve human rights to be respected by their Government. This is not occurring. Therefore, Congressman HALL's amendment is most appropriate.●

□ 1500

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 149, yeas 259, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 135]

AYES—149

Albosta	Glickman	Paul
Anthony	Goodling	Pease
Applegate	Gray	Penny
AuCoin	Green	Perkins
Bates	Gregg	Rahall
Bedell	Guarini	Richardson
Bellenson	Hall (OH)	Ritter
Boner	Hall, Ralph	Rodino
Bonker	Harkin	Roemer
Borski	Harrison	Roybal
Boxer	Hayes	Russo
Brooks	Hertel	Sabo
Brown (CA)	Hubbard	Schroeder
Bryant	Jacobs	Schulze
Burton (CA)	Jenkins	Schumer
Carr	Jones (TN)	Seiberling
Clay	Kaptur	Shannon
Coelho	Kastenmeier	Shumway
Collins	Kennelly	Sikorski
Conyers	Kildee	Siljander
Cooper	Kogovsek	Simon
Courter	Koiter	Slattery
Coyne	Leach	Spratt
Crockett	Leath	St Germain
D'Amours	Lehman (FL)	Staggers
Darden	Leland	Stark
Daschle	Levin	Stenholm
Daub	Lowry (WA)	Stokes
Dellums	Luken	Studds
Derrick	MacKay	Tallon
Dingell	Martin (IL)	Tauzin
Donnelly	Matsui	Towns
Dorgan	McCloskey	Traxler
Dowdy	Mikulski	Vento
Downey	Miller (CA)	Volkmer
Durbin	Miller (OH)	Walgren
Early	Mineta	Walker
Eckart	Mitchell	Waxman
Edgar	Moakley	Weaver
Edwards (CA)	Mrazek	Weiss
Evans (IL)	Murphy	Wheat
Fazio	Natcher	Whitten
Feighan	Nichols	Williams (MT)
Ferraro	Oaker	Williams (OH)
Foglietta	Oberstar	Wirth
Ford (TN)	Ottinger	Wolpe
Fowler	Owens	Wyden
Frank	Panetta	Yates
Gaydos	Patman	Young (MO)
Gejdenson	Patterson	

NOES—259

Ackerman	Bateman	Britt
Addabbo	Bennett	Broomfield
Akaka	Bereuter	Brown (CO)
Alexander	Berman	Broyhill
Anderson	Bevill	Burton (IN)
Andrews (TX)	Biaggi	Byron
Annunzio	Bilirakis	Campbell
Archer	Bliley	Carney
Aspin	Boehert	Carper
Badham	Boggs	Chandler
Barnard	Boland	Chappell
Barnes	Boucher	Chapple
Bartlett	Breaux	Cheney

Clarke	Jones (OK)	Pursell
Clinger	Kasich	Quillen
Coats	Kemp	Rangel
Coleman (MO)	Kindness	Ratchford
Coleman (TX)	Kiecicka	Ray
Conable	Kostmayer	Regula
Conte	Kramer	Reid
Corcoran	LaFalce	Ridge
Coughlin	Lagomarsino	Rinaldo
Craig	Lantos	Roberts
Crane, Daniel	Latta	Robinson
Crane, Philip	Lehman (CA)	Roe
Daniel	Lent	Rogers
Dannemeyer	Levine	Rose
Davis	Levitas	Rostenkowski
de la Garza	Lewis (FL)	Roth
DeWine	Lipinski	Roukema
Dicks	Livingston	Rowland
Dixon	Lloyd	Rudd
Dreier	Loeffler	Sawyer
Duncan	Long (LA)	Schaefer
Dwyer	Long (MD)	Scheuer
Dymally	Lott	Schneider
Dyson	Lowery (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Edwards (AL)	Lujan	Sharp
Edwards (OK)	Lundine	Shaw
Emerson	Lungren	Shelby
English	Mack	Shuster
Erdreich	Madigan	Sisisky
Fascell	Marlenee	Skeen
Fiedler	Marriott	Skelton
Fields	Martin (NY)	Smith (FL)
Fish	Martinez	Smith (IA)
Flippo	Mavroules	Smith (NE)
Florio	Mazzoli	Smith (NJ)
Foley	McCaig	Smith, Denny
Ford (MI)	McCandless	Smith, Robert
Franklin	McCollum	Snowe
Frenzel	McCurdy	Snyder
Frost	McDade	Solarz
Fuqua	McEwen	Solomon
Garcia	McGrath	Stangeland
Gekas	McKernan	Stratton
Gephardt	McKinney	Stump
Gibbons	McNulty	Sundquist
Gillman	Mica	Swift
Gingrich	Michel	Synar
Gonzalez	Minish	Tauke
Gore	Mollinari	Taylor
Gradison	Mollohan	Thomas (CA)
Gramm	Motgomery	Thomas (GA)
Gunderson	Moody	Torres
Hall, Sam	Moore	Toricelli
Hamilton	Moorhead	Udall
Hammerschmidt	Morrison (CT)	Vander Jagt
Hartnett	Morrison (WA)	Vandergriff
Hatcher	Murtha	Vucanovich
Hefner	Myers	Watkins
Heftel	Nelson	Weber
Hightower	Nielson	Whitehurst
Hiler	Nowak	Whitley
Hillis	O'Brien	Whittaker
Holt	Obey	Wilson
Hopkins	Olin	Winn
Horton	Ortiz	Wise
Howard	Oxley	Wolf
Hoyer	Packard	Wortley
Huckaby	Parris	Wright
Hughes	Pashayan	Wylie
Hunter	Pepper	Yatron
Hutto	Petri	Young (AK)
Hyde	Pickle	Zschau
Ireland	Price	
Johnson	Pritchard	

NOT VOTING—25

Andrews (NC)	Hansen (ID)	McHugh
Bethune	Hansen (UT)	Neal
Bonior	Hawkins	Porter
Bosco	Jeffords	Savage
Dickinson	Jones (NC)	Spence
Erlenborn	Kazen	Valentine
Evans (IA)	Lewis (CA)	Young (FL)
Hall (IN)	Markey	
Hance	Martin (NC)	

□ 1510

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Markey for, with Mr. Dickinson against.

Mr. Hance for, with Mr. Lewis of California against.

Mr. HOPKINS, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, and Messrs. DAVIS, MOLLOHAN, WATKINS, and DENNY SMITH changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. OTTINGER, VENTO, HAYES, MACKAY, PERKINS, WAXMAN, and STOKES changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1520

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER: On page 19, after line 15, add the following new section:

"Sec. 126. None of the funds available to carry out this title for the fiscal year 1985 shall be allocated to any country whose votes in the 38th United Nations General Assembly Plenary differed from the United States' position by more than 85 percent, as recorded in the Department of State's 'Report to the Congress on Voting Practices in the United Nations,' dated February 24, 1984."

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, this should be a fairly easy amendment for the Members to understand and it deals with the fact that the American people are suspicious of foreign aid anyhow. Here is a chance to make certain that our foreign aid gets directed in the right way.

A number of observers of our foreign policy have said that when we give foreign aid we ought to at least assure ourselves that we are giving the money to nations that are basically friendly to us, that they are nations that at least measured by what they do in international organizations vote with us a good part of the time.

What my amendment says is that you have got to vote with us in the United Nations 15 percent of the time in order to qualify for aid. Recognizing that is not a very high standard to set, only 15 percent of your votes in the United Nations have to be in concert with the United States in order to qualify to get aid, it, nevertheless, I think, sets a principle in place. It says that we no longer are going to simply put taxpayers' dollars out to anybody and everybody who comes in with their hands out asking for money, that we are in fact going to make some judgments about who gets this money.

In this case we are saying that you can go to the United Nations, you can vote against us 85 percent of the time and still qualify for aid; however, if you vote against us 86 percent of the time, then we are going to cut off the aid to you because we think that some standard has to be set with regard to who our friends are.

The amendment is fairly simple. It seems to me it is practical. In a nation where the American people are concerned about \$200 billion deficits, this seems to me to be something that can be done to at least show that we are being somewhat responsive to public needs and responsible with tax money.

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

Mr. WALKER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OBEY. Why would not the gentleman set a requirement that a country votes with us 85 percent of the time?

Mr. WALKER. Well, I would say to the gentleman that if we did that, we would give no aid to anyone anywhere in the world. There is no nation in the world in the United Nations in the last session that voted with us 85 percent of the time.

The United Kingdom comes the closest. They voted with us 84.2 percent of the time; so it seems to me that we ought to make the amendment into something that was reasonable, that we ought to try to do something to set the principle, but assure ourselves that we were doing something that was within reason and was sensible.

So therefore, I would be glad to debate the merits of a 20-percent amendment or some of those, but I would say to the gentleman that as you look at the voting records of some of our so-called friends, they do not stack up very well in the United Nations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further on that?

Mr. WALKER. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OBEY. If in fact the determiner of the wisdom of our providing foreign aid to any country is the percentage of time which they vote with us in the United Nations, then I have difficulty understanding why the gentleman does not really appear to believe in the principle of his own amendment by having that threshold at 75 to 85 percent of the time. Why should a country get aid from us if that is an important consideration if they do not vote with us all the time?

Mr. WALKER. Well, I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Of course, the gentleman knows that to set the standard he suggested would eliminate the foreign aid program and maybe that is what the gentleman wants to do. If he wants to do it, I would welcome his amendment. I might even vote for it, but this was an attempt to offer a sensible amendment, one which does in fact go to some of the worst nations in terms of their performance in international bodies and it says it seems to me something important to a lot of nations that we are kind of watching to see whether or not you stand with us in

world affairs. We are going to keep an eye on your voting record with us in the United Nations and make some determinations as to whether or not you ought to receive our aid based upon that.

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

Mr. WALKER. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman tell us whether or not the votes that we expect adherence on would be announced beforehand? This would be a key vote, this would go in the Ambassador's report card or would it be all votes?

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman it seems to me has gotten too used to how PAC's operate around here and how labor unions work.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman just answer the question?

Mr. WALKER. I have the time, I think. What we did was we had the United Nations vote records put together by the Department of State. There is a compendium of those votes. It in fact covers the entire voting record at the United Nations and it also lists some of the key votes that we were also looking at; but this is a compendium of those voting records. I think it is extremely fair to judge based upon the entire voting record of a nation that we are helping.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

(At the request of Mr. GREGG, and by unanimous consent, Mr. WALKER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. WALKER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it would cover all votes cast at the general assembly and it would be tied to the report as filed with the Congress, which was a report which was filed as the result of an amendment which this House passed in the last Congress in amending the foreign aid legislation and which is required to be made to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, I believe, and which contains within that report a list of all votes cast in the General Assembly, which would have been the 38th General Assembly that we are referring to. Therefore, it would not be selective voting. It would be all the votes cast and the percentage would be tied to that.

If I can ask the gentleman a question, as I understand it, those nations which voted less than 15 percent of the time with us, or 14 percent or less, would not be able to receive aid under

this bill. As such, I understand the Soviet Union's voting record was 13.8 percent, so we are essentially saying that the Soviet Union and those nations which basically vote at the level or below the level of support that the Soviet Union casts at the United Nations; is that correct?

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The Soviet Union was at a 13.8 percent rate.

It is interesting to note that there were several nations below the Soviet Union, but the gentleman is correct. All this demands of them is that they have voted with us 15 percent of the time.

Mr. GREGG. So essentially what the gentleman is asking for is that those states in the world which are basically client states of the Soviet Union and part of their political position shall not receive foreign aid from the United States. Is that not correct?

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. If you look at our own hemisphere, there are only two nations that would not qualify for aid under this amendment. That is Cuba and Nicaragua. I think it makes it quite clear right there that we are in fact dealing with Soviet client states around the world in most instances and that also should be a good reason for supporting this particular amendment.

Mr. GREGG. Well, if the gentleman will yield further, as an assertion of the fact that we are just impacting client states of the Soviet Union and those which follow the Soviet Union, in Eastern Europe the states that would not qualify would be Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, the German Democratic Republic, the Ukraine, the Soviet Union, and Albania, all of whom are Eastern bloc states to whom we should not be giving aid if they are not going to give us any support in our attempts to bring about human rights in the world and to vote properly in the United Nations.

I understand the nations in Asia which would also fall under this would be Yemen North, Iran, Iraq, Mongolia, South Yemen, Syria, Afghanistan, Vietnam, and Laos.

□ 1530

Certainly none of those nations having voted against us more than 85 percent of the time deserve our support.

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

As the delegate to the United Nations in the last General Assembly I can tell you that there were times when I sat there and listened to the rhetoric chewing up the United States and a lot of the feelings that I am sure are felt by the gentleman who offered

the amendment went through my veins. I can see how these things could culminate in this amendment.

But I do not think it would be wise. First of all, I do not think we want to put a standard of 15 percent as if being above 15 percent means that they are eligible. If I was going to make a mark I would put the mark higher than that.

There are other actions one should use for making judgments. Do we have bases there? Were they helpful in some previous occupation? Did they send troops sometime when they were trying to get some peacekeeping force? Did they allow our troops to land there and move on? There are a host of reasons on how we judge other countries.

To put this standard out as if it is the premier standard I think is totally wrong.

The President is continually being cut down on his ability to handle foreign policy, and this will just be one more restriction. I think, as a matter of fact, there is a restriction now on aid programs for Communist countries and most all of them that you mentioned would fall into that ban.

We are all frustrated at times at how countries vote in the United Nations. But it is possible that a country that had a very poor voting record would like to make some moves away from the domination of Russia. We ought to be able to encourage it at that moment and not be cut back by saying no, no, we cannot do anything this year; we will have to wait until next year to give them some help.

On the other hand, there are countries down in the 20 and 30 percent area that have treated this Nation shabbily and no one would say they have met a standard for aid.

So while I can appreciate the frustrations that would bring about this amendment, I think most of us would agree that it really is not in the best interest to put this standard into law in judging other countries.

Mr. FASCELL. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding and I rise also to agree with his remarks and in opposition to the amendment.

No matter how well intentioned, the fact is that what the amendment does is establish only one criteria for evaluating our bilateral relations with a country. Regardless of our interests, regardless of the U.S. security interests or the need to provide the military assistance to a friend, the only criteria we would use would be that country's voting record in the U.N. Keep in mind those are votes on resolutions that are not binding and there

is some doubt as to whether they even make international law.

That would be the criteria to which the President of the United States would be bound under this amendment and all the identical amendments which the gentleman intends to offer to all of the sections of the bill dealing with assistance under this bill. It would absolutely tie the hands of the President.

The law already says that we may not have any bilateral programs in direct assistance with Communist countries. Therefore the only people we are talking about are our friends. And we use that single standard to get to them and we say to the President of the United States you cannot take anything else into consideration.

So I think it is a bad amendment, even though it is very sincere. I think the fact is that for our own security interests, the thing for us to do is to vote down this amendment.

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

As to the point that we are tying the President's hands, I looked through this bill and I think we have to acknowledge that the role of the Congress in foreign policy has significantly changed over the last 20 years and the Congress has decided to assert itself in foreign policy and make decisions which control what the executive is going to do in foreign policy. And I seriously doubt that the executive is going to oppose this.

In fact, it was Ambassador Kirkpatrick who suggested originally that the House take action in the area of reflecting how votes are cast at the United Nations so that she will have some clout when she is on the floor of the United Nations in going to the various nations and saying, "Listen, the Congress is going to note your vote, and your vote is going to affect how Congress reacts in the area of aid and treating your nation." In fact, if you will refer to Ambassador Kirkpatrick's summary when she forwarded this report to the Congress she said:

Experience has shown that when we let other nations know we are deeply interested in an outcome, those others are much more likely to take our values and interests into account in casting their vote.

We are talking here simply about limiting aid, and these are American dollars, hard-earned tax dollars that your constituents, your men and women, have worked all week to lay their hands on, which had been turned over to us in their trust, and with their trust for distribution.

We are talking about taking those hard-earned tax dollars and turning them over to people and nations which have voted with the Soviet Union, or voted less than the Soviet Union has

voted with us in support of our principles and doctrine.

Now, if we do not believe as a body governing the people of this country that we have an obligation to spend those tax dollars in a manner which supports and encourages the values of this country, rather than supports and encourages the values of the Soviet Union, then I think we have passed on a sincere and a very important responsibility.

Let us go through the nations again that are involved in this matter that would fall below the 14 percent: Ethiopia, Algeria, Libya, the Seychelles, Angola, Mozambique, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, the German Democratic Republic, the Ukraine, the U.S.S.R., Albania, Cuba, and the list goes on and on, Iran, Iraq, Yemen, South Yemen, Afghanistan, Vietnam, Laos.

This is a very simple step on what is a very important road for this Congress to make it clear to the members of the United Nations that there will be an accounting when we have our positions at the United Nations totally ignored by nations who are coming to us for assistance and for aid and that we will turn to those nations and at least ask them a simple, threshold question: Did you vote for us 14 percent of the time? After we have asked that question if the answer is yes then there are other things that we can evaluate in making the aid. But if the answer is no, clearly to take that tax dollar and give it to that country is to step inappropriately on the trust which has been given us over those tax dollars by the American people.

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

Mr. GREGG. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PRITCHARD. I would only say that none of those nations that you have recited are receiving any aid. So we really are not affecting anything by passing this.

I know what you are trying to do, but I just do not think that this is a very effective way, since what you pass today will not affect any of the aid that is going out today.

Mr. GREGG. If the gentleman will yield back, if that is true, and I am not absolutely sure it is true—there are a couple of nations on here that I think may have qualified—but in any event, if that is true, then we have made a statement which is essential, which is that we are going to call attention to the other nations who are presently participating in the U.N. General Assembly, that we are calling to account their votes, and our Ambassador will be able to go to the other nations in the U.N. General Assembly and say this is an action that the Congress has taken. You can see that the Congress is now concerned about the votes in

this General Assembly, and I am not sure what they are going to do next.

But I know that if you do not take our concern seriously when I go back to them, they will ask me why and maybe they will do something further.

□ 1540

This will be the step that will give our ambassadors to the United Nations the leverage they need in order to take action to get the attention of the people in that body.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

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

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ZSCHAU. I would like to suggest to the gentleman that if this amendment would not have any effect on the aid that is given in this bill and if it would only be used, therefore, to send a message to the nations in the United Nations, it seems to me we would want to have a standard that is higher than 15 percent.

If we specify no precise percentage the countries in the world may assume that our aid is conditioned on their voting with us a higher percentage of the time. But if we pass this amendment, we will have said that "15 percent is good enough; that is all you have to achieve in order to get the aid."

It would not have had any impact on next year's aid and it will send a signal that is a negative signal rather than a positive signal.

Mr. GREGG. If I could reclaim my time, I disagree with the gentleman most sincerely. The fact is that the cutoff level is clearly tied to the Soviet Union bloc votes and to the Soviet Union votes specifically. Second, we have totally ignored U.N. voting action in this body.

Over the last 20 years, nothing has been done in this Congress which has any responsive chord at all to U.N. voting action. This clearly becomes a first step and a rather major step for this House to take, because it is putting on notice members of the General Assembly body that their votes are not going to be ignored by this Congress.

Sure, it is a low threshold, but it is a threshold. It is not a final statement that "After this, if you get over 14 percent you are free and clear." Obviously, that is not true. What it is is the bottom line, "If you do not make it over the 15 percent, if you do not happen to at least extend the support of the United States more than your support of the Soviet Union's support of the United States, then you are going to have to be cut off right at the

threshold, you will not get to the second step of being evaluated on other issues."

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take my full time.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard simplified amendments on the floor of this body over the course of the years, and I guess I will hear and see many more.

Imagine, imagine if you will if an amendment such as this were to be adopted and imagine, if in fact some nation which had not voted with the United States 14 percent of time were to be suddenly invaded by the Soviet Union and it were to be in the interests of the United States of America to provide immediate military and economic assistance to that country, under this amendment the gentleman would have the President take out the abacus, would look at the sheet and the rollcall and say, "Ah, 8 percent; tough, fellows, no matter what it does to the national interests of the United States, too bad. You fall prey to the Soviet Union."

Imagine if you will, if this concept were to be adopted and have a nation that is suffering the consequences of some great natural calamity, drought, earthquake, flood, what you will; and the humanitarian instinct of the executive and the legislative branches of this Nation is to provide assistance and the gentleman's amendment is in effect, and the President has to take out the sheet and say, "Aha, those peoples' government only voted with us 6 percent of the time in the United Nations; let them starve."

I think that this kind of amendment deserves to be withdrawn, never mind defeated. I would think that the gentleman would think better than to offer an amendment of this nature.

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

Mr. Chairman, there is no amendment that will be offered on this bill with which I am more sympathetic.

Mr. Chairman, there is no amendment that has been or will be offered to this bill that I am more in sympathy with because it is more than irritating to watch country after country accept our support, not to say our largess, and continually reject the resolutions and the positions we take in that parliament of the world, the United Nations.

Particularly when the Soviet Union shot down an unarmed civilian airliner, the KAL 007, we could not even get a resolution deploring, much less condemning, that act of barbarism.

But that said, I ask my colleagues to consider whether the foreign aid program, the economic support and for-

eign military sales is simply a reward for good deportment in the United Nations. It should not be. It has much broader objectives. And I suggest to you that there are countries that have performed and will perform great services in our national interest regardless of how they may vote in the United Nations.

Let me cite one country, Algeria. Now I do not know if there is money for Algeria in here or not, because that is a country that is leftist, that I am sure is not sympathetic with our general positions in the United Nations, but, when our hostages were being held by Iran and we were in great difficulty as to what to do, whether to start world war III or whether to endure a prolonged period of humiliation, it was Algeria that acted as intercessor, intermediary, and was able to negotiate with the Iranians on our behalf and solve the most difficult international situation of our time.

So our foreign aid programs are designed much more than simply as a reward for good behavior in the United Nations. What they do is help us acquire allies when we need them; help us get access to raw materials that are not indigenous to this country; help us develop markets for the export of our manufactured goods. There is also a humanitarian rationale for our assistance.

Sometimes you are mad at the government, but the people of that country may need that aid. Questions like hunger, questions like economic development, questions like the availability of potable drinking water. This is not a program of charity, but there is an aspect of humanitarianism that ought to transcend a country's voting record in the United Nations.

Now, I suggest if you want to punish a given country for repeated misconduct in the United Nations, if you choose to define not voting with us as misconduct, then zero in on that country and send them a message.

Mr. KEMP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is making an extremely important point about this issue, because I am very sympathetic to what the gentleman from Pennsylvania is attempting to do, but we need to find a better formula. Let me say to him as a friend that greater effort is being made today to do what he wants to see done than ever before under Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick, Senator KASTEN, and Chairman LONG of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee and the minority members of that subcommittee including myself, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. LIVINGSTON, and Mr. LEWIS.

Many of us are looking at the voting record of U.N. countries who receive

U.S. aid. I want to just say that I think that the gentleman has raised an issue which is critical to our Nation's foreign policy. But as our friend from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) has pointed out, there are other considerations upon which to make our aid decisions and while votes in the United Nations are very important, they cannot be the only consideration. Besides, 15 percent voting in support of our position is far too low in my view.

And I am particularly pleased to see that at the United Nations we have taken the "kick us in the teeth" sign down and we have an Ambassador who is speaking up for the United States as never before and she is absolutely convinced, I do not speak for her at this point, but she is absolutely convinced we need to take into consideration the resolutions and votes that are taken at the United Nations: The anti-Israel position, support of the PLO and other terrorist groups, attacks on the free press, and the incessant barrage against free enterprise and free market of the United States must be challenged.

But having said that, the gentleman from Illinois is raising an extremely important point which is that you cannot just predicate the assistance programs on one narrow voting record, because you come up with some rather silly possibilities.

□ 1550

For instance Zimbabwe would qualify. Someone more friendly might not. Yugoslavia and Romania would qualify, yet Poland would not. We need to take into consideration, I would say to my friend from Pennsylvania, the voting record of nations at the United Nations, but it ought not to be the only consideration. We hope we can reach a compromise.

I think the gentleman from Illinois makes an outstanding point and I endorse what he says.

It seems to me that we need to formulate a policy, not in the sense of strict guidelines, but a flexible policy which takes a nation's U.N. voting record into account but, at the same time, balance this against other strategic and regional foreign policy concerns. There are also instances when we need to evaluate the slow but steady changes which are taking place in a nation's position vis-a-vis the United States so that we can assist those who are moving our way but are not quite there yet. We need to make an explicit point of considering U.N. votes, but they must be considered in the context of our broader interests. The United Nations, though a visible forum, is not the center of foreign policy and we should not elevate its actions above their proper status.

Therefore, while I am sympathetic to the concerns of the gentleman from

Pennsylvania, I urge him to work with those of us who have his concerns to establish a policy which achieves his objectives while granting the President and the Congress necessary flexibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) has expired.

(At the request of Mr. WALKER and by unanimous consent, Mr. HYDE was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HYDE. Let me make one more point and then I will yield to my friend for whom I have great admiration.

Some years ago a man named Sukarno headed the country of Indonesia and he was anti-West, anti-American. At that time we were training Indonesian military in our country, because I attended the same camp at which they were receiving training. And I inquired as to why we would have anything to do with these people who were so opposed to our value system and to our political ideals.

I was told, yes, but Sukarno will not be there forever. And the people who are working their way up in authority will be favorably disposed to our country.

That is precisely what happened. When Sukarno left, the succeeding administration were a lot of people who were trained and educated in our country and supported us.

So there is much more to this whole program than simply rewarding or punishing people for their voting record at the United Nations.

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

Mr. HYDE. I yield to my good friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to make certain that we understand what it is I am amending. I am amending title I which deals with military sales. All I am suggesting is that if you vote with us only 15 percent of the time you are going to be qualified for military sales.

The gentleman mentioned humanitarian aid. The gentleman before him, who spoke about simple mindedness, spoke very much about military aid.

Mr. HYDE. If I may reclaim my time, does the gentleman mean that we leave these markets to the French and the Soviets? And we just walk away, taking the high ground, without having them purchase our weapons if they choose?

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman would yield, it seems to me that the kinds of nations that we are talking about are not nations that we want to be selling military equipment to.

I would say to the gentleman I am not certain I want sophisticated military equipment going into nations that cannot see fit to vote with us 85

percent of the time in the United Nations.

Mr. HYDE. Well, I am not sure I do either.

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

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. LAGOMARSINO and by unanimous consent, Mr. HYDE was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for his statement and for making some very fine points.

It seems to me that if the amendment read: "This is one of the factors that will be taken into consideration," not only would that be responsible, it probably also would be very helpful not only to the administration in putting together the aid requests and in dealing with proposed donee countries, but it would certainly be very helpful to U.N. Ambassador Kirkpatrick in the U.N. debates.

I would hope that we will so amend this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I thought I might just rise and clarify a few points here because I will be offering an amendment later on in title IX which accomplishes some of the things that the gentleman from Pennsylvania hopes to do.

In regard to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEISS) who rose and spoke about this being a simple or simple-minded amendment, I would like to point out to the Members here that most of you voted for a very similar amendment, as did the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEISS) when he supported the conference report last fall on the appropriations for foreign aid contained in the continuing resolution.

I think if you all look back at your voting records, you voted for the amendment, the Kasten amendment which was agreed to in conference, which produced this report, this 800-page report, which my good friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) says he is using as a guide in determining how he votes on future foreign aid, which my good friend from Illinois said he is using in the same manner.

So I am going to give you all the opportunity to vote on that again as you did last year, because it has been tremendously successful and helpful to all Members to see just how we are treated by many of our so-called friends.

What my amendment will do and what the Members voted on last fall simply requires the reporting form, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER) does in his amendment, but then it goes on to say and it wipes out most Members' arguments, of the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROOMFIELD), and a lot of the others of why you oppose the Walker amendment.

All the existing law does is say that after it compiles the report that:

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

Now that is what you all voted for and this is going to expire October 1, because it was placed in the law in an appropriations bill.

I would hope since it has been so helpful to our Foreign Affairs Committee, to the Intelligence Committee, to the Appropriations Committee that the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) is on, that you will all vote to put this into permanent law in this authorization bill.

I will be supporting the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER) because I think it is moving in the right direction. But I also will be covering all titles when I offer this amendment later on.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I would be most happy to yield to our very good chairman.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I thank the gentleman for his statement. He is correct that the requirement in current law or U.N. voting records expires because it was put in under the continuing resolution. When we get to that point in the bill, where the gentleman will offer his amendment with respect to all the titles in this bill, in the manner in which he has discussed, then I would be prepared to consider it at that time and accept it.

Mr. SOLOMON. I certainly thank the gentleman for his statement.

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

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

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to correct one statement that I made in the course of my remarks. It turns out the

United Kingdom with 84 percent is not the highest ranking in the United Nations. Another nation has achieved a 93.3-percent rating on it and that is something that should be commended, that is the nation of Israel.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, this issue has been discussed to death and I will not add to many of the issues that have already been covered, but I would like to put the issue in context.

What we are talking about is if there is any limit on how we give our money away. History is filled with examples of foreign assistance that have been both successful and unsuccessful for the countries involved.

Let us not forget where we are at as a nation. We had a deficit that exceeded \$200 billion last year, when you count the off-budget items. We had a governmental deficit last year that was equal to our entire private savings or capital formation as a nation.

I do not know of a single Member here who could look you in the eye and say he is proud of this Congress performance in controlling spending, regardless of party, regardless of philosophy.

There is not anyone here who I know who claims that interest rates are too low.

The question is not just the details that we have discussed. The question is: Is there any limit on our willingness to give away the taxpayers' money? Is there any resolve in this House to control spending? Is there any willingness to face up to the issue that is the No. 1 issue for our country—runaway spending. The No. 1 issue is what we are doing to the economy of our country after this Congress gets through throwing away the taxpayers' money. The issue before the House right now is are we willing to limit our foreign assistance and eliminate countries that are clearly opposed to the policies of this Nation. Are we willing to put at least a modicum of limits on how we spend the taxpayers' money?

Let us give the folks who have opposed this amendment their due. They point out that there is some value to foreign aid. They point out that countries that oppose may merit aid.

□ 1600

I grant that is possible. The real question, though, is: Will this House be willing to do anything to control its spending?

When the historians look back on this hour, they will see a House that has passed budgets and then every year appropriated more money than they approved in their budgets. When historians look back, they will see that we passed a budget on this floor, and that the bill we are considering exceeds that budget.

Now, I grant you, the bill has shifted some of the spending off budget, and

this it is claimed that it is within budget. The truth is, it is over budget.

People are going to see that we talked about cutting spending, and what we actually did this year was increase spending almost \$70 billion. And that is not to the appropriations level yet. We may increase spending more than that.

The question here is: Are we willing to limit the hemorrhaging of money that goes out from this country?

I would suggest to you that this is a very modest, minor step, but at least it is an effort to provide some sort of limitation to the hemorrhage of funds that we have been willing to pour out to countries across the world.

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

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. I would like to pick up on that point, because what we are talking about here are the taxpayers' dollars. How can we go back to the taxpayers, when we are running a \$200 billion deficit, and say to them that we as the Congress did not have the courage to at least limit foreign aid spending, so that we do not spend it on those nations that voted with the Soviet Union or voted even less than the Soviet Union did in support of our position at the United Nations.

Furthermore, how can we deny our representative to the United Nations the leverage which she needs in order to go to those nations when she is on the floor of the United Nations and say, "Listen, if you do not take our concerns seriously, we are going to have to take a second look at how we treat you in the marketplace of lending money and giving money away and giving taxpayers' money away?"

The fact is that this is such a minor step that it is unbelievable to me that this House is not willing to take it in an attempt to make it clear to the nations of this world that we take seriously the votes cast in the United Nations and we are not going to allow our foreign aid to be thrown at those nations which are clearly opposed to our values in this world and are showing their opposition by casting their votes against us at the United Nations consistently.

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

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BROWN) has expired.

(On request of Mr. MILLER of California and by unanimous consent, Mr. BROWN of Colorado was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. MILLER of California. The gentleman has made a marvelous argument in terms of: Is there any length to which we will go at which we will not appropriate money in foreign aid.

Will the gentleman tell us how much money this amendment would save?

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. I am sure the gentleman from California knows there are portions of the bill where we have left the administration with discretion.

Mr. MILLER of California. No. This amendment. How much money will this save over what we are currently doing?

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. I think, if the gentleman would allow me to answer the question, the gentleman will find that I will respond to the thrust of his question.

Mr. MILLER of California. Well, members of the committee have testified, if the gentleman will continue to yield, that we are not giving any of this kind of aid to any of these countries. So clearly this Congress has made a decision not to fund these countries, whether it is because of this voting record or some other reason, and we are not giving any aid; so this amendment does not save anything if the members of the committee are correct that we are not funding any military sales to any of these countries.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. I do not believe that summarizes it accurately, and I would be happy to try to answer the question, if the gentleman will allow me to respond.

A close examination of the bill reveals that there is freedom for the President in many of these areas to appropriate the money or give that money to the countries that he chooses. So if the gentleman's point is if we have pinpointed countries that are in this category, I would say no; if the gentleman's question is, is it possible under this bill to give money to these countries, the answer is, very clearly, yes, and this amendment would save money from those allocations.

Mr. MILLER of California. If the gentleman will yield, the effect is not to save any money, but it would prevent the President from taking any action that he might ordinarily be allowed to take if he so desired with respect to one of these countries.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. I think it is very clear that it would save money from going to any one of those countries.

Mr. MILLER of California. One of my concerns is—and I am not a member of the committee—that there is a raging war going on between Iran and Iraq, and there is a lot of discussion about where we are between those two countries, some 350,000 to 400,000 people have died, what is the interest of the Soviet Union, what is our interest, the interest of the French and European community? They are both on this list. If the President makes up his mind in the next 45 days or after this is signed that he wants to make a military sale to one of

those two countries, which I have no truck with, but he makes a decision that that is in our best interest vis-a-vis the Soviet Union, the gentleman is saying that he cannot do that. Even though this Congress does not spend a dime on military sales to those countries, if the President makes an independent determination that that vital area of the world is about to blow up and our interest is on one side or the other, he is prohibited under this amendment. But it does not save us a dime if he does not do that.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. I would say to the gentleman that I hope we do not sell arms to Iran.

Mr. MILLER of California. I do not know who he will sell them to.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. The President can always come to this Congress. As the voices of people we can make the decision in that area. I would hope you would want the Representatives of the people to be consulted before you sell arms to Iran.

Mr. MILLER of California. I understand that. I wish he would come to this House on a lot of items, but he does not. But the fact of the matter is, there is no taxpayers' argument in this amendment, and this is something more than just to rule out any negotiation, any participation, by this President with any of these countries.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. That is clearly not correct, and all you have to do is read the bill to understand that.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SILJANDER TO THE
AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. SILJANDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SILJANDER to the amendment offered by Mr. WALKER: Strike out "None of the funds available to carry out this title for the fiscal year 1985 shall be allocated to any country whose" and insert in lieu thereof "As a major criterion to be taken into account in determining the amount of funds available to carry out this title which may be allocated for any country for the fiscal year 1985, the President shall consider whether that country's".

Mr. SILJANDER. Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt in anyone's mind that here, in the Congress, many of us are very, very frustrated with the fact that we are rewarding our enemies all too often. I am very sympathetic with the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but also there is a diversion of opinion on the floor. I agree that what we need to do is certainly make the point to those in the United Nations that consistently vote against us that the United States will not stand by and allow it to continue. So therefore I am offering a compromise to this amendment.

What it would do is ask the President, in regard to the point made by the other side of the aisle, to take the concept of the Walker amendment as one of the criterion of a group of crite-

ria when considering military assistance. This is all it does, as opposed to making a single controversial criterion mandatory, it places it in a group of many criteria.

So I certainly hope the Members on both sides of the aisle will accept the amendment to the amendment which, in my opinion, makes the point very clear to our opponents and helps solve some of the concerns that have been brought up on both sides of the aisle.

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

Mr. SILJANDER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PRITCHARD. Does it still set 15 percent as some kind of a figure that is good or bad? That is what bothers me about this amendment.

Mr. SILJANDER. Well, the 15 percent if in fact was a fixed figure, which anything below that sum would cut off all military assistance, I could agree with the gentleman. However, it just states that the President should take the 15 percent in mind as a part of the criteria when considering military sales. That is all it does.

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

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

Mr. FASCELL. I must be truthful that I do not like the concept of setting up that kind of criteria, but at least the gentleman makes an effort with his amendment to allow the President to make a determination on the criteria, and I think that is a definite step forward because it eliminates the problems that the flat prohibition of the original amendment has.

So it accomplishes what the original proponents had in mind in terms of their own amendment without all of the disadvantages that flow from that.

As far as this side is concerned, we are prepared to accept the amendment to the amendment.

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

Mr. SILJANDER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I, too, believe that this improves the original amendment, provides flexibility, and I would urge the House to adopt the amendment now.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SILJANDER) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER).

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER), as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RAHALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAHALL: Page 2, strike out the sentence beginning with "Of this" in line 20 and ending with the "program." in line 25; and page 4, after line 8, insert the following new subsection:

(d) Section 42 of the Arms Export Control Act is amended by striking out subsections (a), (b), and (c) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) Financing made available under sections 23 and 34 of this Act may not be used to finance the procurement outside the United States of any defense articles, defense services, or design and construction services, including financing for coproduction or licensed production outside the United States or defense articles of United States origin."

□ 1610

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment because I feel that we should not be exporting American jobs today at a time of high unemployment in this country. The unemployment rate in my home State of West Virginia is highest in this country, and it has been for well over a year now.

It is certainly not in the best interests of my high unemployment area to be sending any foreign country around this world money to build their own weapon systems which in the end run will come into direct competition with those weapon systems built by American companies.

I do not think this is in the best interests of our country, especially those States with high rate of unemployment. The issue at stake here in my amendment is American jobs, and I want to stress this to the fullest extent. It is not a question of foreign aid to any country; it is a question of whether we as a nation can afford to be exporting jobs while so many of our own Americans are out of work.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce estimates that for every \$250 million that is taken out of our economy, it means a loss of 6,000 American jobs. Is 6,000 American jobs a fair exchange for helping any foreign country build their aerospace industry? I think not.

My amendment simply states, Mr. Chairman, that no FMS funds may be used by any country, now or in the future, to finance the procurement, outside of the United States, of any defense articles, defense services, or design and construction services including financing for coproduction or licensed production outside the United States of defense articles of U.S. origin.

The House broke a longstanding policy last year in the continuing resolution of not allowing foreign countries to use any of the funds they received from the United States to build their own weapons systems by an amendment to the continuing resolution that was offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG). This amendment allowed FMS credits to be

spent in a foreign country rather than in the United States to build a weapons system which would be coming into direct competition with those systems that are built by American companies. I stress that this was precedent-setting and the first time in American history that our FMS credits have been used in this manner.

Why is the development of a foreign aerospace industry more important than keeping U.S. tax dollars here at home and keeping Americans employed? Why should Americans be put out of work to help build up the military of any foreign country? I ask my colleagues, how can we vote to export jobs to any foreign country? Can we go back to our districts and tell our voters that we really, honestly felt that building up the aerospace industry of a foreign country is more important than keeping these jobs here at home?

So I urge my colleagues to examine exactly what is involved in this amendment. If my amendment is not adopted today, then I fear that we as a country will be setting a most important precedent. We would authorize U.S.-appropriated funds to be used by a foreign government to do two things: One, to pay for research and development work to be performed in the United States, yes, but for the foreign government's own use, and two to pay for defense articles and services to be produced in a foreign country for its own use. I stress the second point is production in a foreign government using American tax dollars for that foreign government's own use.

The implications of this, Mr. Chairman, and especially this latter point, extend well beyond the defense equipment area and have long-range ramifications for this country. At a time of high U.S. unemployment, it is highly questionable at best that the Congress can provide taxpayer funds to any foreign government to generate employment in that country.

Moreover, it should be recognized that these funds are likely to be used by that foreign government or other foreign governments in the future to produce products which will compete in world markets with U.S.-made products, thus further eroding U.S. employment.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to stand up and support this amendment, and at the same time stand up for the American worker, for our American industries, and for what is best, for America's vital interests.

Let us keep American jobs here at home, and voting in favor of this amendment will show our constituents that we are indeed in this foreign aid bill looking out for what America's best interests are, No. 1.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am reluctant, I would say to my friend from West Virginia, to get into a debate on this issue. I think, personally, it is a mistake for us to attack this very important part of our strategic relationship between the United States and Israel that has just recently been elevated.

If you can remember, we signed a Memorandum of Understanding with Israel at a very critical point in our relationship with them, and also at a very critical point in the Middle East. For reasons extraneous to the agreement, it was unfortunately suspended. But now for all practical purposes it has been restored and resurrected. It is an important part of a signal to the world that there is between the United States and Israel, a working, strategic relationship predicated upon our natural alliance, not just in the interests of the two countries, but in the interests of peace and democracy in the Middle East.

I would say to my friend from West Virginia, with whom I worked on an assistance program for other countries in the Middle East, particularly Lebanon, the gentleman should not be too quick to judge this use of taxpayer funds. Let us not forget the \$150 million grant that was given to Lebanon, which was the right thing to do at a very key and critical moment in the life of that very fragile democratic government.

Special provision was made for the Lavi as part of the continuing resolution in 1984, in the authorizing as well as the appropriating language. The Congress chose to send a positive signal about our commitment to the security of Israel. What kind of a signal would we be sending were we to rescind that authority now?

Let me tell the Members what more this amendment would do. It does not just go to the Lavi fighter aircraft. This amendment would eliminate the discretionary authority to permit the use of any FMS financing for offshore procurement worldwide, as the gentleman expressed, even when such financing would further U.S. security interests or aid U.S. employment.

Let me not talk about the economy, I do not think it is an economic issue. Ladies and gentlemen, this is not an economic issue; this is a security issue, and I basically want to address it from that standpoint. Let me say parenthetically, if you made the case, as presented by the gentleman from West Virginia, who is a very valuable Member of this body, on behalf of the taxpayer, of course he is speaking to a lot of us who are sensitive to those issues. But, my friends, you can make that case about the whole bill that is up. I know that the gentleman recognizes that some of these programs are aimed at vital interests that this coun-

try has and one of those, I submit to you, is the security interest that we have with the State of Israel in helping them build an industrial economic base from which to help solve some of their difficult security and economic issues, in this very dangerous part of the world, and against the dangerous threat that is posed by the Soviets and their client states in the Middle East.

I ask you not to raise this issue particularly right now, it is such a poor time to be bringing up this issue. Exactly at a time in which our country faces severe challenges in the Middle East, we should not be disrupting a very critical relationship that we have been able to develop with Israel, we should be enhancing it.

Second, it would be a mistake to deny the use of FMS credits for offshore procurement based on our concern over unemployment, because, very frankly, there are a lot of companies who deal with the Lavi project, including many in many of our States and many districts, who will benefit through participation in the production of the Lavi.

I hope we do not turn our relationship with Israel into a debate over the economy or whether we are going to be hurting one company as opposed to another. That would be a big mistake. I ask my colleagues to overwhelmingly turn down this ill-advised and untimely effort to separate the United States and Israel and our historical, strategic relationship and alliance.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP), for yielding and I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) striking subsections 42 (A), (B), and (C) of the Arms Export Control Act, requiring that foreign military sales funds be spent in the United States. While I believe the gentleman's primary intention is to eliminate the \$250 million authorized for the procurement in Israel for defense articles and services for the Lavi fighter plane, by this proposal he is gutting our Nation's productive and important joint initiatives abroad with our NATO partners and other allies.

For example, the gentleman's amendment would adversely affect our Nation's ability to continue financing offshore procurement worldwide including the mutually beneficial coproduction of the F-16 with certain European nations, the F-5 with Korea, and the Harrier aircraft with the United Kingdom.

□ 1620

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) has expired.

(On request of Mr. GILMAN and by unanimous consent, Mr. KEMP was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. GILMAN. If the gentleman will yield further, let me ask my colleagues to fully examine the real reason for the gentleman's amendment: blocking the Lavi aircraft production in Israel. Last year, Congress approved FMS funds for the Lavi program. The Lavi program as supported by our Committee on Foreign Affairs contains a number of important benefits for the United States including a strengthening of the U.S. technological and data base accruing from the development of the Lavi and the increased ability of the United States to work closely with Israel in the area of effective fighter plane development and utilization.

To respond to the gentleman's economic arguments, it is estimated that over \$1 billion over a number of years will be spent in our Nation on the Lavi, creating substantial employment in our own Nation.

Accordingly, to assure that the United States is permitted to take advantage of cost-effective and technologically beneficial production undertakings with other nations, I urge defeat of this amendment.

Mr. KEMP. I appreciate my colleague from New York making that point.

Mr. Chairman, let me say to all of the Members who are here right now, this is not a zero-sum contest. Let us not turn this into a zero-sum game between ourselves and our vital security interests and those of our allies around the world.

I would just say to my friend from West Virginia, who as I say is a valued Member of this body, I would hope that this debate keeps on the right track, which is that we have a vital stake in protecting the interests of the free world in the Middle East, and we should not do anything that is going to jeopardize our ability to be credible and effective in the Middle East.

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

Mr. KEMP. I yield to my former chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ADDABBO).

Mr. ADDABBO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman in the well has made the most important point. Dollars do not come into play here because we are talking about national security. The aid here is for national security. What we are doing here with Israel is giving them the power, the chance, to build up their own national security so that we do not have to continue to make these

aid loans and grants; that they will build their own plane, which is a good plane, but again, if we are worrying about economics, they will not have it until 1990, so they are not competing with anyone except for the future, but they will have their own capability to protect and defend their own nation.

Mr. Chairman, the Rahall amendment is very dangerous because it threatens the security of our longtime ally in the Middle East, the State of Israel. It is not a secret that Israel plans to use the foreign military sales credits earmarked in the 1985 foreign aid authorization bill, H.R. 5421, for the development of the Lavi fighter jet.

The jet will offer Israel the ability to meet the serious threats posed by its hostile Arab neighbors. The recent waiver of terrorist attacks on Israeli citizens has reinforced the fact that Israel faces daily incursions. They must have the capability to adequately deter these hostile forces.

The development of the Lavi jet will also help the Israeli economy. At a time when inflation in that country is over 140 percent due to their enormous defense budget requirements, U.S. aid is an important boost.

Let us be clear that this amendment will block the development of the Lavi jet and have serious ramifications.

While I am for spending American dollars in America, if spending American dollars in America is what concerns my colleagues most, I have considerable evidence that shows there are great economic advantages to the United States by developing this jet fighter. More than \$1.5 billion will be spent in the development of this fighter jet and it will provide 20,000 man-years of employment in the United States. It will also strengthen the U.S. industrial base by offering U.S. specialists training that enable them to perfect future U.S. projects.

My point is that the U.S. people are not being shortchanged by the development of this jet fighter in Israel. The fighter will not be in competition with U.S. planes, it is specially designed to meet Israel's unique security needs. With the relatively small number of planes scheduled to be built and U.S. approval needed to sell these aircraft to other countries, the only thing we would be doing by rejecting this program would be hurting the national security of Israel and damaging our own interests in the Middle East.

I urge my colleagues in the House to exercise support for the State of Israel, and vote against any amendment which would infringe on the construction of the Lavi fighter jet.

Mr. KEMP. Besides that, it would be a terrible blow to Israel's industry, which has begun to work in coordination with our industrial base to develop this capability. It would be terribly erratic and irresponsible for us to dis-

rupt this program after the 1984 continuing resolution created it.

What kind of an ally are we going to be if we keep changing policy directions, and allowing these very vital relationships to be subjected to inconsistent political winds? I know the gentleman does not want to be capricious, but this is a capricious amendment.

Let me make one other point. I will tell my colleagues, the coproduction of the Lavi fighter aircraft is one of the most important programs that symbolizes the strategic relationship between the United States and Israel. This is a poor time to introduce this amendment. It is bad economics. It is bad defense. It is bad for the security interests of this country, and it is bad for an ally that is key to the stability of the vital Middle East.

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

As the author of this amendment in the Committee on Foreign Affairs, along with our colleague from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SMITH), first I want to compliment and commend the gentleman from New York for his eloquent presentation, which I think puts this issue into proper perspective.

This is primarily a security issue. This is an issue fundamentally important to the relationship between the United States and the State of Israel, and to the security of the United States in the Middle East.

I think it is important for the body to understand that, when this amendment was introduced in the subcommittee, it received the unanimous bipartisan approval of each member of the subcommittee. It was passed on a 10 to 0 bipartisan vote. The reasons, I think, that the members did approve it in the unanimous bipartisan fashion that they did were primarily the types of reasons pertaining to security that were outlined by the gentleman from New York.

But I do believe that because our colleague and friend from West Virginia did raise two key issues, the issue of jobs and the issue of competition it is important for the record to challenge those assertions. I know they were made in good faith and I know that the motives behind this amendment are sound, but frankly, I think that the record simply does not justify the assertions that were made and I would like briefly to deal with each of them.

First of all, with regard to jobs, the estimates with regard to the amount of dollars that will be spent in the United States on the Lavi range from \$1¼ to \$1½ billion. The estimates with regard to jobs that will be produced in the United States on the Lavi range

from 20,000 to 37,000 jobs, depending on whose estimates you accept.

There will be some 26 American companies participating in the coproduction of the Lavi, and these companies will be spread through 16 States, creating thousands of jobs in the U.S. aerospace industry.

American involvement with the Lavi will clearly benefit future American aircraft programs and the United States will be working on a unique and sophisticated jet fighter aircraft with the Government of Israel. The technological gains that will be achieved through the development and production of the Lavi will be fully available to the United States and will be applicable to the next generation of U.S. fighter aircraft efforts with regard to development and production.

Second, on the issue of competition, there is simply no competitive threat that the Lavi provides to any American fighter aircraft. First of all, of the 300 Lavi that the Government of Israel is committed to purchase, the first of these will not even be off the production line until the year 1990. The production rate will be only 3 aircraft per month, or 36 per year, so that these 300 aircraft will not be finished until after 1995.

Third, the Government of Israel will obviously continue to purchase first-line American aircraft such as the F-15E and the F-16E.

Finally, before the Government of Israel would be able, even if it decided it wanted in 10 or 12 years to do any exporting of the Lavi, they would be required to obtain a U.S. export license to do any exporting at all.

This simply does not provide any competitive threat to the United States. Interestingly enough, the countries that are discussed in terms of prospective purchasers of the Lavi are primarily Arab countries. I think it is unlikely that an Arab country is going to purchase an Israeli fighter plane.

So I think for the record it should be spelled out that the issue of jobs and the issue of competition do not support the gentleman's argument. Although, as the gentleman from New York rightly emphasizes, they are not the central issues in this debate—they are red herrings—those issues do not stand up to scrutiny. The key issue here is the great significance between the United States and Israel of the strategic relationship, the security relationship, the close ties that are being enhanced through this coproduction.

Mr. Chairman, I associate myself with the remarks of the three gentlemen from New York who spoke before me and I urge the Members of the body to oppose this amendment and support the unanimously approved subcommittee position.

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

Mr. LEVINE of California. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GREEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, where last fall we approved a similar approach to the Lavi program, I want to commend the gentleman for his statement. I think he is quite accurate on the issues.

Mr. Chairman, Representative RAHALL's amendment would stipulate that no funds may be used by any foreign countries outside of the United States to develop their own weapons systems. The amendment is clearly designed to overrule the Foreign Affairs Committee's provision that \$250 million of the money earmarked for Israel's Lavi fighter plane may be spent in Israel.

I would like to take issue with some of Representative RAHALL's claims in a "Dear Colleague" letter explaining his amendment earlier this week. While he stated that this expenditure of funds in Israel will result in the loss of 6,000 jobs in the United States, he does not explain that another \$150 million will be spent on the Lavi program in the United States and will actually contribute to employment in the United States, with such American firms as Pratt & Whitney, Grumman, and Sundstrand, to name a few, taking part in the Lavi project.

In the broader sense of cooperation, we must remember that there have been many instances in the past where the United States has gained from exchange of information with Israel and this will be another such instance. Moreover, the Lavi will not compete with any current U.S.-made planes for the export market but rather will fulfill Israel's internal needs, and would not even be available for export for another decade. Even then it is only to be sold with U.S. permission.

There is no denying that this aid provision benefits Israel also, but I fail to see where aiding an ally, which has time and again proven itself to be the only reliable, democratic ally in the Mideast, is a betrayal of American interests. Israel needs the Lavi to upgrade its aging air fleet and counter the military balance in the Middle East. I think that few of my colleagues in this House would dispute the fact that a strong Israel is in a better position to uphold American values and protect Western interests in the region. I urge that we not weaken this proven ally in a misguided attempt by our colleague to equate aiding Israel with loss of American jobs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVINE) has expired.

(On request of Mr. RAHALL and by unanimous consent, Mr. LEVINE of

California was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. LEVINE of California. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RAHALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman from the Committee on Appropriations who just referred to the action of the full House in regard to the continuing resolution of last November, the gentleman is entirely correct. The House in a vote of 262 to 150 on November 8, 1983, did approve this amendment to the continuing resolution.

It should be noted, however, that that was done without any hearings, without the Foreign Relations Committee having had the opportunity to conduct open hearings on this issue. There was not the normal congressional process followed in that amendment that was adopted.

□ 1630

That amendment set a very important precedent, and now today's actions, of course, would confirm that precedent-setting move.

But I think what I would like to point out more than anything, Mr. Chairman, is that every speaker has mentioned that this amendment would stop the development of the Lavi jet fighter, and that is not its intention. It is not the intention to include Israel alone. Indeed the amendment itself does not even mention the State of Israel.

The amendment does not stop development of the Lavi jet fighter. It only stipulates that these funds be spent in the United States. I do not think it is too much to ask a country that receives the biggest bulk of our foreign aid, the largest share of foreign assistance from this country, to ask that they spend this money in the United States to the benefit of the American taxpayer. The Israelis are welcomed, even encouraged, and I would be the first to encourage them, to strengthen their defenses through the purchase of our sophisticated aircraft and our weapons and through the use of our technology. But let us not ask the American taxpayer who is being stripped of his hard-earned dollars to forego receiving some benefit from this large foreign aid bill we provide for the State of Israel.

Indeed the weapons that we have provided Israel have been the most sophisticated and most advanced in the world, and they have proven that time and time again in the Middle East, the latest example being over Lebanon in 1982 when the Syrian Mig missiles were wiped out so effectively by the Israeli weapons.

So I think it is very important that we look at what this amendment does and does not do. It does not stop the production of the Lavi jet fighter, and it is not aimed at Israel alone. It is aimed at preventing any foreign country from using U.S. tax dollars to build up their own foreign fighting machines that in the long run would come into competition with U.S. jobs and U.S. industries.

The gentleman from California mentioned that it does not compete against U.S. industries, and I would point to many industries that would be affected by the competition that the Israelis would provide on the world weapons market in the future once the Lavi is developed. Northrop, based in southern California, stands to lose on its development of the F-20. Israel currently has in its arsenal, as the gentleman is well aware, F-15's and F-16's, and if they did not build the Lavi, they would probably buy more of those, or the F-20 built by Northrop. So we see where that company would lose in the future.

General Dynamics, based in Fort Worth, Tex., would be hurt through the loss of F-16 sales which have been going to Israel.

McDonnell Douglas of St. Louis would be hurt through the loss of sales of the F-15's which have been going to Israel.

General Electric, which makes engines for both the F-15 and the F-16, would be hurt.

Pratt & Whitney in Connecticut also makes engines for the F-15 and F-16. Even though they will be making money on the Lavi contract, this would be offset by the loss of sales of their F-15 and F-16 engines.

Hughes Radar in California makes radar for the F-15.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVINE) has expired.

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

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this time to respond to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL). I will just briefly tick off the points the gentleman from West Virginia raised and try to respond to them briefly.

On the issue of whether or not the taxpayer will suffer, I think it was quite clear from the remarks that I made initially, as well as those from some of the others, that the taxpayers in this country will be benefiting because of the coproduction agreements we are talking about with regard to the Lavi.

On the issue of competition, simply to talk about the example of Northrop that was given by the gentleman from West Virginia, four of the principal countries to whom Northrop is talking about selling its F-20 Tiger Shark are

Egypt, Jordan, Turkey, and Bahrain. I respectfully submit that it is highly unlikely that Egypt, Jordan, Turkey, or Bahrain would consider purchasing the Lavi from Israel even if Israel made the judgment at some time to seek a U.S. export license with regard to the Lavi.

Third, with regard to the issue of hearings, I would respectfully submit to the gentleman from West Virginia that this floor amendment itself is designed to circumvent the hearing process, and I would remind the gentleman from West Virginia that this Lavi amendment was included in this bill at the earliest stage of the hearing process, at the subcommittee stage, during which the Europe and Middle East subcommittee made the decision by a unanimous bipartisan vote of 10 to 0 to include this amendment. It was then approved by the full committee. There was not an effort to remove it, and we are now talking about a floor amendment that very clearly skirts the hearing process the gentleman tells us we should be respecting. I agree, we should be respecting it.

Finally, the gentleman is correct in saying that this does not only deal with the Lavi. It would also stop the coproduction of radar being produced by GE and Hughes, engines that he discussed before, fire control systems for the Mercha tank, and the development of the tank engine. None of these things were intended by the gentleman to be included, and all of these would be stopped.

For all of these reasons, again, Mr. Chairman, I urge the rejection of this amendment.

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

Mr. LEVINE of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RAHALL. Again, Mr. Chairman, I stress that I am not stopping the production of the Lavi jet fighter or any of the systems that the gentleman mentioned. I am only asking that it be spent here in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVINE) has again expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, somehow this debate on this amendment has descended into an argument about whether or not we are going to have coproduction of a Lavi fighter and whether or not this is a pro-Israeli or an anti-Israeli amendment.

I would like to focus the attention of the Members of this body on the fact that this amendment is aimed at the central proposal; whether or not, due to last year's continuing resolution and this follow-on confirmation in law, we are going to precedently destroy

the sanctity of the FMS system. The FMS system has been operating very well in this country and in the free world for the enhancement of the defensive capability of our friends and allies throughout the world in order that they might better buy the most sophisticated weaponry thus far produced in the world, namely, American produced weapons systems.

The whole concept of FMS is to provide American weapons to friends of America by an FMS credit system that works to the benefit of the free world and to the taxpayers and the people of the United States of America.

The question has arisen: Do we want to start a new aerospace industry somewhere in the world? A commendable idea, indeed! We certainly do not in any way denigrate the fact that the Israelis are producers of aircraft: the Kfir. I have discussed this aircraft with Ezer Weizman; one of the foremost aviators in the world; I know something about airplanes, too.

The question is: Are we going to subsidize a new aerospace industry in a foreign country through FMS credits that are supposed to be used to buy American weapon systems made in America? Or, are we going to preserve the concept of the FMS system—which grants American taxpayer funds to foreign governments for the express purpose of buying American systems. Is there really a need for another manufacturer of high performance jet fighters in the world? Ask the Germans. Ask the French. Ask the British. Ask the Danes. Ask the Dutch. Ask anybody.

We have been trying for years within the NATO structure to cease the very expensive process of duplication of effort in order to produce needed R&D and needed production of sophisticated weapons systems. We have been trying desparately to keep people from duplicating efforts, not only within our country but within the whole free world.

Does the free world need another high performance jet aircraft? I do not know why, unless it would be to sell to other nations that do not now have them. And certainly our F-15's and F-16's and F-20's are available for purchase by any friendly nation in the world.

Do we as a habit try to encourage coproduction of airplanes? No; we do not, unless it is for the democratic and two-way street preservation between ourselves and NATO to help the foreign exchange balance in weapons systems.

We cannot afford to destroy the whole precedent of FMS sales. As the gentleman from West Virginia pointed out, never before have we allowed FMS credits to develop a foreign industry or to develop a foreign product or to develop a foreign aircraft. FMS

sales and credits have been used solely, have been designed solely, have been expressed solely for the purchase of American weapons by American FMS credits to help defend the interests of the free world and the United States of America.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the necessity of this amendment now before us would be seriously considered by the Members of this body, and I certainly urge an aye vote on the amendment.

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

Mr. BADHAM. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman makes excellent points in regard to the precedents that would be set here in the use of our FMS credits.

I would also add that by the precedents that would be established if this were allowed to proceed, the demands on U.S. dollars and the demands on U.S. technology would continue to an even greater degree in the future. And how many more countries are going to come to the United States asking that this precedent be allowed for them to occur also?

I think it is just a very, very important precedent that we are establishing, and all Members should be fully aware of it.

Mr. Chairman, I salute the gentleman from California (Mr. BADHAM) for his statement in support of the amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment offered by Mr. RAHALL and refute the claim that development of the Lavi competes with American companies developing similar aircraft systems. The Lavi aircraft will not be ready until the 1990's and is not comparable to the F-20 or other presently existing advanced aircraft. The Lavi program in fact provides jobs in the United States with American companies participating in the Lavi project.

Up to \$150 million shall be for research and development in the United States for the Lavi program. Our assistance to Israel with the means necessary to carry out this program is beneficial to not only Israel, but to the United States. Israel's extensive combat experience has gone into the unique design of the Lavi, and our aid will bring strategic as well as economic benefits to the United States. We have an important stake in Israel's economic well-being and in its ability to maintain its own military independence and self-sufficiency. In the long run, Israel's strengthened technological base will reduce its need for military assistance while contributing to the revitalization of a healthy economy.

Through great sacrifice in numerous wars with Arab neighbors who were unable or unwilling to make peace, Israel is an instructive lesson in the

need to maintain its own military capability and qualitative superiority. The military balance is always in danger of being eroded, and the Lavi offers Israel the long-term viability of its aerospace industry. And it is an important stimulus to Israel's economy with long-term implications for our own future aid programs.

To conclude, the Lavi program is a unique one, with benefits to both Israel and the United States. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Rahall amendment to eliminate this important program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 40, noes 379, answered "present" 1, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 136]

AYES—40

Albosta	Emerson	Nielson
Applegate	Ford (MI)	Oakar
Badham	Hall, Ralph	Patman
Bereuter	Hall, Sam	Paul
Bonior	Hubbard	Perkins
Byron	Jenkins	Rahall
Chapple	Jones (TN)	Shumway
Coleman (MO)	Kastenmeier	Staggers
Conyers	Kolter	Stangeland
Crockett	Leath	Stenholm
Darden	McCandless	Stump
Dingell	Miller (OH)	Wise
Dymally	Montgomery	
Early	Murphy	

NOES—379

Ackerman	Brown (CO)	Dickinson
Addabbo	Broyhill	Dicks
Akaka	Bryant	Dixon
Alexander	Burton (CA)	Donnelly
Anderson	Burton (IN)	Dorgan
Andrews (TX)	Campbell	Dowdy
Annunzio	Carney	Downey
Anthony	Carper	Dreier
Archer	Carr	Duncan
Aspin	Chandler	Durbin
AuCoin	Chappell	Dwyer
Barnard	Cheney	Dyson
Barnes	Clarke	Eckart
Bartlett	Clay	Edgar
Bateman	Clinger	Edwards (AL)
Bates	Coats	Edwards (CA)
Bedell	Coelho	Edwards (OK)
Beilenson	Coleman (TX)	English
Bennett	Collins	Erdreich
Berman	Conable	Evans (IA)
Bethune	Conte	Evans (IL)
Bevill	Cooper	Fascell
Biaggi	Corcoran	Fazio
Billakis	Coughlin	Feighan
Billey	Courter	Ferraro
Boehlert	Coyne	Fiedler
Boggs	Craig	Fields
Boland	Crane, Daniel	Fish
Boner	Crane, Philip	Flippo
Bonker	D'Amours	Florio
Borski	Daniel	Foglietta
Bosco	Dannemeyer	Foley
Boucher	Daschle	Ford (TN)
Boxer	Daub	Fowler
Breaux	Davis	Frank
Britt	de la Garza	Franklin
Brooks	Dellums	Frenzel
Broomfield	Derrick	Frost
Brown (CA)	DeWine	Fuqua

Garcia	Marlenee	Sawyer
Gaydos	Mariott	Schaefer
Gejdenson	Martin (IL)	Scheuer
Gephardt	Martin (NY)	Schneider
Gibbons	Martinez	Schroeder
Gilman	Matsui	Schulze
Gingrich	Mavroules	Schumer
Glickman	Mazzoli	Seiberling
Gonzalez	McCain	Sensenbrenner
Goodling	McCloskey	Shannon
Gore	McCollum	Sharp
Gradison	McCurdy	Shaw
Gramm	McDade	Shelby
Gray	McEwen	Shuster
Green	McGrath	Sikorski
Gregg	McHugh	Siljander
Guarini	McKernan	Simon
Gunderson	McKinney	Sisisky
Hall (OH)	McNulty	Skeen
Hamilton	Mica	Skelton
Hammerschmidt	Michel	Slattery
Harkin	Mikulski	Smith (FL)
Harrison	Miller (CA)	Smith (IA)
Hartnett	Mineta	Smith (NE)
Hatcher	Minish	Smith (NJ)
Hawkins	Mitchell	Smith, Denny
Hayes	Moakley	Smith, Robert
Hefner	Mollinari	Snowe
Heftel	Mollohan	Snyder
Hertel	Moody	Solarz
Hightower	Moore	Solomon
Hiler	Moorhead	Spence
Hillis	Morrison (CT)	Spratt
Holt	Morrison (WA)	St Germain
Hopkins	Mrazek	Stark
Horton	Murtha	Stokes
Howard	Myers	Stratton
Hoyer	Natcher	Studds
Huckaby	Nelson	Sundquist
Hughes	Nichols	Swift
Hunter	Nowak	Synar
Hutto	O'Brien	Tallon
Hyde	Oberstar	Tauke
Ireland	Obey	Tauzin
Jacobs	Olin	Taylor
Jeffords	Ortiz	Thomas (CA)
Johnson	Ottlinger	Thomas (GA)
Jones (OK)	Owens	Torres
Kaptur	Oxley	Torricelli
Kasich	Packard	Towns
Kemp	Panetta	Traxler
Kennelly	Parris	Udall
Kildee	Pashayan	Vander Jagt
Kindness	Patterson	Vandergriff
Kleccka	Pease	Vento
Kogovsek	Penny	Volkmer
Kostmayer	Pepper	Vucanovich
Kramer	Petri	Walgren
LaFalce	Pickle	Walker
Lagomarsino	Price	Watkins
Lantos	Pritchard	Waxman
Latta	Pursell	Weaver
Leach	Quillen	Weber
Lehman (CA)	Rangel	Weiss
Lehman (FL)	Ratchford	Wheat
Leland	Ray	Whitehurst
Lent	Regula	Whitley
Levin	Reid	Whittaker
Levine	Richardson	Whitten
Levitas	Ridge	Williams (MT)
Lewis (CA)	Rinaldo	Williams (OH)
Lewis (FL)	Ritter	Wilson
Lipinski	Roberts	Winn
Livingston	Robinson	Wirth
Lloyd	Rodino	Wolf
Loeffler	Roe	Wolpe
Long (LA)	Roemer	Wortley
Long (MD)	Rogers	Wright
Lott	Rose	Wyden
Lowery (CA)	Rostenkowski	Wylie
Lowry (WA)	Roth	Yates
Lujan	Roukema	Yatron
Luken	Rowland	Young (AK)
Lundine	Roybal	Young (FL)
Lungren	Rudd	Young (MO)
Mack	Russo	Zschau
MacKay	Sabo	
Madigan	Savage	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Gekas

NOT VOTING—13

Andrews (NC)	Hansen (UT)	Neal
Erlenborn	Jones (NC)	Porter
Hall (IN)	Kazen	Valentine
Hance	Markey	
Hansen (ID)	Martin (NC)	

□ 1650

Messrs. RANGEL, EMERSON, EVANS of Iowa, FISH, and LIPINSKI changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Mr. EMERSON and Mr. RALPH M. HALL changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1700

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

Mr. Chairman, I just rise simply to say that I want to thank my colleagues.

I take this time, Mr. Chairman, because I have had so many of my colleagues ask me questions about where do we go from here, and I am sure that is true of my colleague on the other side of the aisle, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

As I said yesterday, and again today, when we started out, we intended to take up title X tomorrow morning, starting at 10 o'clock. And under the rule, there will be 3 hours of debates on each of the two amendments. Hopefully, we will not take all of the time since debate on any of the amendments will actually be a debate on the basic issue; that is, will there be assistance to El Salvador and under what conditions? But we still would have to have votes on each one of those plus perhaps on a motion to recommit and final passage.

In order to accommodate that schedule and to conclude our business at a reasonable hour tomorrow afternoon, late but prior to some urgent events that are taking place, it will be necessary for us to work as late tonight on the rest of the bill as we can possibly work.

We have nine titles in this bill. I have no count of the amendments. I want to thank my colleagues so far in the debate and in the discussion and in the amendatory process on this bill. We have moved along very rapidly.

Frankly, I would prefer not to have as many votes as we have had because they take a lot of time. But we have not tried to restrict debate or raise any questions with respect to the votes and we have agreed to the votes whenever a proponent of an amendment has asked for such a vote.

We are down to, as far as I know right now, one final amendment on title I, which we hope to dispose of in a reasonably short time.

Then we would proceed on the other eight titles of the bill.

All amendments are important; they all deserve consideration. We intend to provide opportunity for that. So I ask for your cooperation, and just simply say that if we are going to carry out our responsibility, we will have to

work late tonight or we will never get it done.

I am just pleading for my colleagues to continue to cooperate with us as they have. Whoever has the next amendment, let us go.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DORGAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DORGAN: Page 4, line 13, strike out "\$587,250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$422,500,000".

Mr. DORGAN. I thank the Chairman.

Members of the House, I rise offering an amendment to the House on a portion of the Foreign Assistance Act that I think is important, but a portion that has been growing very, very rapidly, more rapidly than I think anyone in this House can justify.

As you look down the list of things that we are spending money for in the Foreign Assistance Act, I am sure many of us feel that there are certain areas for which the money is very well spent. There are areas where legitimate security interests must be developed around the world and must be met.

All of us understand that. By the same token, Mr. Chairman, if you look down the list of things we are spending money for, you find one area that has increased very, very rapidly in the past several years. That is the military assistance program, which essentially is military assistance grants.

Since 1981, this area of the budget, if we pass this funding level today, will have increased by 600 percent—one of the fastest growing items in the Federal budget.

The amendment that I have offered today simply says we do not want that kind of an increase. It says, let us freeze military assistance levels at the 1984 level.

The administration sent down a budget that says we would like to increase the military assistance program by 55 percent—55 percent. The committee said, well, we would like to shave that. We would like to increase it by 39 percent.

And that is the proposal you have on the floor of the House of Representatives. What we ought to do is freeze it at fiscal year 1984 levels, including the Central America portion, which is not part of this amendment because it is in title X of the bill; that would still allow for a 20-percent increase in the military assistance program.

There will be people who will stand up and say we cannot get by with a freeze at fiscal year 1984 levels; we need more money. Why do you need more money? Who needs more money? What do they need more money for?

I think what we ought to do is start taking a look at the Federal budget and start exercising some responsibility in all areas. In this particular area,

which does not deal with Egypt and Israel because they receive no MAP funds, and does not deal with Central America, I think we ought to say, let us hold the line at 1984 levels.

The gentleman from Colorado made a big point about fiscal responsibility and an important one. Here is the place to start. This saves over \$120 million.

I come from the Wheat Belt. If I had my way, I would probably say, let us take about half of this military equipment budget and let us substitute corn, wheat, and barley. The folks around this world are hungry. About 500 million go to bed every night with aches in their bellies. They do not need more guns and bullets. They do not need more tanks or jet fighters. They need something to eat. They need medicine and food.

If I had my way, I would substitute food aid, medicine aid, education aid. But we do not have that opportunity today.

This amendment does a limited amount of good in trying to freeze military assistance grant expenditures at fiscal year 1984 levels.

Well, the question is, Why are we sending guns to Botswana and Guinea, Senegal, Somalia, when folks are hungry? I know that people have answers for individual countries, saying they have this condition or that condition. The prevailing condition, friends, is hunger.

A bipartisan group has cosponsored this amendment, feeling very, very strongly that if we want fiscal responsibility, if we want to move in the right direction on military assistance programs, the funding level for fiscal year 1984 is a reasonable and appropriate amount of money to do what needs to be done for the legitimate security interests of countries around the world.

Mr. Chairman, the House today begins debate on the foreign aid authorization bill, which dramatically changes our military aid program.

For one thing, the bill sharply increases the amount of subsidized military aid—boosting it from about 30 percent of the fiscal year 1984 budget to over 50 percent of the fiscal year 1985 military aid. This big increase occurs at a time when American taxpayers regard Federal deficits as the No. 1 priority for the Congress. Admittedly, the authorization bill does not go as far as the administration's plan to make nearly two-thirds of military aid concessional.

Even so, it troubles me that low-cost or no-cost military aid will jump up when we need to reduce drastically a \$200 billion deficit.

The bill also allows for some \$787 million in military assistance program grants—an increase of over 50 percent above the fiscal year 1984 appropri-

tions level. It seems to me that this represents an overly generous and unjustified increase.

That is why I plan to offer an amendment to freeze the non-Central American MAP aid at the fiscal year 1984 level of \$422.5 million. Unless we adopt this amendment, the MAP program will grow by over 600 percent since fiscal year 1981. I believe that we need less unrestrained growth in MAP and more sharply focused security aid.

In addition, the fiscal year 1985 foreign aid bill would also sanction a new program of concessional loans. Unfortunately, the bill gives the President open-ended power to set the terms for this low-interest program.

While I do not oppose the right kind of concessional loans for friendly nations with low cash reserves and proven security threats, the fact is that many domestic low-cost loan programs have been slashed in recent years:

The Small Business Administration has reduced direct loans by 34 percent to the major source of new jobs in our country,

The Farmers Home Administration has failed to make the targeted amount of limited resource loans to young, struggling farmers,

And college students must finance their educations with about 20-percent less student aid.

As a result, I plan to offer an amendment to restrict the use of the new low-interest loans. The amendment will cap the amount of these loans at one-tenth the volume of all FMS loans and also set a minimum interest rate for them. The amendment will not affect loans to Israel or Egypt which are a separate category.

It will put into permanent law the intent of Congress to use taxpayers dollars wisely for low-interest arms aid.

These are two bipartisan amendments that can restrain the enormous growth in foreign military aid. At a time when food aid and development aid have not kept pace with inflation, these amendments will help restore the kind of balance that makes foreign aid a wise investment.

I commend to my colleagues the following article by Pat M. Holt, formerly chief of staff of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, that clearly shows how military aid can backfire when it's not used judiciously. Instead of indiscriminately arming the developing world, we ought to be sending the food, education, and medicine that build security bridges that last.

[From the Christian Science Monitor,
Mar. 7, 1984]

How U.S. MILITARY AID MISSES ITS TARGETS (By Pat M. Holt)

The American experience in Lebanon underscores a lesson which has been demonstrated many times but which policymakers never learn. This is that actions undertaken

with the best of motives frequently have unintended and even counterproductive results.

The most glaring example is military assistance and arms sales. The United States began equipping and training the Lebanese Army so that the Army could enforce the authority of the Lebanese government. But the Army, like everything else in Lebanon, has split into factions. It has abandoned large quantities of American equipment, which is now being used by the rebel groups that the equipment was intended to suppress. And this is not the only case in which this has happened.

Vast quantities of arms were sent to Chiang Kai-shek in the late 1940s—and were used by the communists to drive Chiang from mainland China to Taiwan.

American equipment supplied both sides in the Indo-Pakistani war in the 1960s.

Arms which American forces left behind in Vietnam are now used by guerrillas in El Salvador—and the U.S. is supplying more arms to the Salvadoran government so that it can suppress the guerrillas.

The U.S. poured billions of dollars worth of arms into Iran, in part to assure the stability of the Persian Gulf. These arms are now the principal threat to stability in the Gulf. They are being used to fight the war with Iraq—a war, if won by Iran, not in U.S. interests.

The U.S. poured arms into Turkey to contain the Soviet Union—but Turkey used them to invade Cyprus and came to the brink of war with its NATO ally Greece.

There have been successes with military assistance and sales, but the list is short. Most prominent are Western Europe and South Korea. Taiwan and Israel could be called success stories in that the assistance did achieve the purpose for which it was given—to preserve the independence of the recipient countries. But with respect to Taiwan, the U.S. cannot continue military supplies without jeopardizing its relations with Peking, and it cannot stop without abandoning old friends. In the case of Israel, it was American equipment that was used to invade Lebanon—leading to the present difficulties.

The prolific scattering of American arms abroad especially in the third world, has had three main objectives:

1. To contain the communist bloc. This has been accomplished, but there is serious question as to how much American military assistance has contributed to it.

2. To preserve internal stability. This has occasionally been accomplished, as in Greece, but more often the result has been the strengthening of a repressive government, as in the Philippines or Argentina.

3. To relieve the US of the burden of regional defense. This has rarely been accomplished. On the contrary, American military resources are spread more thinly now than at any time since the Vietnam war.

Nor is only American arms that are turned around to cause more trouble for the US. We started training foreign police forces so they could do a better job of law enforcement and discovered that what some of them were doing was suppressing the opposition. In the 1960s, the Central Intelligence Agency taught many techniques of dirty tricks to anti-Castro exiles, and it was from this pool of skills that the Nixon plumbers recruited the people who burglarized the office of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist and bugged offices of the Democratic National Committee. Even after the Johnson administration ended CIA harassment

of Cuba, various groups of exiles who had been taught how kept right on doing it.

The US is arming and training anti-Sandinista rebels in Central America. These rebels may, or may not, do what the US wants them to. It will be a long time before the last shot is fired from the American guns being supplied to the rebels. Worse, nobody has the slightest idea of who will be the target of that shot.

Programs of this kind rarely achieve their intended purposes. Over the last 35 years the US has scattered too many weapons around the third world, and many are being used in ways which are at best an embarrassment and at worst a threat. Despite this dismal record there seems to be little prospect of a change in course.

Mr. TAUKE. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORGAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TAUKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is worthwhile to note that in 1981 the appropriations for the military assistance programs were \$110.2 million.

□ 1710

For 1984, the current fiscal year, that figure has grown from \$110.2 to \$510 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN) has expired.

(At the request of Mr. TAUKE and by unanimous consent, Mr. DORGAN was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. TAUKE. If the gentleman will yield further, I am sure the gentleman would agree with me that if Members of the House were asked to make a 500-percent increase in most programs over a 4-year period they would believe that that increase was excessive.

Yet, we are not being asked only to swallow that 500-percent increase over 4 years, but now we are being asked to make a 39-percent increase above and beyond that. It just seems to me that the gentleman is on target with this amendment.

Let me add one other thing. I think that the Members on my side of the aisle especially would be very interested in noting that the National Taxpayers Union has done a study of this issue and has concluded that many of the countries to which we are loaning these funds do not have the ability to make repayments. We are saddling them with debts which are sinking them, which are making it more difficult for them to be able to stay afloat economically.

It does not seem to me that we are doing those countries any favors by saddling them with additional loans.

So I want to commend the gentleman for taking this initiative for a whole variety of reasons. We ought to hold the line in this area of the budget which has been exploding over the last 4 or 5 years.

Mr. DORGAN. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. I think that is the issue. Can we hold the line on this budget item?

The gentleman mentioned that the National Taxpayers Union supports this amendment. So does Bread for the World and a good many other organizations.

We talk about the budget cuts that are necessary domestically to solve this fiscal problem of ours. The fact is we have had cuts, for example, in student aid here at home. We have had cuts in nutrition programs here at home, but now we are talking about military assistance programs in other parts of the world.

If we cannot begin to hold the line on foreign military assistance, where can we hold the line? Where will we see some fiscal responsibility? When will this Congress and this President come to grips with the Federal deficit that threatens to rupture this country?

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

Mr. DORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. DASCHLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for his amendment.

I would want to clarify just a couple of points that I think the gentleman brought out in his initial remarks.

How much are we actually authorizing then for fiscal 1984? Is it \$510 million worldwide; is that the figure?

Mr. DORGAN. In fiscal year 1984, excluding Central America, it is \$422½ million.

Mr. DASCHLE. For Latin America \$422½ million—

Mr. DORGAN. Excluding Central America, that is everything other than Central America.

Mr. DASCHLE. And I know that there has been some concern about tying the President's hands and where this money goes. Does this continue to provide the total flexibility to the President in providing assistance where he sees fit?

Mr. DORGAN. Yes, it does. I might correct one other figure that I gave. This would save \$164.8 million. The gentleman suggests holding the line. Holding the line means saving money in this case, saving \$164.8 million.

Mr. DASCHLE. If the gentleman will yield further.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN) has expired.

(At the request of Mr. DASCHLE and by unanimous consent, Mr. DORGAN was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. DASCHLE. If the gentleman would clarify one other question, how does it impact on the whole question regarding Israel and Egypt. Does it have any impact on Israel or Egypt?

Mr. DORGAN. No, it does not have an impact on Israel and Egypt, because Israel and Egypt do not get military assistance program funds under this section.

We are talking about a section of the bill that appropriates money for everything other than Central America, Israel, and Egypt.

I am simply saying that when other folks come to the body of this House asking for increases in appropriations, proposals for 39-percent increases for example, this House start asking some very tough questions, and legitimately so because we have some very serious budget problems.

If we are going to start holding the line, where better to hold the line? We are sending guns and bullets to virtually anybody who wears a khaki jacket, smokes a cigar, and suggests they are against communism.

Let us suggest that we should direct our foreign aid, our military assistance, in a wise and resourceful way to areas around this world that need legitimate security assistance. And we can do that within the confines of the fiscal year 1984 appropriations.

Mr. DASCHLE. If the gentleman will yield for just a final remark, I commend the gentleman for the amendment. I think at a time when this country finds itself close to \$200 billion in debt, we are authorizing a figure here that is totally supportable. It gives the President complete flexibility. It does not deal with a sensitive issue of Egypt and Israel. I would hope that the majority of the Members would support it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment for a number of reasons. I think it is important to put this MAP program in perspective.

One of the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle said that he was in favor of this amendment, because if the amendment were defeated, we would only be saddling some of these poor countries with additional debts which they would have to repay.

But the truth is that what this amendment would do would be to cut out military grant assistance to relatively poor countries, which they are under no obligation to repay whatsoever, since they would be receiving the military assistance as an outright grant.

So whatever other consideration may be involved here, no one should vote for this amendment on the assumption that by doing so they are relieving poor countries of an additional debt burden.

To be sure, as the author of the amendment has suggested, there is an increase in the bill before us for the military assistance program which provides grant military assistance to

poor countries around the world of approximately \$165 million over what they received for the current fiscal year in the continuing resolution. He points out that in percentage terms this is a very substantial increase.

It is, quite obviously, a substantial increase in percentage terms, but that is primarily because the military assistance program which provides grant military aid to these impoverished countries, begins from a very low base.

The reason it begins from a very low base is that after the war in Vietnam we virtually eliminated entirely the military assistance program whereby we provided grant military assistance to countries around the world.

But slowly the recognition began to dawn on the Foreign Affairs Committee, and on the House as a whole, as well as on the administration, that our security—and that is really what we are talking about here—depends on the ability of a number of strategically significant, but relatively impoverished countries, to defend themselves. These are countries which, if they are not able to defend themselves, we may very well be obligated to send troops over to defend because their territorial integrity and their political independence contributes to the national security of the United States.

Now if this amendment were to be adopted, what would happen in the real world?

To begin with, while it is true that the administration retains the flexibility under the amendment to allocate the cuts in any way it likes, the fact of the matter is that it would undoubtedly preserve the MAP program for those countries with respect to which we have base agreements, because if it were to cut back on the MAP program for those countries, we would be violating the terms of the agreements which enable us to use important military facilities in those nations.

That means that there probably would not be any cuts allocated to the Philippines, Portugal, Kenya, Somalia, or Turkey. What countries would then be left? Let me list them for the Members.

First it would probably mean a substantial cut in our grants assistance to the Sudan. The Sudan is a country which has just been attacked by Colonel Qadhafi of Libya. It is a strategically important country. It is also an impoverished country. The Sudan cannot afford to spend more of its own money on defense, least of all can it afford more high interest loans from the United States to buy additional military equipment. If we do not provide them this military assistance on a grant basis, they will not get it. And if they do not get it, they may not be in a position to defend themselves against Qadhafi.

Do we want to send American troops over there to do that? I think not.

Another country which would probably be cut is Thailand. Thailand is a frontline state. Vietnam has sent 180,000 troops to invade and occupy Cambodia.

□ 1720

Just a few weeks ago, the Vietnamese Army crossed the Cambodian border into Thailand. Do we want Thailand to be able to defend itself? I think we do. We have a mutual defense treaty with Thailand. We are obligated to come to their defense if they are attacked. Clearly, we have an interest in Thailand's being able to defend itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLARZ) has expired.

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

Mr. SOLARZ. Thailand is very poor. They do not want an additional debt burden. They do not want to have to spend more of their own scarce resources for defense. So it is important for us to be able to provide them with some additional MAP assistance.

Let me give you another example. Morocco is a country that would probably be cut, but strategically it is a very important country, which borders both the Atlantic and the Mediterranean. Yet Morocco is a country experiencing severe economic and social strains at the present time. We have an interest in preserving the current Government of Morocco. It is a friendly, pro-Western government. It has been a force for moderation in the Middle East. If they have to devote more of their resources to the defense budget, they will be less able to cope with the social and economic problems that confront them. And all of these countries are going to do what they need to do in order to defend their vital interests. The question is: Are we going to help them, recognizing that by helping them we help ourselves?

I want to make one final point. The suggestion has been made that what most of these countries really need is more development assistance. The stomachs of their starving people need to be filled. I fully agree with that. I think the level of development and economic aid we provide to other countries around the world is scandalously low. I would like to see us do much more. I would like to see us tap the great agricultural resources of this country, particularly coming from the district of my very good friend, the author of this amendment, and provide more food assistance to these nations. They need it, and we have the capacity to provide it. But this is not a question of a tradeoff of less military assistance in order to give more economic assistance. The truth is we need

to do both. And by adopting this amendment we will not provide an additional grain of wheat or an additional cent in development assistance to any poor country around the world.

So what is at stake here is whether we are going to cut a grand total of \$165 million—and such a cut is not going to balance the budget—in grant military assistance to strategically significant but very poor countries that are friendly to the West and whose security serves the best interests of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLARZ) has again expired.

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

Mr. SOLARZ. In view of the fact that the MAP program begins from a very low base it really should probably be substantially higher than it is. The percentage increase which the gentleman's amendments seeks to eliminate is really, in absolute terms, not very much of an increase at all. If we had a 29-percent increase in the defense budget for our country, you would be talking big bucks. A 28-percent increase in the MAP program is really quite modest in comparison to the totality of the overall foreign aid program, let alone the Federal budget as a whole.

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

Mr. SOLARZ. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. The gentleman has given a very interesting description of our security interests in various parts of the world, but I think the gentleman missed the entire point. The point is that at fiscal year 1984 levels we are spending about \$423 million under the MAP program. The gentleman is suggesting that somehow we will be stripped naked of our capability of assisting those countries if we did not allow a 39-percent increase in fiscal year 1985. I suggest that is ridiculous.

Mr. SOLARZ. What I am saying to the gentleman is that every one of the countries that would be receiving this aid desperately need this kind of assistance. Their capacity to defend themselves against very real threats to their security, which in turn constitutes threats to our security, cannot fully be met even by the limited amounts of aid we are providing.

The Sudan is going to be less secure if this amendment is adopted. If the Sudan is less secure, the United States is less secure, and the chances are greater that we may have to send our own forces at some point in the future if Qadhafi should actually launch an invasion of the Sudan.

So I say to the gentleman, yes, it is a large increase in percentage terms, but the absolute dollars are very small, the

need is very great. Nobody can doubt that these countries can effectively utilize this additional assistance.

So for those reasons, I think the amendment is counterproductive, although well intended.

Mr. DORGAN. If the gentleman will yield in his final seconds, let me say that the ultimate test of our security is whether or not we can afford some fiscal restraints in this country.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to rise and speak in favor of the amendment. I listened to the very eloquent remarks of the gentleman from New York, and I understand his concern. I would just want to point out again that this amendment does not touch the increase in money going to Central America. This is in. So if you want to talk about a threat to our security, I think everyone recognizes that that is the area of the most serious threat.

The question, then, becomes: How much can we afford to do for all of the other countries who believe that their own security is being threatened?

And when we examine that, we also have to keep in mind the internal problems that we have here at home.

I sit on committees that are involved with hunger at home and the problems that we have here, with all of the ramifications that we hear about from our own cuts, freezes, or whatever. In view of the fact that we have increased already MAP since 1981 some 600 percent—and this bill would increase it 22 percent, that is, up against the bill's 54 percent—where that money would go, with respect to the freeze, and everything, other than Central America, is up to the administration. I cannot conceive, myself, that the security is that much greater now in these areas than it was 1 year ago or 3 or 4 years ago. And yet with the problems we have here at home in trying to keep our budget under control and trying to help those people who have been frozen at their levels for years and years, they certainly need that money more than I think our security will be enhanced.

I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MITCHELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We talk a lot about the security of the Nation, but there are two types of security. One is the external security, one is the internal security. And the internal security is predicated upon the degree to which we can meet the needs of our people.

Now, I cannot go to my district, where there are 40,000 people waiting for subsidized housing, and tell them we cannot get money for that, for

their security, but we can get some money for the security of nations all around the world. I cannot go to my district and tell those kids who are not going to get a national student defense loan that we cut the money because Jordan or Algeria or Morocco or some other country is more important than they are. This is one of the best amendments I have ever heard on this bill, and I have been a long-term supporter of this bill. It has never been popular in my district. But I will tell you right now, ladies and gentlemen of this House, people in this country are reaching a point where they are going to rebel against any form of foreign aid unless we begin to meet their needs and unless we treat them with fairness.

I hope the amendment passes overwhelmingly. It deserves to do that, just out of a sense of fairness and out of a sense of internal security of our own people.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I thank the gentleman for his very appropriate words. I would also agree with him on everything he said and add that perhaps he would also agree with me that if this were for economic assistance or if it were for food assistance or if it were in some of those areas, then perhaps we could match misery to misery; but we are not doing that here. We are talking about military assistance. We are not talking about economic aid.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland again.

Mr. MITCHELL. If it were for the needs of people around the world in terms of food and education and medicine, that would not be a problem. I could justify that because there is a certain compassion that even the poor have for other poor. But when you are talking about weapons of death and destruction and maiming, it just does not make any sense.

I again reiterate that I hope the amendment passes overwhelmingly. It is one of the best that I have seen on the foreign aid bill in a long, long time.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I would also point out that here we are not cutting back. We are freezing the amount at the 1984 levels except that we allow the increase to Central America where we recognize there is a security threat.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to freeze grant military aid to countries outside of Central America at the fiscal 1984 appropriation level. I am pleased to cosponsor this amendment with the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN).

This amendment represents an effort to apply the principles of H.R. 4440, the Human Needs and World Security Act, to the foreign aid authori-

zation bill. The Human Needs and World Security Act, of which I am the principal sponsor, proposes to hold overall security assistance at the fiscal 1984 appropriation level. This legislation has been cosponsored by a total of 91 Members.

The gentleman from North Dakota and I testified before the Subcommittee on International Security and Scientific Affairs on H.R. 4440 on February 23, 1984. At that hearing, both of us emphasized the need to restrain the unchecked growth of the military component of foreign aid. Under the funding levels established by continuing resolution for fiscal 1984, about 63 percent of all foreign aid goes for security-related assistance.

The amendment we are offering today would hold funding for the non-Central American countries to the amount actually appropriated under the 1984 continuing appropriations resolution, which is \$422.5 million. This would be a reduction of \$164.75 million from the \$587.25 million recommended in the committee bill.

The cut of \$164.75 million is not earmarked for any specific countries. It also should be noted that this cut would not affect Israel and Egypt, since these countries are not going to get grant military assistance under this legislation.

The grant military aid program was supposed to have been phased out and eventually terminated as of September 30, 1982. However, the termination of MAP was repealed under the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1981, and MAP funding has increased by 363 percent since fiscal 1981.

MAP was created by Congress to aid countries which face pressing national security threats and lack the funds to pay for needed military equipment under the FMS program. However, the number of countries getting MAP aid has grown from 14 in fiscal 1981 to 24 under the bill before us. In view of the provisions in this bill to create a new \$388.5 million FMS concessional loan program to provide special assistance to those countries seeking to buy military equipment, there is little justification for approving an expanded MAP program this year.

As the National Taxpayers Union has written in a letter in support of our amendment:

Congress should follow consistent policy on such funding. While grants and concessional loans may be necessary for American allies engaged in active hostilities, most countries should not expect America to finance their long-term defense.

Our colleagues should keep in mind that while this amendment represents a cut from the authorization level in the committee bill, it is not a cut in terms of the amount appropriated for fiscal 1984. Instead, it advances the view that the amount of non-Central

America MAP funded in fiscal 1984 should also be the level in fiscal 1985. Given the large growth in the MAP program in recent years, this is a very modest proposal.

The MAP freeze amendment, in the spirit of the Human Needs and World Security Act, is an attempt to bring some fiscal restraint to the runaway growth of the military component of foreign aid. I would urge my colleagues to join with us to vote in favor of the amendment to harness the MAP genie we thought we had put back in the bottle a few years ago.

□ 1730

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to ask a question, I know the answer, but I want to make sure that everyone else does.

What does this do with respect to Egypt and Israel as to military aid?

Mr. HALL of Ohio. It does not affect Egypt and Israel.

Mr. JEFFORDS. So in summary, we are not affecting that which is going to Central America, we are not affecting that which is going to Egypt or Israel; we are just freezing the amount of money that the administration has to be able to give out to other areas where they feel there is a need for military assistance?

Mr. HALL of Ohio. At 1984 levels; the gentleman is correct.

Mr. JEFFORDS. There is no cut-back; it is just freezing it at the 1984 levels?

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Exactly.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague, BYRON DORGAN from North Dakota. This Dorgan amendment would freeze the military assistance program (MAP) grants to countries outside Central America at the 1984 appropriations level of \$422.5 million. This is a reduction of \$164.8 million from the level in the proposed bill H.R. 5421, and a savings of \$230 million from the Reagan administration's fiscal year 1985 budget request.

Let us not forget MAP aid has grown dramatically since the Reagan administration assumed office. Between fiscal year 1981 and the fiscal year 1984 continuing resolution, total growth amounted to \$363 million in nominal terms. If H.R. 5421 is passed, nominal growth since fiscal year 1981 will amount to 614 percent. The Dorgan amendment will not cut the overall size of the MAP aid between

fiscal year 1984 and fiscal year 1985—it will merely freeze future growth in the program. Given the growing Federal deficit, this is a fiscally responsible action.

Moreover, although MAP grants to developing countries are frequently referred to as “security aid,” we must not be fooled by semantics. A well-armed nation whose people are still poor and hungry has not protected itself against the real causes of insecurity. A nation's security depends on the fulfillment of essential human needs. Arms may temporarily hold off those who seek to incite violent change. But the same arms are often used against those who work for peaceful change and for better lives for the poor.

Currently, the world spends \$22 on military purposes for every dollar it spends on development aid to developing nations. According to the U.N. Center for Disarmament, the money required to provide adequate food, water, education, health, and housing for everyone in the world has been estimated at about \$18.5 billion per year. The world spends this much on arms every 2 weeks. In the developing world, 10 times more is spent on arms than on health, education, and welfare combined.

I believe that we must restrain the enormous growth in the MAP grants, at a time of astronomical budget deficits, and at a time when development aid has barely kept pace with inflation. The Dorgan amendment achieves this goal. I urge my colleagues to join with me in support of this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask several questions of the sponsor of this amendment, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN).

It has been suggested here that the passage of this amendment would cause severe cuts in assistance to countries that are in dire need. I would like to know from the gentleman if that is the case. Are we indeed looking at severe cuts for Sudan or some of the other countries?

I yield to the gentleman for purposes of his reply.

Mr. DORGAN. That is simply not the case. This is not an attempt to cut funds that are necessary for security assistance, for example to the Sudan, as the gentleman from New York indicated.

What this does is freeze funding at fiscal year 1984 levels. It is not a cut at all; it simply says we are not going to increase fiscal year 1984 levels. The question of how much money is allocated for purposes of security assistance in the Sudan is something the President can still determine within the confines of this legislation.

This legislation says our pocket has a bottom. We do not have an unlimited amount of money to spend. We should freeze it at 1984 levels for fiscal purposes. It has done the job in 1984; we think it can do the job in 1985.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. I would like to put another question to the gentleman if I may: I understand that there has been an enormous amount of military assistance that was requested by the President put off budget. In other words, provided for, but put off budget. Does this amendment of the gentleman limit the amount, or speak to the amount of off budget expenditures?

Mr. DORGAN. No; it does not. This amendment deals only with that limited portion mentioned in this amendment. Let me point out again that we are talking about a request that originally came to Congress for a 55-percent increase in authorization for that portion of the budget, and the committee has trimmed it to 39 percent.

Once again, I and the cosponsors of the amendment are saying enough is enough. Let us freeze it at 1984 levels. That is not going to injure this country's ability to deal with delicate situations around the world. It is not going to injure this country's ability to provide the legitimate security assistance in the MAP grants to countries who desperately need it.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that a point be made here: I share the speakers', that have preceded me, concerns about national security. I believe in protecting the national security of this country deeply and profoundly. It is because I do care about that national security that I will support the amendment that is before this body.

The simple fact is that our national security is also based on our economic well-being. If we gut this country's ability to produce and save and build for the future, we destroy our national security just as surely as any foreign country would do in attacking us. The simple fact is we had no capital formation last year. The simple fact is that we have gutted this country's ability to expand, provide new jobs, compete in the future.

The simple fact is that the enormous trade deficits that this country faces are a product of our unwillingness to save and build for America's future. This amendment is a very modest one. It only says that we are not going to increase; it does not cut back. All it says is that there is a limit to how much we will spend, and we will spend as much as we did last year. I do not think it goes far enough. I think the national security of this country requires that we do a better job than even this amendment suggests with the budget.

As a minimum step, I would suggest to you concern over national security, I believe, calls for the support of this amendment. I believe the support of this amendment should be bipartisan, and I commend the gentleman from North Dakota for his efforts.

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

Mr. Chairman, I believe we need to certainly have some moderation as we look at matters of this type. The gentleman from Iowa hesitates to take the floor because of the fact that I do not know the situation in the long list of names that are on this list.

It does seem to me that when the gentleman from New York talks about the problems that some of those countries may face, that it appears to me that the Dominican Republic does not particularly face an exterior threat at this time.

It appears to me that Jamaica does not particularly face an exterior threat.

It appears to me that Portugal does not particularly face at this time a threat from the exterior.

So I do not want to be guilty as somebody who does not understand it coming in and demanding that cuts be made, but it does seem to me that it is legitimate that there are serious concerns here in our own country for which we do not have adequate funding, and that we ought to ask ourselves whether or not, in view of that, that it really makes sense that we should increase the military aid to those countries which we clearly know do not face external military aggression at this time.

Under those circumstances, it seems to me that as long as there is flexibility in the amendment that the amendment should be supported.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would probably feel a little better about this amendment if I thought the savings sought were going to be applied to the budget deficit, or was going to buy more wheat or corn to feed hungry people. But everybody knows that is not going to happen.

Also, I would feel better if we did not have to have any security assistance of any kind, any more than I would like to feel that we did not need a national defense budget that is growing by leaps and bounds and contributing to the problem of our deficit.

But the truth of the matter is that, while there may be some countries who do not have a military establishment, they still have police forces, and there may be some cities that have no police or no requirement for police. I

hope there are, and that they do not have to spend money for guns and uniforms and otherwise do what is necessary sensibly to protect themselves.

I hope some aspects of this bill, particularly the economic and the military aid, would lead us toward that great day, whenever it is, that man can treat man with some kind of common sense and we can feed and educate people and build houses. But in the meantime it seems that military establishments will continue to exist.

So military assistance on a grant basis by the United States to those countries where we think it is essential and in our interest and their interest to provide such assistance, will be necessary. As Members know, we intended to terminate the MAP program. However, it became necessary to build it up very carefully and cautiously, and so we do have an increase. The numbers that have been cited are huge in terms of percentages, but I must remind people that part of that percentage, and a great part has to do with renegotiation of base rights in Turkey, the Philippines, and Portugal.

In the application of this amendment, if it were unfortunate enough to be adopted, I doubt that the administration will alter the agreements under the base rights. I doubt that. So I want to say that what is before the House, and that came out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, is below the President's budget. Some folks do not like that. They think it ought to be zero or they think it ought to be more.

I can understand that, but the fact is that the Committee on Foreign Affairs did cut the President's budget on grant military assistance. If you now apply this additional cut, this happens:

Of the \$587 million that would be affected, because Central America is not included, \$375 million would be for base rights countries. I think all of us agree that the sensible way to approach this would be to implement the base rights agreements in full. That would leave a balance of \$212 million under the committee bill.

The pending amendment cuts \$164 million. That sounds great, except that it leaves only \$48 million for the rest of the MAP recipients. We do not want to hurt the base rights agreements. That means we take \$48 million and divide it among 19 countries.

That is what the amendment does. If you want to do that, that is fine. I simply characterize that as a disaster. The administration can take that \$48 million and give it all to Sudan, if they want to. They had planned to give Sudan about \$69 million this year out of that \$212 million I was talking about that would be left without this amendment. Morocco also is supposed to receive giant assistance. But just assume we applied it evenly across the 19 countries. That is what we would

have. We would have \$48 million for 19 countries.

I would dare say that is rather drastic in terms of the need that the administration has perceived, has proposed to the Congress, and the committee has considered and already cut. We are aware of the problem. We know there is concern. But I would urge that this amendment be defeated and let us act responsibly on this problem.

THE CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN).

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic vote, and there were—ayes 207, noes 208, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 137]

AYES—207

Ackerman	Foglietta	Miller (CA)
Addabbo	Ford (MI)	Miller (OH)
Akaka	Ford (TN)	Mineta
Anderson	Gaydos	Mitchell
Andrews (TX)	Gibbons	Moakley
Anthony	Glickman	Mollohan
Applegate	Gonzalez	Moore
Archer	Goodling	Morrison (CT)
Barnard	Gore	Mrazek
Bates	Gradison	Murphy
Bedell	Gray	Natcher
Bennett	Guarini	Nielson
Billakis	Gunderson	Oaker
Boehlert	Hall (OH)	Oberstar
Boggs	Hall, Ralph	Obey
Boner	Hall, Sam	Olin
Bonior	Harkin	Ortiz
Borski	Harrison	Ottlinger
Bosco	Hatcher	Owens
Boxer	Hayes	Oxley
Brown (CA)	Hefner	Panetta
Brown (CO)	Heftel	Patman
Broyhill	Hertel	Paul
Bryant	Hightower	Pease
Burton (CA)	Hopkins	Penny
Byron	Hubbard	Perkins
Carper	Hughes	Pickle
Carr	Jacobs	Rahall
Chappie	Jeffords	Rangel
Clarke	Jenkins	Ratchford
Clay	Johnson	Ridge
Coleman (TX)	Jones (OK)	Ritter
Collins	Jones (TN)	Roberts
Conyers	Kaptur	Rodino
Cooper	Kastenmeier	Roe
Courtner	Kildee	Roemer
Crockett	Kogovsek	Rogers
D'Amours	Kolter	Roukema
Daschle	Kostmayer	Rowland
Daub	Kramer	Roybal
de la Garza	LaFalce	Russo
Dellums	Leach	Sabo
Derrick	Lehman (CA)	Savage
Dixon	Levitas	Schaefer
Dorgan	Lloyd	Schneider
Downey	Long (MD)	Schroeder
Durbin	Lowry (WA)	Seiberling
Eckart	Luken	Sensenbrenner
Edgar	MacKay	Shannon
Edwards (CA)	Martin (IL)	Sharp
Emerson	Matsui	Shumway
English	Mazzoli	Sikorski
Erdreich	McCandless	Simon
Evans (IA)	McCloskey	Slattery
Evans (IL)	McCurdy	Smith (IA)
Ferraro	McHugh	Smith (NJ)
Fiedler	McKernan	Snowe
Fish	McNulty	Snyder
Florio	Mikulski	Spratt

Staggers
Stangeland
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Tauzin

Taylor
Torres
Towns
Udall
Vandergriff
Vento
Volkmer
Walgren
Walker
Watkins

Weaver
Wheat
Whitley
Whitten
Williams (MT)
Williams (OH)
Wirth
Wise
Wyden
Wylie

NOES—208

Albosta	Gejdenson	Nowak
Alexander	Gekas	O'Brien
Annunzio	Gephardt	Packard
Aspin	Gilman	Parris
AuCoin	Gingrich	Pashayan
Badham	Gramm	Patterson
Barnes	Green	Pepper
Bartlett	Gregg	Petri
Bateman	Hamilton	Porter
Bellenson	Hammerschmidt	Price
Bereuter	Hartnett	Pritchard
Berman	Hawkins	Pursell
Bethune	Hiler	Quillen
Bevill	Hillis	Ray
Biaggi	Holt	Regula
Bliley	Horton	Reid
Boland	Howard	Richardson
Bonker	Hoyer	Rinaldo
Boucher	Huckaby	Robinson
Breaux	Hunter	Rose
Britt	Hutto	Rostenkowski
Brooks	Hyde	Roth
Broomfield	Ireland	Rudd
Burton (IN)	Kasich	Sawyer
Campbell	Kemp	Scheuer
Carney	Kennelly	Schumer
Chandler	Kindness	Shaw
Chappell	Klecza	Shelby
Cheney	Lagomarsino	Shuster
Clinger	Lantos	Siljander
Coats	Latta	Siskis
Coelho	Leath	Skeen
Coleman (MO)	Lehman (FL)	Skelton
Conable	Levin	Smith (FL)
Conte	Levine	Smith (NE)
Corcoran	Lewis (CA)	Smith, Denny
Coughlin	Lewis (FL)	Smith, Robert
Coyne	Lipinski	Solarz
Craig	Livingston	Solomon
Crane, Daniel	Loeffler	Spence
Crane, Philip	Long (LA)	St Germain
Daniel	Lott	Stratton
Dannemeyer	Lowery (CA)	Stump
Darden	Lundine	Sundquist
Davis	Lungren	Swift
DeWine	Mack	Thomas (CA)
Dickinson	Madigan	Thomas (GA)
Dicks	Marlenee	Torricelli
Dingell	Marriott	Traxler
Donnelly	Martin (NY)	Vander Jagt
Dowdy	Martinez	Vucanovich
Dreier	Mavroules	Waxman
Duncan	McCain	Weber
Dwyer	McCollum	Weiss
Dymally	McDade	Whitehurst
Dyson	McEwen	Whittaker
Early	McKinney	Wilson
Edwards (AL)	Mica	Winn
Edwards (OK)	Michel	Wolf
Fascell	Minish	Wolpe
Fazio	Molinari	Wortley
Feighan	Montgomery	Wright
Flippo	Moody	Yates
Foley	Moorhead	Yatron
Fowler	Morrison (WA)	Young (AK)
Frank	Murtha	Young (FL)
Franklin	Myers	Young (MO)
Frost	Neal	Zschau
Fuqua	Nelson	
Garcia	Nichols	

NOT VOTING—18

Andrews (NC)	Hansen (ID)	Lujan
Erlenborn	Hansen (UT)	Markey
Felds	Jones (NC)	Martin (NC)
Frenzel	Kazen	McGrath
Hall (IN)	Leland	Schulze
Hance	Lent	Valentine

□ 1800

Messrs. FRANK, MOLINARI, BARTLETT, MARTINEZ, and MAR-

LENEE changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. HERTEL of Michigan, EDGAR, STENHOLM, MINETA, and McCURDY, Mrs. LLOYD, and Messrs. PERKINS, KOSTMAYER, and DIXON changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title I?

For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROOMFIELD) rise?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, earlier today the committee adopted the Feighan amendment which reduced the authorization figure for the foreign military sales guaranty program with respect to Turkey. Subsequently the committee adopted the Lagomarsino amendment which increased that authorization figure in order to allow assistance for Peru. Unfortunately the Lagomarsino amendment was drafted prior to the adoption of the Feighan amendment and therefore did not reflect the change in the FMS guaranty figure that was made by the Feighan amendment. In order that the bill accurately reflect the actions we have taken, I ask unanimous consent that the figure inserted on line 8 of page 3 of the amendment in the nature of a substitute (text of H.R. 5421) pursuant to the Lagomarsino amendment be \$2,023,000,000.

□ 1810

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the Chairman for his willingness to restrain military aid in the fiscal year 1985 foreign aid authorization bill and for his openness to a strong debate on this issue.

Since the hour is already late—and fairness to Members offering other amendments—I have decided to withdraw my second amendment.

That amendment would have done two things:

First, cap the volume of new concessional foreign military sales loans at one-tenth the FMS total.

Second, set a minimum interest rate for these low-interest loans.

In view of the credit crunch faced by family farmers, small business, students, and homebuyers, this amendment makes good sense.

However, the Chairman has assured me that he will carefully monitor FMS concessional loans in line with the consideration outlined in my amendment. I, therefore, withdraw the amendment on that basis.

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

Mr. Chairman, I had intended to offer two amendments this afternoon dealing with defaults and reschedulings of loans made by the United States to foreign governments under the Arms Export Control Act and the Foreign Assistance Act. These amendments would have been prospective rather than retrospective, and thus would have had no immediate effect. However, I believe that they would have created a more orderly congressional procedure for dealing with the issue of defaults and reschedulings.

As all of us have become increasingly aware, Mr. Chairman, many foreign nations are experiencing difficulties in managing their debt burdens. While official debt owed to the U.S. Government is only a small element of a much larger problem, the Congress does not presently have an adequate procedure for thinking through the consequences of debt that other nations incur by loans made to them under the Arms Export Control Act and the Foreign Assistance Act.

The amendments I had planned to offer were designed to encourage Congress to handle the issue of debt more sensitively in the future than it has in the past. For a number of reasons, I have decided not to offer the amendments, but I would like to take a few moments to explain existing law and how my amendments would have changed it.

EXISTING LAW WITH RESPECT TO DEFAULTS AND RESCHEDULINGS

At the present time, section 517 of the Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act of 1982 (as made applicable to later fiscal years by continuing resolution) mandates the termination of all U.S. assistance to any nation that falls into default, for a period in excess of 1 calendar year, on payment of principal or interest on a U.S. loan.

More specifically, section 517 states:

No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to furnish assistance to any country which is in default during a period in excess of one calendar year in payment to the United States of principal or interest on any loan made to such country by the United States pursuant to a program for which funds are appropriated under this Act.

Section 617 of the Foreign Assistance Act allows the United States to continue providing a limited amount of additional assistance for another 8 months in order to bring about the orderly termination of our foreign assistance program in a particular nation once section 517 sanctions come into play. As I read the law, however, section 617 does not provide for the orderly termination of assistance under the Arms Export Control Act.

In general, I believe that there should be a presumption in law in favor of terminating assistance to any

country that has been in default for more than 1 year. At the same time, there should also be a procedure for continuing assistance if the rational interest requires it. To be sure, section 614 of the Foreign Assistance Act does allow the President to waive any provision of law, including section 517, if he determines that it is "vital to the national security interests of the United States." However, this extraordinary provision of law is rarely used and it places the entire burden of overriding section 517 upon the President.

Because the sanctions imposed by section 517 are so drastic, our Government usually makes every effort to prevent a default or, if a foreign government has fallen into default, to encourage the debtor to become current. In many cases, however, a country may simply be unable to service its debt burden.

When a country is experiencing such difficulties, the United States will often reschedule loans extended under the Arms Export Control Act and the Foreign Assistance Act. We do not reschedule on a bilateral basis. Typically, the rescheduling is handled on a multilateral basis.

The law does not now require the United States to take any specific action when a country reschedules U.S. loans. We can continue to provide additional assistance to that nation, whether in the form of loans or grants.

EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

The two amendments that I had planned to offer would have made two changes in existing law regarding defaults on loans extended under our foreign aid programs. First, they would have provided for the orderly termination of assistance under the Arms Export Control Act by extending the reach of section 617 of the Foreign Assistance Acts of FMS loans.

They would have also provided a procedure whereby the President could waive a country's ineligibility for assistance, after consultation with the appropriate committees of Congress, if the President concluded either: First, that the country would become current on its late payment during the period for which the new assistance was to be provided; or second, that, even though the President could not make that determination, it was nonetheless in the national interest of the United States to provide additional assistance to a nation that had been in default for more than 1 year. To prevent any abuse of this authority by the President, my amendments would have allowed the Congress to override a Presidential waiver by joint resolution within 30 days.

With regard to governments that reschedule U.S. economic or military loans, my amendments would have made such governments ineligible to

receive additional loans from the United States in the fiscal year immediately following the fiscal year during which its previous loans were rescheduled.

The amendments would not require that U.S. assistance to the country be terminated if it rescheduled its loans. Grant assistance could still be provided. However, the country would be ineligible for new loans for 1 fiscal year, during which time the Congress would have the opportunity to review the country's economic situation and its debt burden, and thus make a conscious determination whether it is in our interest, or that country's interest, to provide additional loan assistance.

I think that it is reasonable to presume that a country is experiencing difficulty in managing its debt burden if it must reschedule its loans. In such cases, amendment would have simply forced Congress to carefully assess the effect of providing new loans.

At the same time, recognizing that this presumption might cause some difficulties in certain circumstances, the amendments would have also allowed for a Presidential waiver after consultation with the appropriate committees of Congress. As in the case of defaults, the Congress would have had the right to override a Presidential waiver by joint resolution. This new procedure for reschedulings would also have been prospective.

CONCLUSION

As I said, Mr. Chairman, I have decided not to press forward with these amendments at this time. Nonetheless, I remain convinced that our present procedures for handling defaults and reschedulings need to be reexamined. It is not clear to me that our interests, or the interests of recipients of U.S. loans, are well served by existing law.

I encourage our colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee to review existing law with a view to determining whether amendments, such as I have described, would be an improvement in current procedures.

Mr. FASCELL. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding and also for focusing attention on this very important problem.

It is quite obvious that the administration and the Congress cannot continue to pile up high-interest-rate loans to countries that cannot possibly afford to repay them. That is just a self-defeating proposition, particularly in light of the difficult economic situation that has existed ever since the oil embargo in 1973 which has practically destroyed the economies of many developing countries.

So the Committee on Foreign Affairs shares your concern. We have already moved in that direction, partial-

ly, by putting half of the offbudget military credits back on budget as a means of fiscal restraint. As we have pointed out in our report, and I assure the gentleman, next year we will put the balance on budget so that all of us will know exactly what the economic effect is. I look forward to working with the gentleman and the Appropriations Committee in getting a handle on this problem before it becomes a time bomb, as the gentleman so aptly described.

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

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

Mr. KEMP. As one who is also interested in this issue, I wonder if the gentleman can tell us what exactly his amendment was designed to accomplish.

Mr. McHUGH. I will give the gentleman an example with rescheduling. If a government that receives loan assistance from us, either for economic or military aid, is required to reschedule its loan because it is unable to meet the debt payments, under existing procedures and law, there is no specific action required of Congress in response to that rescheduling.

What one of my amendments would have done, if accepted, would be to require Congress to discontinue loan assistance in the fiscal year subsequent to a rescheduling unless the President certified to Congress that it was in the national interest of the United States to extend additional loan assistance to that country.

The amendment would not have affected grant assistance. If we felt that it was important to our national interests to provide more aid, we could do it with grant assistance, but not with additional loan assistance where there is already evidence that there is indebtedness which the government in question is unable to carry.

So the point of my amendment would have been to require a tighter procedure, a procedure requiring us to more carefully focus on governments which are unable to meet their existing debt burden before we add to that debt burden with new loans.

Mr. KEMP. If the gentleman would yield further, part of the problem is that sometimes some of that economic assistance is going to help those very countries which the gentleman and I are both concerned about deal with their shortage of foreign exchange.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. McHUGH) has expired.

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

Mr. KEMP. Part of the problem is that that economic assistance going to that developing country in many instances is used to boost their balance

of payments, to deal with that foreign exchange depletion that has been caused by the extremely high interest rates. And I only say this to my friend, who serves on the committee that I serve on, he also ought to give some thought to the onerous conditions imposed upon those very countries by the International Monetary Fund and the onerous conditions that are being imposed upon our friends and allies by the high interest rate policy of the Federal Reserve Board.

On one point, I think my colleague and I would agree and that is that the process by which we are rescheduling these debts and by which we are keeping the international financial system patched together is not the optimal process. We are rescheduling debt piecemeal without restructuring the system. As my colleague knows from our work together on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, I have repeatedly called for changes in the way in which debt is handled. The methods by which we are channeling foreign exchange to our allies through the economic support fund and other aid programs are not proper methods for handling debt and are ruinous to the real purpose of these programs.

I believe that we should undertake a major realignment of these policies based on providing assistance through the exchange stabilization fund at Treasury to restructure the debt of many of our friends so that they will have an economic umbrella under which they can undertake the very real economic policy changes which are required for them to achieve renewed economic growth and prosperity. The Treasury is the proper agency for such international financial undertakings. Programs aimed at specific development projects have neither the expertise nor the mandate to accomplish them successfully. That is not a criticism of those involved but a simple recognition that we are asking people to do what they are not equipped to do.

I just noticed the other day that the increase in the prime rate of one point cost Mexico \$600 million, cost Argentina more money than the total bridge loan that has been negotiated by the Secretary of the Treasury and the IMF in Argentina.

So part of the problem is, as the gentleman knows so well, that those high interest rates that I believe are artificially high have become so much a part of this onerous condition on the less developed countries who are allies of the United States. I think it would be a little bit harsh, a little capricious, a little bit counterproductive for us to just say that Congress ought to shut off any economic assistance.

I say to my friend I am glad he has withdrawn his amendment and I think we should take it into consideration.

But we ought to look at the source of the pain, which is the IMF and the Federal Reserve Board.

One other point I would like to make is that many of us have been concerned for some time over the large debts being incurred by some of our allies, particularly for security assistance. This year we are moving to correct that problem, at least for Israel. But the problem exists for other nations. It seems to me that if another nation, an ally, is in need of our assistance to protect its borders and to aid in our own security interests, we are shortsighted if we insist that credit become an overriding concern. I would prefer offering these nations grant assistance in many cases. Many of them are supporting our ideals and our interests at a great sacrifice. The gentleman is correct to point out that the sacrifice is economic as well. I will be pleased to join with the gentleman in working with our subcommittee and the Foreign Affairs Committee to alter the mix of loans and grants in favor of grants for those nations which are in dire economic condition. But I cannot support allowing them to incur the costs of loss of independence and freedom which might result from too strict an application of credit considerations when a major portion of their credit problems stem from our own monetary policies and from our reluctance to address the systemic monetary problems of the world economy.

Mr. McHUGH. I will take back my time.

My basic point is that if we have a government which already has significant problems in meeting its debt burden, we should think very carefully before we extend more loans to this country.

If it has economic difficulties, which obviously it would in that case, we can provide grant assistance which obviously does not impose more debt on the country, or the President can say to the Congress, "Granted there is a problem, but in the interest of the United States, we should provide additional loan assistance," which, in that case, we could do under my proposed amendment.

All I am saying is that we should consciously focus on a country which is already having debt problems before we impose more debt on that country in our economic or military aid programs.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title I?

If not, the Clerk will designate title II.

The text of title II is as follows:

TITLE II—ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 201. Section 531(b)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows:

"(b)(1) There are authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out the purposes of this chapter \$3,231,500,000 for the fiscal year 1985."

PROVISIONS ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. 202. (a) section 535(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "1982 and up to \$75,000,000 for the fiscal year 1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "1985".

(b) Chapter 4 of part II of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out existing sections 532, 533, 534, 536, 537, 538, 539, and 540;

(2) by redesignating existing section 535 as section 532; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 533. MIDDLE EAST.—(a)(1) Of the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out this chapter, not less than \$1,100,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985 shall be available only for Israel.

"(2) This amount shall be for a cash transfer on a grant basis. In exercising the authority of this paragraph, the President shall ensure that the level of cash transfer made to Israel does not cause and adverse impact on the total level of nonmilitary exports from the United States to Israel.

"(b) Of the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out this chapter, not less than \$750,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985 shall be available only for Egypt.

"(c) It is the sense of the Congress that, in order to continue to build the structure of peace in the Middle East, the United States should finance, and where appropriate participate in, cooperative projects of a scientific and technological nature involving Israel and Egypt and other Middle East countries wishing to participate. These cooperative projects should include projects in the fields of agriculture, health, energy, the environment, education, water resources, and the social sciences.

"(d) Of the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out this chapter for fiscal year 1985, \$20,000,000 shall be available only for Lebanon, except that to the extent that these funds cannot be used to provide assistance to Lebanon because of conditions in that country, they shall revert to the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"SEC. 534. PHILIPPINES.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out this chapter, not less than \$155,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985 shall be available only for the Philippines.

"SEC. 535. AFRICA.—(a) BALANCE OF PAYMENTS SUPPORT FOR COUNTRIES IN AFRICA.—Agreements with countries in Africa which provide for the use of funds made available to carry out this chapter for the fiscal year 1985 to finance imports by those countries (under the commodity import program of sector programs) shall require that those imports be used to meet long-term development needs in those countries in accordance with the following criteria:

"(1) Spare parts and other imports shall be allocated on the basis of evaluations, by the agency primarily responsible for administering part I of this Act, of the ability of likely recipients to use such spare parts and imports in a maximally productive, employment generating, and cost effective way.

"(2) Imports shall be coordinated with investments in accordance with the recipient country's plans for promoting economic development. The agency primarily responsible for administering part I of this Act shall assess such plans to determine whether

they will effectively promote economic development.

"(3) Emphasis shall be placed on imports for agricultural activities which will expand agricultural production, particularly activities which expand production for export or to reduce reliance on imported agricultural products.

"(4) Emphasis shall also be placed on a distribution of imports having a broad development impact in terms of economic sectors and geographic regions.

"(5)(A) In order to maximize the likelihood that the imports financed by the United States under this chapter are in addition to imports which would otherwise occur, consideration shall be given to historical patterns of foreign exchange uses, government and, except as provided in subparagraph (B), shall be available only for use in accordance with the agreement for economic development activities which are consistent with the policy directions of section 102 of this Act and which are the types of activities for which assistance may be provided under section 103 through 106 of this Act.

"(B) The agreement shall require that the government of the country make available to the United States Government such portion of the amount deposited in the special account as may be determined by the President to be necessary for requirements of the United States Government.

The agency primarily responsible for administering part I of this Act shall conduct annual evaluations of the extent to which the agreements described in this subsection meet the criteria set forth in this subsection.

"(b) SOUTHERN AFRICA.—Of the amount appropriated to carry out this chapter, \$110,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985 shall be available only for Southern Africa, including all countries which participate in the Southern Africa Development Coordination Committee (SADCC).

"(c) SOUTHERN AFRICA REGIONAL PROGRAM.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated to carry out this chapter, \$60,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985 shall be available only for regional programs in Southern Africa, of which not less than 70 percent shall be allocated to assist sector projects designed and implemented by the Southern Africa Development Coordinating Committee, including improvements in port facilities and high frequency telecommunications links in order to promote inter-regional trade and economic development.

"(d) SOUTH AFRICA EDUCATIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMS.—Funds available to carry out this chapter for the fiscal year 1985 which are used for education or training programs in South Africa may not be used for programs conducted by or through organizations in South Africa which are financed or controlled by the Government of South Africa, such as the 'homeland' and 'urban council' authorities. Such funds may only be used for programs which in both their character and organizational sponsorship in South Africa clearly reflect the objective of a majority of South Africans for an end to the apartheid system of separate development.

"(e) ZAIRE.—The funds allocated under this chapter for Zaire for the fiscal year 1985 may not exceed \$5,000,000 and shall be used only for the direct delivery of services to the needy by private and voluntary organizations.

"(f) TUNISIA.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out this chapter

for the fiscal year 1985, \$10,000,000 shall be available only for Tunisia.

"SEC. 536. EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN.—(a)(1) Of the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out this chapter, not less than \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985 shall be available only for Cyprus.

"(2) In order to assist in building a structure of peace on Cyprus, not less than \$3,000,000 of the amount earmarked by paragraph (1) shall be used for confidence-building measures between the two Cypriot communities. These funds shall be used to finance cooperative economic and cultural projects involving both Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots, with United States participation where appropriate. These cooperative projects should include projects in the fields of agriculture, health, energy, the environment, education, water resources, and the social sciences. Funds to carry out this paragraph shall be drawn proportionally from the funds which would otherwise be allocated for programs for Greek Cypriots and the funds which would otherwise be allocated for programs for Turkish Cypriots.

"(b) Of the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out this chapter, \$175,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985 shall be available only for Turkey.

"(c) Of the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out this chapter, not less than \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985 shall be used to carry out bilateral cooperative activities with Greece and with Turkey. Half of this amount shall be used in accordance with the 1980 agreement between the United States and Greece on economic, scientific and technological, and educational and cultural cooperation, and half shall be used in accordance with the 1983 agreement between the United States and Turkey on scientific and technological cooperation."

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL), the chairman of the committee, for his work in including in the legislation before us a section concerning the issue of conventional arms transfers.

Section 123 of the committee bill requires the President to submit to Congress a report on conventional arms transfers. This report is to examine and analyze the following: First, the lessons of earlier efforts to negotiate restraints on the export of conventional arms; second, the evolution of recipient country attitudes regarding conventional arms transfers; third, the prospects for engaging the Soviet Union in serious discussions concerning arms transfers, both globally and as they relate to regional security problems; fourth, possible measures by the United States and Western European suppliers to control levels of sophisticated weapons, both regionally and globally; fifth, the relationship between arms exports by Western European countries and the needs of those countries to support their domestic military procurement programs; and sixth, the timing and phasing of international conventional arms control negotiations.

The committee report also makes the following statement about the

committee's intent with respect to this report and its implementation:

As part of this report, the executive branch should consider opening consultations with supplier countries in Western Europe about possible restraint measures. The United States should, in concert with other Western European countries, support the establishment of a working group in the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva to implement the findings of the first U.N. General Assembly Special Session on Disarmament and the Secretary General's study of conventional arms control.

This committee report language makes it clear that the committee intends for the report in section 123 to lead to action on steps to bring about conventional arms transfer limitations.

I had the honor of testifying before the gentleman from Florida's Subcommittee on International Security and Scientific Affairs on February 23, 1984, to discuss restraining the growth of the security-related component of foreign aid and initiating action on conventional arms transfer limitation talks.

At that hearing, I discussed a resolution I have introduced, House Joint Resolution 128, which calls for a four-point program to achieve conventional arms limitations. It urges the administration to begin preliminary discussions with the Western arms supplying nations and with the Soviet Union to establish limits and guidelines for conventional arms transfers to developing nations. It further calls for talks between the nations selling conventional weapons and those purchasing such weapons. Finally, it urges self-restraint on the part of the United States with respect to selective conventional arms transfers to developing nations, particularly those involving sophisticated technology.

The basic concepts and objectives of House Joint Resolution 128 are contained in the points to be considered by the report required by section 123.

Now is an especially good time to move forward with initiatives relating to conventional arms transfers. Under the most current data supplied by the Congressional Research Service, it appears that 1983 was not a particularly good year for global arms transfers. Both the Soviet Union and France suffered substantial declines in their shares of Third World arms transfer agreements values in 1983 from the previous year. The Soviet Union's share of agreements declined from 26.9 percent in 1982 to 16.9 percent in 1983. France's share of agreements declined from 18 percent in 1982 to 4.8 percent in 1983. The United States in 1983 continued to rank first in Third World arms transfer agreements at \$9.53 billion despite a notable drop from its record year total of \$14.9 billion in agreements in 1982. It is interesting to note that the only major West European supplier not to register

a decline in agreements was Italy, which made a modest increase over its 1982 total.

These data indicate that now is the time to begin discussions on conventional arms control measures—before increased competition picks up again. Special attention should be given to efforts to head off new arms races in regions of the world that have not seen the most intensive competition for arms transfer agreements.

The Near East and South Asia region has historically been the greatest Third World arms market. In 1980-83, it accounted for more than three-quarters of the total Third World arms agreement values. However, Latin America and sub-Saharan Africa are two regions that seem ripe for an increased round of conventional arms transfer agreements. The major West European suppliers were serious competitors of the two superpowers in weapons deliveries from 1980 to 1983, making notable deliveries of certain categories of armaments to every region of the Third World, but most particularly to Latin America and sub-Saharan Africa. The major West European suppliers, as a group, made 30.9 percent of sub-Saharan Africa's agreements in 1980-83. Moreover, sub-Saharan Africa was the only region where the value of the agreements by Communist suppliers collectively exceeded the values of those of all non-Communist suppliers. For the period 1980-83, Communist suppliers accounted for 52.8 percent of all agreements in this region. In addition, the Soviet Union ranked first in Latin American agreements with 34.7 percent. The United States was second with 12.5 percent, with the major West European suppliers as a group comprising 25 percent of the Latin American region's agreements. It would seem to be imperative for the United States to discuss these developments both with the Soviets and with our Western allies. With conventional arms sales off last year, and with increasing opportunities for sales in sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America, now would seem to be the best time to raise the subject of regional guidelines and standards before the situation gets out of hand.

The figures I have mentioned underscore the merit and timeliness of the action taken initially by the Subcommittee on International Security and Scientific Affairs with respect to focusing attention on the conventional arms transfer issue. Once again, I commend the gentleman from Florida for his leadership in this area, and I look forward to continuing to work with him on measures to direct the attention of the administration to this often-overlooked aspect of arms control.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title II?

If not, the Clerk will designate title III.

□ 1820

The text of title III is as follows:

TITLE III—DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, AND NUTRITION

SEC. 301. (a) Section 103(a)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended—

(1) by striking out "\$700,000,000 for the fiscal year 1982 and \$700,000,000 for the fiscal year 1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$698,751,000 for the fiscal year 1985"; and

(2) by striking out "for each such fiscal year".

(b) Section 103(a) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(3) In addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes, not less than \$16,000,000 of the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry the purposes of this section for the fiscal year 1985 shall be used in accordance with the policies and general authorities contained in section 491 of this Act for disaster relief assistance to alleviate the suffering of the victims of famine, drought, and disease in Africa. Such assistance shall be provided for humanitarian purposes and shall emphasize the provision of transport assistance (including inland transportation), vaccine and veterinary services to protect livestock upon which people depend, medicine and medical care, food, seeds for the next harvest, clothing, temporary shelter, and similar assistance to save lives."

POPULATION AND HEALTH

SEC. 302. (a) Section 104(g) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out paragraphs (1) and (2) of the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) \$305,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985 to carry out subsection (b) of this section; and

"(2) \$118,138,000 for the fiscal year 1985 to carry out subsection (c) of this section."

(b) Section 104(g) of such Act is further amended by amending the second sentence to read as follows: "Not less than 16 percent of the funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1985 to carry out subsection (b) of this section shall be available only for the United Nations Fund for Population Activities, and not less than 50 percent of the amount by which the funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1985 to carry out subsection (b) of this section exceed \$250,000,000 shall be administered by the Office of Population in the Agency for International Development."

CHILD SURVIVAL FUND

SEC. 303. (a) Section 104(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended—

(1) by striking out "In" at the beginning of the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "(1) In"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2)(A) In carrying out the purposes of this subsection, the President shall promote, encourage, and undertake activities designed to deal directly with the special health needs of children and mothers. Such activities should utilize simple, available technologies which can significantly reduce childhood mortality, such as improved and expanded immunization programs, oral rehydration to combat diarrhoeal diseases, and education programs aimed at improving nutrition and sanitation and at promoting

child spacing. In carrying out this paragraph, guidance shall be sought from knowledgeable health professionals from outside the agency primarily responsible for administering this part. In addition to government-to-government programs, activities pursuant to this paragraph should include support for appropriate activities of the types described in this paragraph which are carried out by international organizations (which may include international organizations receiving funds under chapter 3 of this part) and by private and voluntary organizations, and should include encouragement to other donors to support such types of activities.

"(B) In addition to amounts otherwise available for such purpose, there are authorized to be appropriated to the President \$25,000,000 for use in carrying out this paragraph. Amounts appropriated under this subparagraph are authorized to remain available until expended.

"(C) Appropriations pursuant to subparagraph (B) may be referred to as the 'Child Survival Fund'."

EDUCATION AND HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 304. Section 105(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by amending the second sentence to read as follows: "There are authorized to be appropriated to the President for the purposes of this section, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, \$124,833,000 for the fiscal year 1985, which are authorized to remain available until expended."

ENERGY, PRIVATE VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS, AND SELECTED DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

SEC. 305. Section 106(e)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows:

"(e)(1) There are authorized to be appropriated to the President for purposes of this section, in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes, \$152,175,000 for the fiscal year 1985."

PRIVATE SECTOR REVOLVING FUND

SEC. 306. Section 108(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "in fiscal year 1984, up to \$20,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "for each of the fiscal years 1984 and 1985, up to \$20,000,000 per year".

SAHEL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

SEC. 307. The third sentence of section 121(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "\$86,558,000 for the fiscal year 1982, and \$86,558,000 for the fiscal year 1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$97,500,000 for the fiscal year 1985".

PRIVATE AND VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS AND COOPERATIVES IN OVERSEAS DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 308. (a) Section 123(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "thirty" in the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "ninety".

(b) Section 123(f) of such Act is amended by striking out "and 1984" and inserting in lieu thereof "1984, and 1985".

PROMOTION OF DEMOCRATIC COOPERATIVES

SEC. 309. Section 123 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) The Congress recognizes that, in addition to their role in social and economic development, cooperatives provide an opportunity for people to participate directly in democratic decisionmaking. Therefore, assistance under this chapter shall be provided

ed to rural and urban cooperatives which offer large numbers of low and middle income people in developing countries an opportunity to participate directly in democratic decisionmaking. Such assistance shall be designed to encourage the adoption of self-help, private sector cooperatives techniques and practices which have been successful in the United States."

TARGETED ASSISTANCE

SEC. 310. (a) Section 128 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 128. TARGETED ASSISTANCE.—(a) The President shall use poverty measurement standards, such as those developed by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and other appropriate measurements in determining target populations for United States development assistance, and shall strengthen United States efforts to assure that substantial percentage of development assistance under this chapter directly improves the lives of the poor majority, with special emphasis on those individuals living in absolute poverty.

"(b) To the maximum extent possible, activities under this chapter that attempt to increase the institutional capabilities of private organizations or governments, or that attempt to stimulate scientific and technological research, shall be designed and monitored to insure that the ultimate beneficiaries of these activities are the poor majority."

(b) Section 634(a)(1)(B) of such Act is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon the following: "such assessment to include an evaluation of the extent to which programs under chapter 1 of part I directly benefit the poor majority".

HOUSING GUARANTY PROGRAM

SEC. 311. (a) Section 221 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking out "requirements are" and inserting in lieu thereof "including essential urban development services, is"; and

(2) in the rest of the section, by striking out "housing" wherever it occurs (other than in the section caption) and inserting in lieu thereof "shelter".

(b) Section 22(a) of such Act is amended—

(1) in the second sentence by striking out "\$1,718,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,958,000,000"; and

(2) in the third sentence, by striking "1984" and inserting in lieu thereof "1988".

(c) Section 223(e) of such Act is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(e)"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2)(A) In order to meet obligations incurred for the payment of claims pursuant to loan guaranties described in subsection (d), the Administrator of the agency primarily responsible for administering part I may, to the extent that reserves are not sufficient, borrow from time to time from the Treasury, except that—

"(i) the Administrator may exercise the authority to borrow under this paragraph only to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in advance in appropriation Acts; and

"(ii) the amount borrowed under this paragraph which is outstanding at any one time may not exceed \$40,000,000.

"(B) Any such borrowing shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into account the cur-

rent average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities. The Secretary of the Treasury shall make loans under this paragraph and for such purpose may borrow on the credit of the United States in accordance with subchapter I of chapter 31 of title 31 of the United States Code."

(d) The amendment made by subsection (c) of this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

AGRICULTURAL AND PRODUCTIVE CREDIT AND SELF-HELP COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

SEC. 312. (a) Section 222A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking out "in Latin America" and by striking out "in not more than six Latin American countries"; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking out "in not more than five Latin American countries".

(b) Section 222A(h) of such Act is amended by striking out "1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "1986".

DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN IN ASIA

SEC. 313. Section 241(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "\$2,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$3,000,000".

AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION

SEC. 314. (a) Section 510 of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1980 is amended to read as follows:

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 510. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out this title, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985.

"(b) Amounts appropriated under this section are authorized to remain available until expended."

(b) Section 511 of such Act is amended by striking out "1985" and inserting in lieu thereof "1990".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRAY: Page 35, after line 4, insert the following:

MINORITY SET-ASIDE

SEC. 315. (a) Except to the extent that the Administrator of the Agency for International Development determines otherwise, not less than 10 percent of the aggregate of the funds made available for the fiscal year 1985 to carry out chapter 1 of part I of the foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall be made available only for activities of economically and socially disadvantaged enterprises (within the meaning of section 133(c)(5) of the International Development and Food Assistance Act of 1977), historically Black colleges and universities, and private and voluntary organizations which are controlled by individuals who are Black Americans, Hispanic Americans, or Native Americans, or who are economically and socially disadvantaged (within the meaning of section 133(c)(5)(B) and (C) of the International Development and Food Assistance Act of 1977). For purposes of this section, economically and socially disadvantaged individuals shall be deemed to include women.

(b) The Administrator of the Agency for International Development shall issue regu-

lations to carry out this section within 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. GRAY (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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman and colleagues, on November 14 of last year, the President signed into law the fiscal year 1984 continuing resolution. Included in that public law was a provision, which was approved by this body, requiring the Agency for International Development to expend at least 10 percent of their development assistance funds with economically and socially disadvantaged businesses, historically black colleges and private voluntary organizations controlled by economically and socially disadvantaged individuals.

The amendment before us now would simply reauthorize this particular provision, which was approved by the Congress and the President last year, for fiscal year 1985.

This amendment simply seeks to expand economically and socially disadvantaged participation into all facets of AID's development program, encouraging the Agency to use every mechanism available to remove those obstacles, regulatory and otherwise, to expand such participation.

Mr. Chairman, this particular provision enjoyed broad bipartisan support last year in this body. In fact, it was included in both the Foreign Affairs Committee's amendment to the fiscal year 1984 continuing resolution, and the minority substitute amendment, in addition to the original bill reported by the Appropriations Committee.

This amendment is essentially identical to that approved by this body and signed by the President last year, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the Chairman.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's statement is correct. I commend the gentleman for offering the amendment so that it becomes part of the basic law.

As a matter of fact, because of the gentleman's interest in the matter, AID has already issued guidelines and is pursuing the very course that the gentleman's amendment would provide.

Accordingly, we are very happy on this side to accept the amendment.

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

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. WINN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I just would like to clarify one point, if I may. I believe in

the wording that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has presented to the House, that the Administrator of the Agency for International Development still has the option; it is still at his discretion, is it not?

Mr. GRAY. Would you clarify your question?

Mr. WINN. Yes; if I understand the gentleman's amendment correctly, it says here, "except to the extent that the Administrator of the Agency of AID determines otherwise." In other words, he has the option still.

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman is absolutely correct in that understanding.

The language reads that it is up to the Administrator of the Agency for International Development to determine and set those goals and to the fullest extent possible, as determined by the Administrator.

I would also point out that the Agency for International Development and its Administrator are very enthusiastically pursuing the provisions that were authorized by this Congress, signed into law by the President last year and in fact just last week, the Agency for International Development had a national conference with over 1,000 economically and socially disadvantaged business participants there.

So it is left to that discretion, as under previous law of the Congress.

Mr. WINN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. This side accepts the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GRAY).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title III?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey: Page 27, line 16, strike "Not" and insert in lieu thereof "Subject to the limitation in subsection (f)(4)(A)(ii) of this section, not".

Page 27, after line 24, insert the following: "(c) Section 104(f) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4)(A) Funds authorized to be appropriated to carry out subsection (b) of this section for the fiscal year 1985, and any unobligated balances of funds appropriated to carry out that subsection for any prior fiscal year, may not be used—

"(i) to carry out population planning programs in the People's Republic of China, or

"(ii) for contributions to any international organization or any private or voluntary organization which carries out population planning programs in the Peoples' Republic of China,

unless the President has certified to the Congress that he is satisfied that the government of that country does not carry out any population planning programs which include forced or coerced abortion."

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer this amendment in an attempt to end our complicity in and unwitting approval of the barbaric and utterly savage population policy in China that includes forced and coerced abortion.

Specifically, my amendment would bar the use of American taxpayers' funds to finance population planning programs in the People's Republic of China unless the President first certifies to Congress that he is satisfied that the Government of that country does not carry out any population planning programs that include forced or coerced abortion. This amendment is in the finest tradition of our human rights policy.

The amendment applies to both direct funding to China, a policy that could well come into being within the coming year and to international organizations like the U.N. Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA) and voluntary organizations which carry out population planning programs in China.

Mr. Chairman, I suspect that there will be those today who will say that the occurrence of forced and coerced abortion in China cannot be proven, which is what the Communist officials say. To them I say the evidence is overwhelming and even if you have doubts, my amendment includes a certification requirement. Mr. Chairman, likewise, I suspect that there will be those who argue that U.S. funds are not used to pay for abortions directly. To them, I would suggest that pouring millions of dollars into organizations that are an integral part of China's repressive population program makes us partners in the repression of women and children in China for clearly, our dollars further the goals and objectives of that policy and the methods employed. It seems clear to me that the proposed \$50 million grant to China by the U.N. Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA) of which the United States donates approximately 25 percent, significantly improves China's ability to expand and implement its aggressive population program.

Mr. Chairman, there is an abundance of evidence that the People's Republic of China has embarked on one of the most brutal and repressive population control policies the world has ever known. In order to enforce the Government's 1979 "one child per family" norm, coerced and forced

abortion has become commonplace. Not rare, but commonplace.

Well documented stories of women being hauled into clinics often in late stages of pregnancy to undergo forced abortions have been reported by reputable journalists and responsible news media including "60 Minutes," the New York Times, and the Wall Street Journal. In its February 1984 "Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1983," the U.S. Department of State states on page 746:

Each province sets guidelines for the desired number of children to be born during the year. These guidelines often become translated into rigid quotas at lower level units such as factories and communes. In such units, women must apply for permission to have a child. Those becoming pregnant outside the "plan" are subject to peer pressure, harassment, and sometimes economic penalties and in many cases are forced to have abortions, even in late stages of pregnancy.

I recently contacted Elliot Abrams, Assistant Secretary of the Bureau of Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs to ask his view on whether or not forced or coerced abortions were part of China's population policy. According to Mr. Abrams' office, it is an "indisputable fact."

On April 9, the Wall Street Journal carried an editorial: "Paying for Abortions" in which they called for termination of U.S. funds to China's program.

By now, the evidence about coercive birth control in China is overwhelming. . . . China Scholar Steven Mosher, in his book "Broken Earth," described what he saw in one rural village:

"(The Pregnant Women) sat listlessly on short plank benches in a semicircle . . . where He Kasifeng (A top cadre and Communist Party member) explained the purpose of the meeting in no uncertain terms. 'You are here because you have yet to "think clear" about birth control, and you will remain here until you do . . . None of you has any choice in this matter . . . Then, visually calculating how far along the women in the room were, he went on to add, "the two of you who are eight or nine months pregnant will have a Caesarean; the rest of you will have a shot which will cause you to abort." What is less well known, however, is that the U.S. government supports this "family planning" . . . We realize that China's huge population presents a unique birth-control problem, but "poison shots" and "struggle sessions" aren't the solution . . . China may believe that only coercion will work, but American taxpayers shouldn't have to subsidize it.

In the May 16, 1982, edition of the New York Times, veteran reporter Christopher Wren quoted Mr. Li Hanbo, the deputy director of Guangdong Province family planning program who said: "There is no question of forcing pregnant women to have an abortion."

The New York Times article goes on to say:

Elsewhere in this coastal province two women were locked up for 15 days as "sorceresses" for inciting pregnant women at

their farm commune to flee from family-planning workers. All but 9 of the 325 women with unauthorized pregnancies were later given abortions . . . Those incidents, reported by the Canton radio, are but two skirmishes in a desperate battle that the provincial authorities have been waging over birth control. Harsher reports reaching Hong Kong last summer charged that thousands of pregnant women in Eastern Guangdong were rounded up and forced to have an abortion.

Broadcast newsmen Morley Safer narrated a segment on "60 Minutes" aired on February 12, 1984, that provided further insight and documentation of coerced and forced abortion in China.

Entitled "No Brothers, No Sisters," Morley Safer begins by saying:

Imagine the world this way, by law, one child per family, which would eventually mean a world without brothers and sisters . . . but how does a government, even a totalitarian government, impose such a policy? How do you dictate one child per family? That's what the BBS and "Nova" . . . went to China to find out.

"60 Minutes" continued:

Chong Zuo is considered to be a model town in the attempt to achieve a nation of one-child families . . . Madam Chen is the official in charge of Chongzuo's one-child policy. She tells the representative of each factory the quota of births they've been allocated for 1983. So far, they've kept to their quota.

Madam CHEN. There was a pregnant woman in Wazan factory. We persuaded her to have an abortion. We took her to the hospital. That night she changed her mind and escaped. The doctor didn't notice, and she escaped. She ran off to Shanghai. The Shanghai people helped us find her, and we brought her back to the hospital for the abortion. We were all very busy finding her. Such things happen.

SAFER. Workers must have their factory's permission to get married. To get that, they must receive instruction in family planning and pass a written test. They must be over 24 years old. When they get their permission, they are told by Dr. Chen, the Family Planning Officer, when they can try for a child.

SAFER. In each team of 16 women there's an informer, a tattletale. She's constantly alert for anyone who might be pregnant without permission, any whispers of someone acting suspiciously maternal.

Madam Chen goes on to say:

CHEN. "Controlling the population is our aim. Less birth is our aim. Punishment is not our aim. The fines are to enable us to control the population. If they prefer the fine and have a child, we have not succeeded in our aim. Our job is to finish the baby in the stomach. So when you have got rid of one there will be one less person."

Later in the broadcast, Morley Safer introduced us to another population control leader. And we get a good look at the methodology of coercive abortion.

SAFER. Mr. Ming is the leader of a work brigade of 500 families in a commune just outside of Chongzuo. . . . There are no two-children families in the commune, but Mr. Ming's record is being threatened by this couple, Jeng Hu and Man Zue, who wanted

to have a second child. It took weeks of persuasion to change their minds, and now, six months pregnant, Man Zue has agreed to have an abortion. . . it was this woman, Mrs. Feng, a family planning officer, who commanded the persuasion. Mrs. Feng decides which women can have a child. . . Mrs. Feng called and said, I have to tell you why you mustn't have this child. Man Zue said, come back and tell me after the baby is born. Mrs. Feng brought along the leaders of the brigade, who spent several evenings telling her that one child is good for the country, that it's also good for you. . . Next night, more senior officers of the commune came to the house. They went through it all again and again, very slowly. The next night an even more senior official came, and he said the same things. . . And so it went on, night after night. Man Zue said, I think they found me very difficult. In the end, she got worn down. she said, after awhile I knew they would just keep on and on and on. . . Finally, she did agree to have the abortion, at six months pregnant. She'll be given an injection into the womb that will kill the baby. the dead baby will then be delivered within 24 hours. Man Zue did sign the one-child certificate.

A Wall Street Journal correspondent, Michele Vink, reported in the November 30, 1981, edition of the Journal:

In Dongguan County in eastern Guangdong, for example, a reporter for Hong Kong's leftwing newspaper Zheng Ming Ribao saw pregnant women herded into vehicles and taken to hospitals for abortions. "The vehicles were filled with wailing noises, and the scenes were really bitterly distressing." He reported. One woman already nine months pregnant arrived at the hospital, he wrote, and immediately received an injection. "Three hours later the baby was born—but then it stopped breathing," the reporter said. Some pregnant women reportedly were handcuffed, tied with ropes or placed in pig's baskets. . . . Though doctors aren't supposed to perform abortions past the eighth month of pregnancy, they do, a Chinese source reports. "Every day hundreds of fetuses arrived at the morgue," he says. A woman with an unauthorized pregnancy is likely to receive an injection from hospital doctors before labor, resulting in a stillborn child or a baby so ill that it dies in a few days, the source adds.

Fox Butterfield, a highly respected reporter and former New York Times Peking Bureau chief writes in his book China, "Alive in the Bitter Sea":

In recent years the street committee has gained a further and more extraordinary power—the right to decide which couples in the neighborhood may have children. This prerogative is part of the government's tough new campaign to reduce China's rate of population increased. Each province and city has been awarded a quota for the number of babies to be born per year, and the street committees then determine which families may use the quotas. "We give first preference to couples without children," said Mrs. Tiem, a street committee member I got to know. "If a couple already has two children or more, we tell them not to have any more."

. . . Mrs. Tiem (a "street committee" member) was frank about how her street committee administered the program. "We assign a person to keep track of each woman's menstrual cycle. If someone misses

her period and isn't scheduled to have a baby, we tell her to have an abortion. There isn't room for liberalism on such an issue."

Nick Eberstadt, a visiting fellow at Harvard University's Center for Population Studies wrote in the New York Times, April 22, 1984:

So, increasingly, the population program turned to coercion . . . in some areas, women with "unauthorized" pregnancies were rounded up and ordered to submit to injections of abortifacients. Official edicts warned that those "who attempt to defeat the fertility plan" would be considered "enemies of the people"—a threat that any adult who lived through the Cultural Revolution understood only too well. Families that defied the "one child norm" were faced with monthly fines that often meant semi-starvation. (. . .) Almost a quarter of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities' \$50 million bequest to Chinese population programs is American money. Failure to act against these grave and obvious human rights abuses would expose America to some very serious charges—and those charges would be right.

In their book "One Billion: A China Chronicle (1983)," Jay and Linda Matthews wrote:

The new birth control campaign had just begun and commune officials wanted to make an example of her . . . Finally, under intense pressure, the couple agreed to let the doctors induce early birth at seven months and let the baby die if it was a girl. But when a commune official standing by in the delivery room saw it was a boy, he reneged and insisted it not be saved. The husband and mother-in-law were on their knees at the delivery room door, pleading for reconsideration, but their child died because the nurses were not allowed to put it in an incubator. Some days later the mother-in-law saw the four-year-old son of one of the officials playing by a lake. In a rage, she threw the child into the water, then jumped in herself, and both drowned . . . Compulsory sterilizations and abortions have become common.

Mr. Chairman, the repressive population policies have also led to an alarming increase in infanticide. In his article "Why are Baby Girls Being Killed in China?" Steven Mosher points out:

The wave of infanticide sweeping China is a direct consequence of a population-control policy of unprecedented severity. It restricts families to one child, ignores the realities of old-age economics in the countryside and systematically denigrates the value of human life. Parents are permitted to have only one child, and then only after a "birth quota" has been issued by the authorities. While the birth of a son has always been a more important event than the arrival of a daughter, Peking's policy of one child per family has raised the stakes. For the peasantry birth has become a kind of Russian roulette: The arrival of a son heralds a relaxed and secure old age: The coming of a daughter portends poverty and slow starvation during one's declining years. It is not "feudal nonsense" but brutal economic reality that moves the parents to hope for a man-child. If the child isn't male, then the choice is a stark one: Either kill or abandon the newborn female infant, reserving your one-child quota for the birth of a boy, or face a harrowing old age. It is no surprise that many peasants decide in favor of their

own security, and trade the infant's life for their own.

It is also an act in which the Chinese state is a silent accomplice. The English-language China Daily printed in Peking may publish editorials lamenting the resurgence of infanticide, but the implementation of the birth control policy at the grass roots encourages cadres to overlook the willful murder of female infants.

County, commune and production brigade cadres are told how many births their unit is to be allowed each year and are promoted and otherwise rewarded on the basis of whether they succeed in meeting the quota. It isn't in their interest to prevent female infanticide. Each girl who dies at birth or disappears soon after is one less head that they will be held to account for in the annual birth control report. Not only are forced abortions being performed up to the time of birth, there are even cases of officially sanctioned infanticide. In one incident shortly after I left Guangdong province, a young woman pregnant for the first time gave birth to twin boys. What should have been an occasion for rejoicing quickly turned tragic as the cadres present asked her which one she wanted. Both of them, she replied, but to no avail. One of the babies—she could not and would not choose which—was taken from her and put to death.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, many of China's own newspapers have admitted the rise in infanticide.

On March 3, 1983, the People's Daily wrote "the butchering, drowning and leaving to die of female infants and the maltreating of women who have given birth to girls has become a grave social problem."

An article in the April 11, 1983, New York Times written by Li Jianguo and Zhang Xiaoying—pseudonyms for two Chinese students attending school in the United States states:

According to news reports in China's dailies, during the last two years large numbers of female infants have been butchered, drowned or left to die, and numbers of women have suffered gross maltreatment as a result of nationwide implementation of the Government's population control policy.

We learn, from the People's Daily, the Liberation Daily, the Worker's Daily, Canton Evening News and The Chinese Youth that these illegal incidents happen not only in villages but in cities as well. In the areas most seriously affected, female infants and women who have given birth to female infants have been forced to die. As a result, nationwide, male infants have begun to far outnumber female infants. Both of us, citizens of the People's Republic of China, are deeply ashamed of, and mortified by, this utter barbarism and disregard of humanity. We are filled with boundless indignation that during this last quarter of the 20th Century such atrocities take place in our country. They reflect, on the one hand, the persistence of feudal thought and traditional indifference to the welfare of women and female children, and, on the other, the backward, benighted conditions of poverty and ignorance under which most parts of China still lives. But if China has curtailed population growth and lengthened the life of an average individual at the tragic expense of the lives of newborn girls, would it not be the greatest irony possible

for Mr. Qian to receive this award at this time?

As you well know, Mr. Chairman, it is common, accepted practice for our Government to withhold Federal dollars to programs, projects, and institutions that are found to be practicing racial or sexual discrimination, a prudent policy, I might add, that I strongly support.

There are numerous examples of laws and regulations that stipulate the loss of Federal funds if certain conditions are not met. Examples are to be found in laws pertaining to the handicapped, to HUD grants, to the loss of highway funds and sewage treatment moneys if, for example, provisions of the Clean Air Act are not adhered to.

Even Presidential candidates recognize that denial of U.S. funds for programs provides real leverage. According to the Chicago Sun Times, Senators GARY HART and ALAN CRANSTON—the latter while still a candidate—promised to deny Federal projects to States whose legislatures fail to ratify the equal rights amendment.

I believe we would be utterly remiss and irresponsible if, when fully informed of the use of forced abortion in China, we were to look the other way and pretend it did not exist or that it was completely out of our hands. We do have some clout in this grisly matter. We can make a difference. We do have some tools at our disposal—namely our funds and our outrage—to press for reform.

Mr. Chairman, UNFPA has three options if my amendment passes and eventually becomes part of the law. First, they can exert their considerable influence and clout to exact reforms in Chinese population policies. Or, second, they can disengage and get out—an unambiguous message to the Peking Government that the world community will not tolerate—or walk hand in hand with a policy of—forced or coerced abortions. Or third, UNFPA might decide to continue on in China, without our aid, and thus itself look the other way and pretend forced abortions are not really occurring. Of course, this would make a mockery of the United Nations often stated commitment to human rights.

I would suggest to my colleagues that we in this body have an obligation, a duty, not to be partners in this cruel repression of Chinese women and children. I would suggest that if we fail to take action, the cancer of the Chinese experiment will worsen and intensify and thereby claim more victims. I would remind my colleagues that such a policy would never be tolerated here. The outrage, I hope, would be deafening. Civil libertarians would assail such a policy, and they would be right. Human rights activists would assail such a policy, and they would be right. Religious and moral leaders would assail such a policy, and

they would be right. Government leaders and editorial writers would assail such a policy and they would be right. Liberals, moderates, and conservatives would assail such a policy, and they would be right.

Forced and coerced abortion would never be tolerated in our own backyard. It is no less offensive, I hasten to point out, in someone else's, even if they live on the other side of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment. Our traditions, our laws, the generous impulse of our people call for us all to do nothing less.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following article for Members' further study:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 9, 1984]

PAYING FOR ABORTIONS

By now, the evidence about coercive birth control in China is overwhelming. Fox Butterfield, in his book "China: Alive in the Bitter Sea," described how neighborhood cadres monitor women's menstrual cycles. CBS's "60 Minutes" recently reported on involuntary abortions. And China scholar Steven Mosher, in his book "Broken Earth," described what he saw in one rural village:

"[The pregnant women] sat listlessly on short plank benches in a semicircle . . . where He Kalfeng [a top cadre and Communist Party member] explained the purpose of the meeting in no uncertain terms. 'You are here because you have yet to think clear' about birth control, and you will remain here until you do. . . . None of you has any choice in this matter. . . . Then, visually calculating how far along the women in the room were, he went on to add, 'The two of you who are eight or nine months pregnant will have a Caesarean; the rest of you will have a shot which will cause you to abort.'"

What is less well known, however, is that the U.S. government supports this "family planning." It does so by contributing to the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (\$38 million this fiscal year), which in turn is giving \$50 million over four years to China's birth-control program. The contribution is probably breaking U.S. law, which prohibits U.S. aid for forced sterilization or abortions.

The UNFPA naturally resists this conclusion. "This organization has never funded an abortion of any kind," says Rafael M. Salas, the agency's executive director. He says the UNFPA's agreement with China prohibits coercion. And while abuses may occur, Mr. Salas says, the UNFPA has no evidence that this has happened in China.

We respect Mr. Salas's protests, but we also find it hard to believe that some of that money isn't going to pay for forced abortions. And even if the money goes only to Peking's birth-control bureaucracy, it still supports a policy that requires the chilling coercion that Mr. Mosher describes. In totalitarian China, policy flows from the state down, and political control is rigid enough to make sure it's enforced. Nor can the Chinese toss out the government if they don't like its policy, as the Indians did a few years back when they opposed Indira Gandhi's forced sterilizations.

The U.S. Agency for International Development is concerned enough to have begun investigating UNFPA's funding in China.

Jay F. Morris, deputy administrator of AID, says "there's no denying what the Chinese are doing" with birth control. But he says that so far, AID hasn't any evidence that its money is subsidizing coercion. As for concern about indirectly subsidizing a policy, Mr. Morris says: "That's a much larger issue that we really don't deal with."

We realize that China's huge population presents a unique birth-control problem, but "poison shots" and "struggle sessions" aren't the solution. Countries with far higher population densities—such as Taiwan and South Korea—have prospered without such measures. They've recognized that the best birth-control policy is an economic policy that produces rapid growth. China may believe that only coercion will work, but American taxpayers shouldn't have to subsidize it.

TESTIMONY OF JACQUELINE R. KASUN, PROFESSOR OF ECONOMICS, HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY, ARCATA, CALIF.

It is not widely known that the People's Republic of China is operating the world's most coercive program of population control, including forced abortion, sterilization, and infanticide.

What may not be so widely known is that United States foreign aid dollars are supporting the Chinese program. According to the Population Reference Bureau, a population activist group supported by the United States government, the Chinese population control program receives about \$50 million a year from the United Nations,¹ whose largest supporting donor is the United States. The Chinese program also receives support from the International Planned Parenthood Federation which in turn gets a large part of its money from the United States government.²

The Chinese program of population control has been operating with varying degrees of intensity since the 1950's. It has been intensely studied and widely reported in the house publications of American population organizations—the Population Council, the Population Reference Bureau, Worldwatch, and related groups. Cultural exchanges between China and the United States have taken Americans to China and brought Chinese to this country to study and explain the system. American television and Steven Mosher's recent book *Broken Earth: The Rural Chinese* (Free Press, 1983) have brought it to public attention.

By the early 1970's the system of birth quotas was in effect in China. The quota system meant that couples who had pregnancies out of turn were denying that privilege to others and were therefore subjected to intense peer group pressure for abortion and/or sterilization. Punishments—such as loss of pay and employment and dismissal from school—and rewards—such as payments for sterilization and vacations for abortion—were in effect.³ The program was greatly admired by enthusiasts such as the U.S. State Department's Ambassador Marshall Green for its use of the so-called "village system" of population control, because this system uses group rewards and peer pressure as means of enforcement.⁴ When the group reward (such as additional seed for fertilizer for crops) depends on meeting the village birth reduction quota, group pressure on recalcitrant couples is very effective. The U.S. Agency for International Development admired the village system so

¹ Footnotes at end of article.

much that, under the direction of Dr. R. T. Ravenholt, the agency introduced it into AID's program for Indonesia.⁵

From the two-child family of the 1970's it was only a step for China to the one-child family norm proclaimed in 1979. Increasing reports of repression and resistance began to reach the outside world at the same time as the evaluations by the United States-based population organizations became ever more admiring and funding from the United States increased.⁶ By 1982 Christopher Wren was reporting in the *New York Times* on thousands of Chinese women being "rounded up and forced to have abortions." He described women "locked in detention cells or hauled before mass rallies and harangued into consenting to abortions." He told of "vigilantes [who] abducted women on the streets and hauled them off, sometimes handcuffed or trussed, to abortion clinics" and of "aborted babies which were . . . crying when they were born."⁷ Michele Vink reported in the *Wall Street Journal* on women who were "handcuffed, tied with ropes or placed in pig's baskets" for their forced trips to the abortion clinics.⁸ As Steven Mosher points out, the People's Republic press itself now openly speaks of the "butchering, drowning, and leaving to die of female infants and the maltreating of women who have given birth to girls"⁹ in this society where only the son can care for his parents in their old age.

As the horror of the system has mounted, so have the accolades in the population lobby press. The Population Reference Bureau lists it among "well-designed family planning programs."¹⁰ Worldwatch, which is supported by the United Nations and therefore indirectly by the United States, cites it among its "Population Policies for a New Era."¹¹ Planned Parenthood of Korea, which receives support from International Planned Parenthood, which in turn receives support from the United States, has launched its own one-child family drive.¹² Topping it all, Rafael Salas, director of the U.N. Fund for Population Activities which was created at the urging of the U.S. Agency for International Development and which receives financial support from the United States,¹³ has presented the Chinese government with an award for excellence. I am proud to say that a distinguished member of my profession, Dr. Theodore Schultz, a Nobel Laureate enlisted as an adviser to the U.N. Fund for Population Activities, told the agency to remove his name from the award.¹⁴

The honey-voiced narrator of a Nova film being shown on public television in the United States assures us that this brutal program is necessary in order for China to "modernize" and to avert what she calls the "catastrophe" of excess population. The fact is, the Chinese system is catastrophe. It robs human beings of their dignity, treating them as if they were livestock being bred for the convenience of the state. The Chinese system of population control is not the result of overpopulation in China but rather the result of the catastrophic misdirection of policy and abuse of power by the Chinese government.

After more than three decades of economic mismanagement by their central planners, the Chinese people have realized one of the slowest rates of development and lowest standards of living on earth. Though they have vast industrial and agricultural resources and are an industrious and intelligent people, their output in 1981 amounted to only \$300 per person, barely enough for

survival. Most of their economic resources are unused. For example, less than a third of their agricultural land is in crops.¹⁵ Far more densely populated nations around them in Asia have forged ahead of them in economic development. Taiwan, with a population density more than five times as great as China's, produces eight times as much per capita and has a larger volume of trade.¹⁶ The Republic of Korea, with a population density four times as great as China's has a per capita output almost six times as great as China's.¹⁷

From the Great Leap Forward through the Proletarian Cultural Revolution and up to the current one-child family drive, recent Chinese history has consisted of one mad experiment after another, with devastating consequences for the Chinese economy and the Chinese people. What China needs is not population control but political rationality and economic efficiency. According to Christopher Wren, the Chinese estimate that it now costs more than \$865 to prevent one birth in Guangdong.¹⁸ This is almost three times the per capita gross national product and fifteen times the annual cost of supporting a child in China. What this means is that with a tiny fraction of the effort now being lavished on stamping out births, the Chinese could support the children in question and still have enough left over to mount a sizeable investment program for the improvement of their economy. A sustained and efficient development program of this magnitude would bring China to comfortable prosperity rather than the ruin which it is now producing.

The United States cannot change the government of China. We cannot stop their mad experiments upon their own people. We can and we should, however, separate ourselves from this savagery. We should, like Professor Schultz, let the world know that we do not countenance or support such things. For the sake of our national honor and our name in history, we should—we must—immediately terminate all support for the U.N. Fund for Population Activities, for the International Planned Parenthood Federation, and all organizations which support population control in the People's Republic of China.

HOW BAD IS THE SO-CALLED POPULATION PROBLEM IN CHINA?

(Many countries are more crowded than China, but few produce as little per person, as the following table shows)

Country or State:	Persons per square mile 1982	GNP per capita dollars 1981
Taiwan	1,482	\$2,280
Republic of Korea	1,080	1,700
Japan	825	10,080
West Germany	643	13,450
United Kingdom	595	9,110
India	570	260
Switzerland	398	17,430
China	285	300
France	256	12,190
United States	64	12,820
Pennsylvania	264	NA
Maryland	429	NA
New York	371	NA

¹ Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.

Source: Population densities from "Statistical Abstract of the United States," 1982-83; GNP figures from World Bank, "World Development Report 1983."

FOOTNOTES

¹ Population Reference Bureau, *Intercom*, May/June 1983.

² International Planned Parenthood Federation, *Report to Donors, 1980*, p. 40.

³ Pi-chao Chen, "Lessons from the Chinese Experience: China's Planned Birth Program and Its

Transferability," *The Population Council, Studies in Family Planning*, Vol. 6, No. 10, October 1975, pp. 354-366.

⁴ Ambassador Marshall Green, "U.S. Perspectives on World Population Issues," The Conference Board, Dallas, Texas, March 30, 1977.

⁵ AID, Memorandum for Assistance Administrators, Mission Directors, AID Representatives and Principal AID Officers, 11 June 1980; Hearings of Select Committee on Population, 95th Congress, 2nd Session, Vol. II, April 25, 26, 27, 1978.

⁶ U.N. Fund for Population Activities, *1980 Report*, and *1981 Report*.

⁷ Christopher Wren, "Chinese Region Showing Resistance to National Goals for Birth Control," *New York Times*, May 16, 1982.

⁸ Michele Vink, "Abortion and Birth Control in Canton, China," *Wall Street Journal*, November 30, 1981.

⁹ Steven W. Mosher, "Why Are Baby Girls Being Killed in China?" *Wall Street Journal*, July 25, 1983.

¹⁰ Population Reference Bureau, *Intercom*, March/April 1983, p. 7.

¹¹ Worldwatch Paper #53.

¹² International Planned Parenthood Federation, *People*, Vol. 10, No. 2, 1983, p. 28.

¹³ NSSM 200, "Implications of Worldwide Population Growth for U.S. Security and Overseas Interests," December 10, 1974, declassified on December 31, 1980, pp. 121-122.

¹⁴ *New York Times*, June 24, 1983.

¹⁵ Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, *FAO Production Yearbook 1980*.

¹⁶ World Bank, *World Development Report, 1979*, 1980, 1981, 1982.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 1983.

¹⁸ Wren, *op. cit.*

[From the Richmond News Leader, June 28, 1983]

CHINA'S BIRTH CONTROL

Communist China's population control programs emphasize abortion and sterilization. Chinese officials often "encourage"—i.e., force—expectant mothers to abort their babies; they also require the sterilization of couples with two or more children. Both practices contravene explicit provisions in the international aid programs subsidizing Communist China's birth control drives.

Communist China receives extravagant grants from the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA). In turn, the fund receives extravagant grants from the U.S. Agency for International Development. Not only does the UN proscribe the use of its money for forced sterilization, U.S. law prohibits the use of AID cash for abortion and sterilization. The standard disclaimer attached to AID applications states:

This project is consistent with AID policies, and with sections 104 of the Foreign Assistance Act and 525 of the Appropriations Act, 1982, which provide that funds will not be used to pay for the performance of abortions as a method of family planning or to motivate or coerce any person to practice abortions or to pay for the performance of involuntary sterilizations as a method of family planning or to coerce or provide any financial incentive to any person to undergo sterilizations or to pay for any biomedical research which relates, in whole or in part, to methods of or the performance of abortions or involuntary sterilization as a means of family planning; or to lobby for abortion.

The intent is clear. And clearly, Communist China's forced abortion and sterilization programs traduce U.S. law and UN regulations. The issue transcends birth control. It involves the sanctity of the law.

Either laws mean what they say, or there is no reason to write them. No nation should be above the law. If law prohibits the use of U.S. or UN money for, say, building soccer fields, then countries using such cash to construct stadiums should forfeit their

grants. A similar standard should apply to birth control programs.

Although UN officials concede that Communist China may be violating UNFPA guidelines, they seem less than vigorous in enforcing the law. U.S. officials appear similarly lackadaisical. Yet Communist China's flouting of the law carries profound implications for relations between it and the U.S.

Many in the U.S. want to increase trade between Washington and Peking dramatically. Trade agreements between the U.S. and potential enemies usually include assurances that American products or technology will not be used for military purposes. If Communist China openly breaks laws regarding population control, then can the U.S. expect it to obey agreements regarding manufactured goods?

The United Nations and the United States often speak of their desire to enforce international law in a world rent with lawlessness. Communist China's abuse of its population control grants gives the UN and the U.S. an opportunity to practice what they preach.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 25, 1983]

WHY ARE BABY GIRLS BEING KILLED IN CHINA?

(By Steven W. Mosher)

In 1980, when I was living with the 8,000 members of Sandhead Brigade in China's Guangdong Province, I asked village friends whether female infanticide ever occurred locally. The answer, which came with rather more heat than I had expected, was an emphatic no. "Ours is a land of fish and rice," one wrinkled old midwife told me in explanation. "All the people here have always been able to raise their daughters." She and others insisted that even under the old imperial regime girl babies had never been put to death.

Yet less than two years later Chinese friends in Hong Kong who had recently been back to the village began to tell of girl infants dying soon after birth in suspicious circumstances. One young woman was even more candid, admitting to me that when her mainland sister-in-law had recently given birth to a girl, the baby had been murdered immediately. A bucket of water had been prepared beside the bed. When the newborn turned out to be a girl, she was drowned.

Female infanticide isn't just an anomaly of the village I lived in. Premier Zhao Ziyang thought the problem widespread enough to condemn it in his report to the National People's Congress in December 1982. "We must protect in particular infant girls and their mothers," he said. "The whole society must resolutely condemn the criminal activities of female infanticide and maltreatment of mothers. The judicial apparatus should resolutely punish the offenders according to law."

In recent months provincial newspapers throughout China have reported grisly tales of the murder of female infants. On March 3, the People's Daily admitted that "the butchering, drowning and leaving to die of female infants and the maltreating of women who have given birth to girls has become a grave social problem."

Peking claims that these crimes are committed by "backward" villagers in the name of "feudal" attitudes that "boys are precious, girls are worthless." Male villagers, said to desire sons to "carry on the ancestral line and extend the generations," have been especially singled out for censure. "In their keen desire to have sons," the English-lan-

guage Peking Review said last January, "some men still torment their wives who bear daughters and worse still, they kill the baby girls through neglect or outright murder." If Peking is to be believed, many peasant men are ignorant and misguided monsters who willingly sacrifice their infant daughters on the altar of some feudal belief.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Infanticide does have a long and tragic history in many parts of China. But by the middle decades of this century, it looked as though this barbarism was on its way to extinction. In Chinese villages today, where ancestral land has long since been expropriated by the state and ancestor worship in on the decline, traditional notions of clan and family continuity no longer exert much influence. These attenuated ideas could not possibly account for the sudden reoccurrence of female infanticide.

The wave of infanticide sweeping China is a direct consequence of a population-control policy of unprecedented severity. It restricts families to one child, ignores the realities of old-age economics in the countryside and systematically denigrates the value of human life.

Parents are permitted to have only one child and then only after a "birth quota" has been issued by the authorities. Each population unit, such as a rural collective, is limited to a certain number of births per year, which it allots to couples who have.

Women pregnant with "over-quota" babies are forced to attend round-the-clock "studies courses" until they submit to an abortion. Families who actually have a second child must pay heavy fines of up to \$2,000—several years wages in mainland China—and run the risk of demotion or assignment to less desirable work as well.

This draconian policy makes no provision for the long-term economic concerns of peasant parents, especially their anxieties about financial security in old age. Sons are the only social-security system known to villagers, for there are no pension programs in the Chinese countryside. Neither can daughters give long-term assistance, for rural custom decrees that they take up residence with their husband's family upon marriage and sever all economic ties with their natal family. Even if they were to keep a daughter at home, peasants say, it would be impossible to find her a husband in a population of only sons.

Those who are without sons must toil in the fields throughout their twilight years. As their strength declines to the point where they cannot keep up, they are assigned lighter work that pays scarcely enough for their rice ration. Old age is a long downward spiral of flagging vigor, worsening diet and weakening health.

While the birth of a son has always been a more important event than arrival of a daughter, Peking's policy of one child per family has raised the stakes. For the peasantry birth has become a kind of Russian roulette: The arrival of a son heralds a relaxed and secure old age; the coming of a daughter portends poverty and slow starvation during one's declining years. It is not "feudal nonsense" but brutal economic reality that makes the parents to hope for a man-child.

If the child isn't male, then the choice is a stark one: Either kill or abandon the newborn female infant, reserving your one-child quota for the birth of a boy, or face a harrowing old age. It is no surprise that many peasants decide in favor of their own security, and trade the infant's life for their own.

It is also an act in which the Chinese state is a silent accomplice. The English-language China Daily printed in Peking may publish editorials lamenting the resurgence of infanticide, but the implementation of the birth control policy at the grass roots encourages cadres to overlook the willful murder of female infants.

County, commune and production brigade cadres are told how many births their unit is to be allowed each year and are promoted and otherwise rewarded on the basis of whether they succeed in meeting the quota. It isn't in their interest to prevent female infanticide. Each girl who dies at birth or disappears soon after is one less head that they will be held to account for in the annual birth control report.

Front-line cadres take their cues from their superiors, and these have made clear that population growth is to be held down at all costs, even that of the lives of millions of infants.

Not only are forced abortions being performed up to the time of birth, there are even cases of officially sanctioned infanticide. In one incident shortly after I left Guangdong Province, a young woman pregnant for the first time gave birth to twin boys. What should have been an occasion for rejoicing quickly turned tragic as the cadres present asked her which one she wanted. Both of them, she replied, but to no avail. One of the babies—she could not and would not choose which—was taken from her and put to death.

(Mr. Mosher, one of the first American social scientists since 1949 permitted to live in a Chinese village, is author of "Broken Earth: The Rural Chinese," to be published later this summer by The Free Press.)

[From the New York Times, Apr. 11, 1983]

INFANTICIDE IN CHINA

(By Li Jianguo and Zhang Xiaoying)

According to news reports in China's dailies, during the last two years large numbers of female infants have been butchered, drowned or left to die, and numbers of women have suffered gross maltreatment as a result of nationwide implementation of the Government's population-control policy. This shocking situation, which the Government must take immediate steps to stop, deserves to be brought to the attention of the United Nations.

We learn, from The People's Daily, The Liberation Daily, The Worker's Daily, Canton Evening News and The Chinese Youth that these illegal incidents happen not only in villages but in cities as well. In the areas most seriously affected, female infants and women who have given birth to female infants have been forced to die. As a result, nationwide, male infants have begun to far outnumber female infants.

The Government's birth-control policy has reduced population growth rate to 1.2 percent—it is 2 percent in other developing countries—but the rate reportedly was creeping toward 1.3 or 1.4 percent, and this means the Government may not meet the 1.2 billion target set for the year 2000. A census last July put the population at 1,008,175,288—five million more than was expected. The customary preference for a male child, pressure to limit new families to just one child, bonuses for cooperating parents and a warning that families who have more than one will be financially penalized inevitably have led to infanticide.

On March 3, The People's Daily said: "At present, the phenomena of butchering,

drowning and leaving to die female infants and maltreating women who have given birth to female infants have been very serious. It has become a grave social problem." The People's Daily said, on Jan. 31, that because of investigations and statistics from Shenyang, Anshan, Benxi and six other cities, in the last year 196 women went to local offices of the Chinese Women's Association to report maltreatment." Apparently, the most seriously affected provinces are Anhui, Liaoning, Shandong, Hebei, Guangdong and Sichuan.

Both of us, citizens of the People's Republic of China, are deeply ashamed of, and mortified by, this utter barbarism and disregard of humanity. We are filled with boundless indignation that during this last quarter of the 20th century such atrocities take place in our country. They reflect, on the one hand, the persistence of feudal thought and traditional indifference to the welfare of women and female children, and, on the other, the backward, benighted conditions of poverty and ignorance under which most parts of China still lives.

But traditional prejudice and economic backwardness notwithstanding, we strongly feel that all elements of our Government concerned with implementation of the new population policy should be held directly accountable for the prevalence of such tragic incidents. Infanticide need not be an inevitable outcome of the policy. Apparently, the affected units and organizations have not adopted a policy of "gentle persuasion and education" to achieve the desired goal of birth control and population control but have callously exerted political pressures and adopted extreme political measures for implementation of the policy.

It is true that the population-control policy has effectively reduced China's population growth. Nevertheless, these other, unintended results of such a policy contradict fundamental values of humanism, ethics and civilization. The Government, by permitting the news reports of the atrocities, obviously indicates that it opposes them. But, deplorably, it has not exercised its power to stop them, as far as we know.

Ironically, Qian Xinzong, chairman of the Chinese National Committee on Birth Control and Population Planning, in June is to come to the United Nations to receive an award as the representative of the country that has been most effective in implementing birth control and population planning. But if China has curtailed population growth and lengthened the life of an average individual at the tragic expense of the lives of newborn girls, would it not be the greatest irony possible for Mr. Qian to receive this award at this time?

Because of this situation, we hope that the Secretary General, Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, will take appropriate action to inform the concerned United Nations agencies—with the full cooperation of the Chinese Government—so that they may start a detailed investigation of this matter and, using all the resources at their command, end these horrors as soon as possible. To protect its dignity, we suggest that the United Nations should postpone giving Mr. Qian the award pending an investigation by responsible United Nations bodies and a report from Peking that this deplorable situation has ceased.

□ 1830

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FASCELL TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FASCELL to the amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey: In lieu of the text proposed to be inserted after line 24, page 27, by the Smith amendment, insert the following:

(c) Section 104(f) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4)(A) Funds authorized to be appropriated to carry out subsection (b) of this section for the fiscal year 1985, and any unobligated balances of funds appropriated to carry out that subsection for any prior fiscal year, may not be used—

"(i) to carry out population planning programs in the People's Republic of China, or

"(ii) for contributions to any international organization or any private or voluntary organization which carries out any population planning program in the People's Republic of China if such program includes forced or coerced abortion."

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, in simple words the language of the amendment speaks for itself. The difference primarily is that under the principal amendment the President would have a difficult time in certifying with respect to the entire program of such a large country. But the net effect of it would be that the United States would be prohibited from contributing to any population programs are involved, either through the United Nations or other organizations that are working on population programs in the People's Republic of China, even if they did not involve forced or coerced abortion. That would be an unfortunate effect of the amendment.

The substitute, on the other hand, carries out the same idea by saying that none of the U.S. money can be used for direct population programs in the People's Republic of China, by the United Nations program, through other organizations, or if those programs are involved in forced or coerced abortion.

Now, that is the difference between the two. I think it carries out the gentleman's objective without any of the disadvantages.

I would urge that my colleagues support the amendment to the amendment.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SILJANDER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

If the gentleman would respond to a question. Under present law any Federal moneys, any U.S. dollars are now prohibited to be used for abortion planning anyway.

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SILJANDER. So what the issue I think is could population control money still be used in China even though China as a Government policy, whether admitted or not, is enforcing coerced abortions?

Mr. FASCELL. Yes.

Mr. SILJANDER. So essentially what we are saying is we are reiterating the present law into the gentleman's substitute to the amendment, as well as allowing our population control moneys to be used in population controlled planning in a country whose policy is to force coerced abortions.

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman is correct, as I understand it, because the money cannot be used for forced or coerced abortion.

Mr. SILJANDER. But the point is, if I may ask one last question, while our moneys may not be going toward specifically encouraging a program for coerced abortions, it is still being used in population control planning in the context of which part of that, our tax dollars may not be used, but which the Government does force coerced abortions.

I guess the concern we have, some of us on both sides of the aisle frankly, is that our tax dollars are being used to encourage a population control philosophy in a nation that in fact includes coerced abortions.

□ 1840

And one way to avoid this might be a way of allowing a Presidential certification of some kind to assure the overall plan and policy of a country does not in fact, include coerced abortions in which our dollars are helping in a base and a foundational way to perpetuate that kind of a plan and philosophy.

I do not know if the gentleman on the other side of the aisle would agree with some form of Presidential certification in that light.

Mr. FASCELL. Well, frankly, I think it would be a very difficult requirement to put on the President of the United States, and I would certainly not want to support it.

But let me yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who has a comment on this.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. I would say to the gentleman from Michigan that I do not think a Presidential certification is necessary to this law or to others in general. I think all of us recognize and share the concerns expressed by the gentleman from New Jersey, and none of us wants to see U.S. funds or UNFPA funds used for forced or coerced abortions in China or anywhere else.

As the gentleman from Michigan has already stated, under current American law no tax dollars, no Amer-

ican tax dollars, are used under any circumstances, either directly or indirectly, for abortions, forced or voluntary, in China.

What the substitute offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) says is that it strengthens that, takes that policy, incorporates it into law.

The gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from New Jersey speak of Presidential certification. Who knows who will be in the White House when? Let us not leave it up to any President to certify. I think we can make it even stronger by putting it into the law, and that is what this does.

So let me reiterate, finally: The Fas-cell substitute establishes a strict prohibition on the use of American tax dollars, either directly or indirectly, through other agencies, such as the UNFPA, for abortion in China, forced or not.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman, if I may, to answer a question in regard to his comments earlier.

Would the gentleman, then, based on his comments, support any U.S. dollars going to a country in which the overall population program included coerced, forced abortions?

While our tax dollars may not be specifically going toward forced abortions, it is according a policy, a philosophy, a program, in which certainly our funding in one end that is not dealing with forced abortions could help supplement in an indirect way, the old back door philosophy, to support a government which is in fact encouraging and supporting a policy of forced abortions. And if in fact one could indicate that China does not have a forced abortion policy, then I would submit to the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he does not like Presidential certification I would say, with all good moral respect to the issue at hand, how would he suggest, then, we could certify the fact that the People's Republic of China is or is not involving population control planning, including forced abortion?

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. I thank my friend for yielding to me.

What the gentleman from Michigan is saying is that since there is a population control program in China, which all of us find repugnant, then we should not participate in any alternative population program in China.

This is a list of the 13 programs that the UNFPA pays for in China, population programs. None of them are related to abortions at all. These programs provide an alternative to the Government of China. If the UNFPA and the

United States indirectly pulls out of the population picture in China, then the only program for population left in China will be the one which the gentleman from Michigan and I both feel is very wrong. Provide the Chinese Government with some alternative; do not lock UNFPA out. If you do, they are stuck only with the program which both of us feel strongly is a bad one.

Mr. SILJANDER. Reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I want to say that this amendment is well meaning but it does just restate current policy, it does not break any new ground.

The gentleman just said, for instance, that the U.N. family planning population funds are alternatives.

Well, that is not the case. In China today—so few Members I think really realize this—going back to 1979, began a one-child-per-family program. In other words, if you have two children, that child will then be aborted, and they have coerced and forced abortions to implement that.

Well, our census data that we provide and the IBM machinery, and the like, that we send to China through the United Nations help them get a better bead on whether or not they are living up to their quotas. As I did not point out in my opening comments but I will include it in the RECORD, they have very sophisticated ways of targeting certain provinces in China to figure out whether or not they are indeed reaching their quotas.

So it is not an alternative. It is part and parcel of their program. They need the technology that IBM can provide and the moneys that will come from the United Nations to again further implement this very repressive program.

So we are trying to get a handle on that and to disassociate ourselves from this kind of program.

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

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

Mr. HYDE. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, as I look at this amendment I do not find it objectionable because as I read it there can really be no funds to carry out population planning programs in the People's Republic of China. No funds. That is direct.

Moreover, there can be no contributions to any international organization—and that is the UNFPA—or any private or voluntary organization which carries out any population planning program in the People's Republic

of China if such program includes forced or coerced abortion.

Now, the gentleman wants to know how do we know, how do we enforce that? I would suggest to the gentleman that the Director of AID will cooperate by instituting an investigation and will report.

Now, the law does not say that. But I have those assurances from him on the telephone.

I think this amendment is pretty tight and pretty clear. No direct money for population planning in the People's Republic of China. That is subparagraph (i). And then the next one refers to international organizations or private voluntary organizations that carry out any planning program in the People's Republic of China if such program includes forced or coerced abortion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SILJANDER) has expired.

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

Mr. HYDE. I think it is a compromise. I think it is going to effectuate what the gentleman wants. And I do not think it is a restatement of current law. It focuses in on the People's Republic of China which has this coerced abortion and it focuses not only on direct funds from the United States but through international and voluntary organizations.

Mr. SILJANDER. If I could reclaim my time, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee, the author of the substitute, a question. I would agree with the gentleman from Illinois if we could get on the record that in subsection (ii) the term "program" means a program of the People's Republic of China as opposed to the program, the specific program, of population control.

Mr. FASCELL. If the gentleman will yield, it means the programs carried out by the organizations.

Mr. SILJANDER. So what the gentleman from Illinois is saying would not be accurate.

Mr. FASCELL. No; he was accurate.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. The gentleman from Illinois is absolutely accurate.

Mr. FASCELL. Absolutely accurate.

Mr. SILJANDER. He is accurate in suggesting that this amendment would cut off any population control moneys to the People's Republic of China?

Mr. KOSTMAYER. If the gentleman will yield to me, this amendment will cut off any money, direct or indirect, to the People's Republic of China which is used for coercive or forced abortions.

Mr. SILJANDER. In programs that we spend for coerced abortions. But it would not include cutting off funds for a country that in fact continues to

promote as part of their population control program coerced abortions.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. To the extent that those programs are funded not only by American dollars but to the extent that they are funded by the dollars of other countries who also contribute to UNFPA they would be cut off. So we are not speaking only for American tax dollars; we are speaking for every country that contributes to UNFPA. We will not permit \$1, American or other, to be used for forced or compulsory abortions.

And I would say, in closing, Mr. Chairman, that I urge Members to vote for the Fasel-Hyde amendment to halt the policy of coercive and compulsory abortions in China.

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Smith amendment to H.R. 5119.

There are incontrovertible reports that forced sterilizations and forced abortions are the rule, rather than the exception, in some sovereign nations.

As one who has always opposed abortion, I find the entire process repugnant. The fact that our tax dollars are assisting in it is unconscionable.

And I cannot fathom the arrogance of those who would flout the law that prohibits the use of our foreign aid funds for any program of involuntary sterilization or for abortions.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title III? If not, the Clerk will designate title IV.

The text of title IV is as follows:

TITLE IV—ECONOMIC POLICY INITIATIVE FOR AFRICA

ECONOMIC POLICY INITIATIVE FOR AFRICA

SEC. 401. Part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding after chapter 3 the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 4—ECONOMIC POLICY INITIATIVE FOR AFRICA

"SEC. 401. POLICY AND GENERAL AUTHORITY.—(a) The Congress finds that the problems of inadequate growth rates in food production and agriculture exports and of widespread poverty, hunger, illiteracy, and disease in sub-Saharan African countries threaten the region's economic stability. In recognition that sustained economic growth and development of sub-Saharan African countries continues to be important to the economic and security interests of the United States and that the economic policy framework of such countries is critical to maintain financial stability and to accel-

ate growth, the President is authorized to furnish assistance, on such terms and conditions as he may determine, in order to promote policy reforms in sub-Saharan Africa oriented toward growth-with-equity. Assistance provided under this chapter shall be used to assist countries that are pursuing or have shown a willingness to pursue policy reform in such key sectors as food and agriculture, education, health and family planning, as well as to strengthen institutional and skilled manpower capacities to implement such reforms.

"(b) Agreements providing for the use of funds under this chapter to finance imports by countries in sub-Saharan Africa under sector programs shall require that those imports be used to meet long-term development needs in those countries in accordance with the following criteria:

"(1) Emphasis shall be placed on imports for agricultural activities which will expand agricultural production, particularly activities which expand production for export or to reduce reliance on imported agricultural products.

"(2) Emphasis shall also be placed on a distribution of imports having a broad development impact in terms of economic sectors and geographic regions.

"(3) Foreign currencies generated by the sale of such imports by the government of the country shall be deposited in a special account established by that government and, except as provided in paragraph (4), shall be available only for use in accordance with the agreement for economic development activities which are consistent with the policy directions of section 102 of this Act and which are the types of activities for which assistance may be provided under section 103 through 106 of this Act.

"(4) The agreement shall require that the government of the country make available to the United States Government such portion of the amount deposited in the special account as may be determined by the President to be necessary for requirements of the United States Government.

"SEC. 402. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the President for the purposes of this chapter, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, \$75,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985, which are authorized to remain available until expended.

"SEC. 403. CONSULTATION WITH CONGRESS.—The administrator of the agency primarily responsible for administering this part shall consult with, and shall take under serious advisement the views of, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate regarding the specific countries to receive assistance under this chapter. Such consultation shall include presentation of a list of potential recipient countries and supporting economic analyses by October 1, 1984, or 30 days after the enactment of this chapter, whichever is later. Should additional countries subsequently become potential recipients of such assistance, the administrator shall promptly begin the consultation process with the committees."

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title IV? If not, the Clerk will designate title V.

The text of title V is as follows:

TITLE V—OTHER ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

AMERICAN SCHOOLS AND HOSPITALS ABROAD

SEC. 501. Section 214(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "\$20,000,000 for the fiscal year 1982 and \$20,000,000 for the fiscal year 1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$30,000,000 for fiscal year 1985".

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS

SEC. 502. (a) Section 302(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows:

"(a)(1) There are authorized to be appropriated to the President \$279,114,000 for the fiscal year 1985 for grants to carry out the purposes of this chapter, in addition to funds available under other Acts for such purposes. Of this amount—

"(A) \$170,000,000 shall be for the United Nations Development Program;

"(B) \$53,500,000 shall be for the United Nations Children's Fund;

"(C) \$20,500,000 shall be for the International Atomic Energy Agency;

"(D) \$15,500,000 shall be for Organization of American States development assistance programs;

"(E) \$10,000,000 shall be for the United Nations Environment Program;

"(F) \$2,000,000 shall be for the World Meteorological Organization;

"(G) \$2,000,000 shall be for the United Nations Capital Development Fund;

"(H) \$1,000,000 shall be for the United Nations Education and Training Program for Southern Africa;

"(I) \$500,000 shall be for the United Nations Voluntary Fund for the Decade for Women;

"(J) \$200,000 shall be for the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species;

"(K) \$2,000,000 shall be for the World Food Program;

"(L) \$500,000 shall be for the United Nations Institute for Namibia;

"(M) \$343,000 shall be for the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa;

"(N) \$422,000 shall be for the United Nations Institute for Training and Research, except that these funds may be obligated only if, and only to the extent that, the Secretary of State determines (and so certifies to the Congress) that sufficient progress is being made toward effective financial management of that organization;

"(O) \$449,000 shall be for the United Nations Fellowship Program;

"(P) \$100,000 shall be for the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture; and

"(Q) \$100,000 shall be for the United Nations Industrial Development Organization."

(b)(1) In addition to amounts otherwise authorized for the fiscal year 1984 to carry out chapter 3 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, there is authorized to be appropriated \$1,636,000 for the fiscal year 1984 to carry out such chapter, for payment to the International Atomic Energy Agency.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

PALESTINE LIBERATION ORGANIZATION

SEC. 503. Chapter 3 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 307. PALESTINE LIBERATION ORGANIZATION.—(a) Funds authorized to be appropriated by this chapter may not be made avail-

able for the United States proportionate share for programs for the Palestine Liberation Organization or for projects whose primary purpose is to provide benefits to the Palestine Liberation Organization or entities associated with it.

"(b) The Secretary of State shall review, at least annually, the budgets and accounts of all international organizations receiving payments of any such funds and shall report to the appropriate committees of the Congress the amounts of funds expended by each such organization for the purposes described in subsection (a) and the amount contributed by the United States to each such organization."

INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL

SEC. 504. Section 482(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "\$37,700,000 for the fiscal year 1982 and \$37,700,000 for the fiscal year 1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$50,217,000 for the fiscal year 1985".

REPORTS ON INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL PROGRAM

SEC. 505. Section 481(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows:

"(b)(1) Not later than forty-five days after the end of each calendar quarter, the President shall transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, a report on the programming and obligation, on a calendar quarter basis, of funds under this chapter prior to the end of that quarter. The last such report for each fiscal year shall include the aggregate of obligations and expenditures made, and the types and quantity of equipment provided, on a calendar quarter basis, prior to the end of that fiscal year—

"(A) to carry out the purposes of this chapter with respect to each country and each international organization receiving assistance under this chapter, including the cost of United States personnel engaged in carrying out such purposes in each such country and with each such international organization;

"(B) to carry out each program conducted under this chapter in each country and by each international organization, including the cost of United States personnel engaged in carrying out each such program; and

"(C) for administrative support services within the United States to carry out the purposes of this chapter, including the cost of United States personnel engaged in carrying out such purposes in the United States.

"(2) Not later than August 1 of each year, the President shall transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, a complete and detailed mid-year report on the activities and operations carried out under this chapter prior to such date. Such mid-year report shall include, but shall not be limited to, the status of each agreement concluded prior to such date with other countries to carry out the purposes of this chapter."

CUBAN DRUG TRAFFICKING

SEC. 506. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) the subject of the flow, use, and control of narcotic and psychotropic substances is a matter of great international importance;

(2) the problem of drug abuse and drug trafficking continues to worsen throughout most parts of the world;

(3) the concerns of the governments of many countries have become manifest in

several bilateral and multilateral narcotics control projects;

(4) United Nations agencies monitor and apply controls on the flow and use of drugs and coordinate multilateral efforts to control production, trafficking, and abuse of drugs;

(5) the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control funds narcotics projects throughout the world and has been a vehicle since 1971 for multilateral implementation of narcotics control and reduction programs;

(6) the International Narcotics Control Board is charged with monitoring compliance with the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, and the Convention on Psychotropic Substances, and Cuba is a party to both Conventions;

(7) the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs is responsible for formulating policies, coordinating activities, supervising the implementation of international conventions, and making recommendations to governments for international drug control;

(8) the promotion of drug abuse and participation in drug trafficking is universally considered egregious criminal behavior wherever it occurs, whether it occurs locally, nationally, or internationally;

(9) a Federal grand jury of the United States has indicted four prominent Cuban officials on charges of conspiring to smuggle drugs into the United States;

(10) United States Government officials have testified at several congressional hearings that the Government of Cuba is facilitating the flow of illicit drugs into the United States in order to obtain hard currency, support guerrilla/terrorist activities, and undermine United States society; and

(11) such conduct on the part of the Government of Cuba is injurious to the world community and is counter to the general principle of international law that no country has the right to use or permit the use of its territory in such a manner as to injure another country or persons therein.

(b) It is the sense of the Congress that the President should—

(1) acting through the Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations, take such steps as may be necessary to place the question of the involvement by the Government of Cuba in illicit drug trafficking on the agenda of the United Nations;

(2) acting through the Representative of the United States to the Organization of American States, request the Organization of American States to consider this question as soon as possible; and

(3) request other appropriate international organizations and international forums to consider this question.

(c) The President shall report to the Congress on the actions taken pursuant to this section.

COOPERATION WITH THE BAHAMIAN ROYAL COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

SEC. 507. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) the Commonwealth of the Bahamas is a major transshipment point for marihuana, cocaine, and other dangerous drugs entering the United States;

(2) there have been numerous allegations concerning narcotics-related corruption in the Bahamas;

(3) Bahamian government and political party officials have been convicted for narcotics violations in the United States;

(4) the Government of the Bahamas has appointed a Royal Commission of Inquiry to investigate these allegations;

(5) the Royal Commission of Inquiry has requested the assistance of various agencies of the United States Government in investigating these allegations; and

(6) the facilitation by any country of illicit narcotics entering the United States is a threat to the national security of the United States.

(b) The President shall direct the appropriate executive branch agencies to cooperate with the requests for assistance from the Royal Commission of Inquiry of the Bahamas to the maximum extent possible and consistent with the principles of criminal justice and the integrity of the criminal investigative and prosecutive process.

(c) The President shall report to the Congress on actions taken pursuant to this section.

(d) The Secretary of State shall inform the Royal Commission of Inquiry of the Bahamas of the provisions of this section.

INTERNATIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE

SEC. 508. Section 492(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "\$27,000,000 for the fiscal year 1982 and \$27,000,000 for the fiscal year 1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$25,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985".

ASSISTANCE FOR REFUGEES AND DISPLACED PERSONS IN AFRICA

SEC. 509. Section 495F(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) In addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes, not less than \$15,000,000 of the funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1985 to carry out part I of this Act shall be used under the authority of this section to provide resettlement services and facilities for refugees and displaced persons in Africa."

ANTI-TERRORISM ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

SEC. 510. Section 575 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "\$5,000,000 for the fiscal year 1984" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$5,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985".

TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

SEC. 511. Section 661(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by amending the first sentence to read as follows: "There are authorized to be appropriated to the President for purposes of this section, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, \$21,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985."

OPERATING EXPENSES

SEC. 512. Section 667(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "\$335,600,000 for the fiscal year 1982 and \$335,600,000 for the fiscal year 1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$398,097,000 for the fiscal year 1985".

□ 1850

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WEISS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Weiss: Page 44, line 14, after the semicolon, insert "and"; line 20, strike out "; and" and insert in lieu thereof a period; and strike out line 21 and all that follows through line 2 on page 45.

Mr. WEISS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment addresses itself to a provision of this legislation which addresses drug trafficking as it relates to Cuba. The provision in the bill in its entirety runs from the top of page 43 at line 4, through all of page 44 and through page 45, line 18.

All that my amendment seeks to do is to delete 5 or 6 lines which make a finding of fact that drug trafficking has been engaged in by the Government of Cuba, and is injurious to the world community and is counter to the general principles of international law.

It leaves intact all the background material of testimony from our Federal officials; it leaves intact the reference of the matter to the United Nations for further inquiry or investigation. But it puts us in a position, that is the House of Representatives, of not finding guilt without the facts having been explored.

The background to this, Mr. Chairman, is that there apparently were a number of present or former Cuban officials who were indicted in absentia by the Federal attorney in Florida. On the basis of that indictment, the conclusion has been drawn not only that those officials are guilty, even though indictments, as we know, are simply charges or accusations, against people still presumed to be innocent, but also as far as this legislation is concerned, through them, assumes the guilt of the Government of Cuba.

Now it seems to me that as concerned as we all might want to be, and I think we have the right to be, with drug trafficking from all quarters and all corners of the Earth, we ought not to be undermining and ignoring the very basis of our legal system, and certainly not doing it in what appears to me to be a misguided zeal, anti-Cuban, anti-Communist, anti-whatever kind of paranoia is being engaged in here.

The fact is, that the U.S. attorney who secured the indictments has himself been very clear in stating that as far as he is concerned on the basis of the evidence that he marshaled for the conspiracy trials of other people, and the securing of these indictments, he is not able to conclude that the Government of Cuba was involved and was guilty of these actions.

The FBI Director, Mr. Webster, when he was asked to comment on the indictments and associated charges that the Government of Cuba was itself involved said, in essence, and I am paraphrasing, "Be very, very careful about drawing that kind of conclusion, because all of these charges come from one source."

That source is tainted, because the people who gave that testimony were themselves coconspirators who have something very definite to gain by in fact saying, "It's not us, it's the Government of Cuba that is doing it."

Now, especially when you take into context the statements of the Drug Enforcement Agency itself that drug trafficking which may be engaged in by Cuba is a very tiny portion of the kind of trafficking of narcotics which ends up in the United States of America, I think we ought to be very, very careful.

We know, for example, that 75 percent of all the cocaine that reaches this country comes from Bolivia. We know that a great deal of the cocaine comes in from Colombia. Heroin and hashish and marihuana come in from countries with which we have all kinds of assistance and trade programs and there has been great resistance on the part of this and prior administrations to cut off any of those programs.

So what do we do? For political reasons and political purposes we decide to ignore all of those other nations and the bulk of the narcotics coming into this country, and we think we have got a nice and neat and clean answer, we will blame it on Fidel Castro and the Cubans. I do not think that that makes us very noble in anybody's eyes, even in our own. I would think that it is one thing to provide the background to say the United Nation ought to be investigating this matter, but for us to make a finding of guilt against a government simply because we think that that is politically convenient, I think is dead wrong.

I urge that my amendment which seeks to strike that four or five lines which find guilt, on the part of the Government of Cuba is adopted.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from New York and while I understand, as an attorney, the gentleman's problem in terms of having what he claims to be a prejudgment on the part of this bill by virtue of having the words "Government of Cuba" in line 21, paragraph 11, on page 44 of the bill, let me tell you why in fact it is not such a prejudgment, and why, even though this is not an indictment, even though this is not a document which is going to be used in a court of law, it is still appropriate to have this type of language.

First, while the gentleman from New York talks about the FBI Director advising not to rely on the sole source of this information because the source is tainted, the reality is that the FBI Director was talking about something other than all the specifics we have about Cuba.

The reality is that Cuba has engaged over the last number of years in a pre-planned, specific course of conduct aiding and abetting those who are smuggling out of South America large quantities of drugs. This information does not come solely from smugglers who have been arrested and who are trying to weasel out of any prosecution by turning and giving evidence.

This comes from the intelligence-gathering network of the U.S. Government, and let me tell you what it is.

First, we know from the Drug Interdiction Task Force called the South Florida Task Force, which is now one of the 12 NNBIS's, that is National Narcotics Border Interdiction System Task Forces, that their radar trackings have indicated time and again, and I and others on this committee, and this committee has had a special task force set up, chaired by the gentleman from Ohio, cochaired by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN), set up purposely to take this testimony, we have seen the tracking charts showing time and again flights emanating out of South America, landing in Cuba, and the re-flying from Cuba toward the United States or the Bahamas where many of them either land or drop their cargoes which are then picked up by small speed boats and brought into the United States.

In addition to these radar trackings, we have the reports of the air interdictions, Customs pilots themselves, the pilots, who, on occasion, chase these planes back from the areas where they have made the drops after contact is made. And what happens when the planes get toward Cuba, the most direct route back to South America? They fly directly across Cuban airspace without any planes scrambling to meet them.

□ 1900

But as soon as our planes come even close to the air space of Cuba, we know for a fact that their air force has scrambled and come up to intercept our planes, which then turn away to the south and the east.

In addition, we have confiscated on two occasions aircraft and marine vessels which contain specific information called drop charts in case of airplanes, and water passage charts in the case of the seagoing vessels, which have specific routes marked off over, in and around Cuba. Nobody uses a drop chart for Cuba in an airplane unless they are going to land or fly over Cuba. An analysis of the gasoline in the tanks of the airplane that was confiscated, after it was caught by the Drug Enforcement Administration, shows it was gasoline obtainable no other place that we know of in this Western Hemisphere except Cuba. The petroleum has a different octane and lead content than any other area of the South American or Caribbean area, including Jamaica, where other flights may emanate.

We do not get our information solely from tainted sources. We get it from those people who are in the drug fight today. Let me say, in addition, we have sources that are, in fact, drug connected. There are large numbers of smug-

glers who have been arrested. All of their testimony is not tainted. Many of them have had little or nothing to do with that South American-Cuban connection, who have verified on their own that this is happening. They have related other incidents which, taken together with testimony given by people arrested or detained in the Cuban connection, have, in fact, made the same statements and verified those statements made by those people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SMITH) has expired.

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

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Taken together, this evidence has convinced, I believe, the majority of members on the special task force set up by the chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL), that there is in fact a very strong connection between drug smugglers and Cuba.

In addition, taken together, all this evidence leads us to believe that this is a preplanned, specific kind of action on the part of Cuba, used to finance their particular brand of sales of arms through drug merchants in South America and in Central America.

This is not something that we are paranoid about, to use the word of the gentleman from New York. We are not paranoid at all. I think we made painstaking efforts and made great strides in determining, through the intelligence-gathering network of the military and civilian forces in this country, to document and detail the evidence which is now almost irrefutable that the Cubans are involved in drug trafficking for very simple reasons: It profits them monetarily and politically to help the drug smugglers from South America both coming to and returning from the United States.

Paranoia has absolutely nothing to do with this. We have no connection with the Cubans. We do not give them aid. We do not have an Embassy. We do not have any way to leverage them, talk to them, or ultimately actually try to convince them that they are wrong. With other countries, as the gentleman from New York, Mr. WEISS, has pointed out, we have the ability to leverage them because many of them receive some form of foreign assistance and we can cut that off or, as the gentleman from New York, Mr. GILMAN, and the gentleman from New York, Mr. RANGEL, have done, tie it to a program of cooperation of crop substitution of growing drugs. If they do not, we reduce the aid. We do not have that with Cuba.

What this bill asks to be done is that Cuba be brought before the appropriate fora in the United Nations and all other forums where we have some input and ask that they be brought to

task for what they have done. We feel this is the appropriate thing to do.

The last thing we are talking about here is paranoia or a fear of the Cubans because they are Communists. We are talking about them not only operating politically against the best interests of this country, but remember one thing: The Cubans are involved in drug trafficking. They are involved in something which is an insidious disease which affects the young people of this country more so than the political problem of communism. The first level that they are reaching is our children. We have the evidence that Cuba is involved. We do not intend to let that evidence go unheeded or unheard by the world community.

I would urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment. There is nothing wrong with naming Cuba in the bill based on the evidence we have.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SMITH) has again expired.

(On request of Mr. WEISS and by unanimous consent, Mr. SMITH of Florida was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of Florida. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEISS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman agree with me that the total amount of drug trafficking coming in from Cuba is, in fact, a very miniscule portion of the overall amount of drug trafficking coming in from international sources?

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Let me make a distinction, and I will answer the question.

The total amount of drug trafficking that stops in Cuba and then reemanates is a small portion. However, now, today, that portion which is coming directly from South America and overflying Cuba directly, which requires their knowledge and consent, is a greater portion than it was in years past.

Mr. WEISS. But still a small portion; yes?

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Of course a small portion of what is considered to be a \$90 billion business in this country this year.

Mr. WEISS. Right. And would the gentleman agree that, in fact, there are a great many other countries in not only South America, but certainly in Latin America and in Asia, which are friends of ours and which trade with us and which receive the benefits of our economic involvement, who also continue to pollute our youth and our Nation generally through narcotics?

Mr. SMITH of Florida. My answer to the gentleman is that there are coun-

tries with whom we have relations which, in fact, are growing crops which ultimately wind up as illicit substances in the United States. But again, let me point out that we have already adopted some laws relating to foreign assistance to those countries, and some ability to ultimately impact on their ability to grow the drugs by crop substitution, the AID program. We do not have that with Cuba.

Mr. WEISS. Because I do not want to waste the committee's time to any great extent, I have only one further question left for the gentleman.

Would it not be more seemly if, instead of not only finding the background but also finding a guilty behavior before we refer it to the United Nations, and that, in fact, we simply refer it to the United Nations for their determination of guilt?

Mr. SMITH of Florida. The use of the word "seemly" is interesting in the context of Cuba. Let me just say that I would believe that when we lay our case before any world body, we should have made a determination of whether we believe that case is accurate, appropriate, and we have come to a conclusion that what we are laying before them is, in fact, happening.

Mr. WEISS. Well, the gentleman understands that an indictment is not the same as proof of guilt.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I will reclaim my time and answer the question in that regard.

We have determined, a number of us on this committee, and the committee has voted, I believe, to ratify that decision that in fact this does exist and the committee would like to lay this before the appropriate fora in the world organizations, and we have made a decision that they are involved. I think that is a very appropriate decision to have made.

Mr. WEISS. I hope the gentleman does not get to be in charge of our criminal system in this country.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would begin by saying that I, in fact, disagree with the gentleman's assessment that the amount of drug trafficking coming through Cuba or the amount of drug trafficking in overflights through Cuba is miniscule. It is not miniscule. It is a significant amount of drug trafficking and, in the entire scope of drug trafficking, illicit narcotics trafficking to this country, it may not represent a major portion, it may not represent a large percentage, but the amount that it does represent is very, very significant, and is certainly significant to those young people, to those people in our American communities, who become addicted to that kind of narcotics that is coming through those

channels. So it is a very serious matter.

Earlier this year, the Task Force on International Narcotics Control—which I have the honor to chair—held a hearing on the subject of Cuban Government involvement in drug trafficking. It was the latest in a series of hearings held both in the House and in the other body on this subject. Time after time, United States Government officials have testified that the Cuban Government is involved in facilitating the flow of drugs into the United States.

These are not allegations. These are facts. Four Cuban officials—including a vice admiral of the Cuban Navy, a former Cuban Ambassador to Colombia, a former Minister Counsel of the Cuban Embassy in Colombia, and a senior official of the Cuban Intelligence Service—have been indicted in Miami for conspiring to smuggle drugs into the United States. These men are not a handful of corrupt customs agents—they are part of Castro's ruling circle. Two of them are members of the Communist Party's Central Committee. In a country the size of Cuba, with the tightly knit power structure that marks Castro's regime, it is inconceivable that they could have carried out these activities without the full advice and consent of Fidel Castro.

I might add that although these four men have not been convicted in a court of law, their eight coconspirators who were apprehended in Miami have all been convicted.

Since that trial, the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Agency, Mr. Bud Mullen, has provided further evidence that the Cuban Government has been helping drug runners. DEA evidence shows that the Cuban Government still permits drug traffickers to use the island as a transit point for drug shipments to the United States. When asked whether he felt the Government of Cuba was participating in the drug trade as a matter of Government policy, Mr. Mullen answered very clearly: "Yes. I do not equivocate on that answer. My answer is yes."

Section 506 of the committee print—which passed the full Foreign Affairs Committee by a near unanimous vote—simply reflects the recommendation that the United States should raise the issue of Cuban involvement in drug trafficking in the United Nations, the Organization of American States, and other appropriate international forums. We do not call for investigations by these bodies; we do not call for sanctions against Cuba. We simply seek to call these activities by the Cuban Government to the attention of the rest of the world community.

Finally, I must also object to the gentleman's contention that our international narcotics program is ignoring

the real drug problems by unfairly singling out Cuba. Over \$50 million in this bill are dedicated to international narcotics control. Most of this money will fund crop eradication and substitution programs that attack the drug problem at its source—the coca, poppy, and marijuana fields of Latin America, the Golden Triangle, and the Golden Crescent. We recognize that our efforts to control narcotics trafficking must begin at the source, and we focus our efforts on drug-producing countries. But we also know that countries which allow illegal narcotics to freely pass through their borders pose an added threat to our society.

Mr. Chairman, the U.S. Government must show the world that we attach a high priority to international narcotics control, and that we expect more effective international cooperation to help prevent the cultivation and traffic in narcotics. The narcotics control portion of this bill demonstrates that commitment.

I urge all of my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

□ 1910

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I regret that the gentleman's amendment in effect guts that provision of the bill reported by our committee which attempts to shed needed visibility on the growing and detectable involvement of the Cuban Government in illicit drug trafficking.

As my colleagues on the committee will recall, the gentleman from New York offered a similar measure during our committee markup. His amendment at that time was defeated.

The gentleman from New York believes that due to a lack of evidence it is inappropriate to raise this issue at the United Nations of the involvement by the Government of Cuba in illicit drug trafficking.

Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman's arguments, I would like to share with my colleagues several significant pieces of information on this issue that have come to our attention.

The first bit of information comes from our own DEA Director, Mr. Mullin. As part of our international task force on narcotics testimony that was cited in our markup of the foreign aid bill in the Committee on Foreign Affairs on February 28 and 29, I asked the gentleman if he was familiar with the testimony by Mr. Mullin in response to a question by our distinguished subcommittee chairman, Mr. FEIGHAN.

Mr. FEIGHAN questioned:

Is it your opinion that the Cuban government, through significant individuals in the government of Cuba, as a matter of policy, is participating in the narcotics trafficking

of cocaine and marihuana in the United States?

Mr. Mullin, the Director of our Drug Enforcement Agency, responded:

Yes, I do not equivocate on that answer. My answer is yes.

The second bit of information comes from a Wall Street Journal article entitled "Havana Haven, Smugglers of Drugs from Colombia to U.S. Are Protected by Cuba." It is dated April 30, 1984. This article is by Stanley Penn and Edward Pound.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 30, 1984]

HAVANA HAVEN—SMUGGLERS OF DRUGS FROM COLOMBIA TO THE UNITED STATES ARE PROTECTED BY CUBA

(By Stanley Penn and Edward T. Pound)

These selected traffickers have been permitted to use Cuban waters as a haven from the U.S. Coast Guard while transshipping narcotics to the U.S. from Colombia.

In return, Cuba gets scarce hard currency—as much as \$500,000 per shipment, by some estimates. It uses some of this money to buy arms that are secretly ferried by drug smugglers to guerrillas in Latin America.

This arrangement, said to be sanctioned by Fidel Castro himself, has been detailed by U.S. drug investigators and intelligence specialists, as well as by drug runners who have given first-hand testimony of their activities to lawmen in the U.S. and Mexico.

OFFICIAL CONCERN

"There's evidence of a considerable amount of drug trafficking that transits through Cuba by water and air," says Frank V. Monastero, assistant administrator of the Federal Drug Enforcement Administration. Noting that the smugglers sometimes use Cuban government facilities, Mr. Monastero adds: "If the Cuban government wanted to cease that activity, they could put a stop to it."

Drug agents don't think Cuba operates its own drug-smuggling network. Rather, they say Cuba permits certain traffickers safe passage and allows large "mother ships" laden with drugs from Colombia to lay over and refuel in Cuba. This allows the mother ships to transfer their illicit cargo to smaller, faster, boats for delivery to Florida.

The Cuban government's ties to drug smuggling were discussed two years ago during hearings by a Senate subcommittee headed by Sen. Jeremiah A. Denton of Alabama. Federal lawmen gave Senate panels additional information last year and in closed session last month.

A criminal trial last year in Miami provided still more evidence. Four Cuban government officials were among those charged with conspiring to permit Cuba to be used as a loading station for U.S. bound drug vessels during 1980 and 1981. Six people were convicted or pleaded guilty. The Cuban officials, including a former Cuban ambassador to Colombia and a vice admiral who belonged to the Cuban Communist Party's central committee, failed to appear at the trial and are considered fugitives, according to the U.S. Justice Department.

Evidence presented at the trial has convinced Tom Boyatt, a former U.S. ambassador to Colombia, of the Cuban government's complicity. "When you have a Cuban ambassador and a Cuban admiral involved" he

says, "you don't need further evidence that it's a matter of national policy."

Indicted with the Cuban officials was Jaime Guillot-Lara, a 38-year-old Colombian charged with using Cuban facilities to help transport large quantities of marijuana and Quaalude tablets into the U.S. The U.S. government has never apprehended Mr. Guillot-Lara, but in November 1981, he was imprisoned in Mexico for using false identity papers.

Mr. Guillot-Lara admitted shipping arms to Colombia's Cuban-backed M-19 terrorist group, according to a State Department official reporting to a Senate subcommittee. Mr. Guillot-Lara said that funds for the arms shipments were furnished by Cuban embassies in Mexico and Colombia. He was freed by Mexico in 1982, but the Mexican government refused a U.S. request for his extradition. His current whereabouts aren't known.

Mr. Guillot-Lara apparently entered the drug business in 1976. By the U.S. government's estimate, his 15-member gang shipped some 2.5 million pounds of marijuana, 80 pounds of cocaine and 25 million Quaaludes to the U.S. between 1977 and 1981.

THE M-19 CONNECTION

In 1980, Mr. Guillot-Lara allegedly arranged to receive Cuban assistance with those shipments and agreed to transport arms to M-19. Mr. Guillot-Lara was known to M-19 through his longtime acquaintance with Jaime Bateman, a Colombian who was an M-19 leader until his death in a plane crash in 1982.

Mr. Guillot-Lara is known to have purchased Uzi submachine guns, pistols and AR-15 rifles from a Miami arms dealer. According to State Department reports, the arms he purchased typically were ferried to Colombia, where his boat picked up drugs for delivery to the U.S.

In October 1981, for example, Mr. Guillot-Lara's boat, *Zar De Honduras*, received arms from a ship off the coast of Panama. The arms—550 FAL rifles worth at least \$500 apiece and 90,000 cartridges—were delivered to a port on Colombia's northeast coast and taken to a clandestine airport nearby. After 5,000 pounds of marijuana bound for the U.S. were stowed on board the ship, the weapons were flown to an M-19 base in Caqueta province, a large cocaine-producing area in southern Colombia.

M-19 and other Colombian insurgents profit from narcotics by taxing drug growers and by guarding traffickers' airstrips and cocaine-processing laboratories. Colombia's defense minister, Gustavo Matamoros, recently attacked the "alliance" between drug runners and guerrillas. He claimed that planes leave Colombia with cocaine and return with weapons originating in Cuba.

Colombia broke ties with Cuba in 1981, following the capture of some M-19 terrorists who admitted they had been trained and outfitted in Cuba. Just last month, 100 M-19 insurgents, armed with submachine guns and hand grenades, battled a Colombian army garrison in Florencia, the capital of Caqueta province. The army drove off the guerrillas, but not before they had seized the local jail and freed 125 prisoners.

Cuba stoutly denies involvement with drug smugglers. "We have been trying to help in control of the drug traffic," says a Cuban government press officer in Washington. "Every plane, every ship or yacht which we catch in our waters or in our air space, we have detained." Terming the charges that Cuba helps drug smugglers

"unfounded," he says that at any given time, 15 to 30 American traffickers are in Cuban jails. "We have been freeing some of them at the request of some [U.S.] congressmen as a goodwill gesture," he adds.

By denying its ties to dope runners, diplomats say, Cuba hopes to avoid antagonizing other Hispanic governments. "The Cubans are interested in expanding regular diplomatic relations with Latin America," a U.S. State Department official says, "and they'd like to present at least a plausible denial that they're involved in subverting these governments."

A MIAMI SUSPECT

Jose Alvero-Cruz, a Miami beauty parlor operator, is among those suspected of using Cuba to smuggle drugs to the U.S. According to a secret 1982 Drug Enforcement Administration report, an informant disclosed that Mr. Alvero-Cruz met with Fidel Castro, and during the meeting they arranged for a fishing vessel, the *Santa Marta*, to use a secluded harbor on Cuba's southern coast.

"The vessel would contain 50 tons of marijuana and a large quantity of cocaine," the report stated. "Arrangements were made from Cuba to have the *Santa Marta* leave port and meet the offload boats at sea."

Mr. Alvero-Cruz, who took part in the abortive, U.S.-sponsored Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba in 1961, recently began a 10-year prison sentence for federal income-tax evasion. The wealthy 44-year-old had "large" bank deposits in Spain, the Justice Department has said. Mr. Alvero-Cruz's attorney says his client "hates Castro" and hasn't been involved with Cuba in drug smuggling.

Another suspected smuggler with Cuban ties is Osiris Santis. According to the drug agency report, Mr. Santis told an informant that he had received "large quantities" of marijuana and cocaine from "high Cuban government officials." The drugs assertedly came from Colombia's M-19 guerrillas. The informant said he saw "automatic weapons, grenades and explosives of apparent Russian manufacture," in Cuban-born Mr. Santis's possession.

In 1982, Mr. Santis pleaded guilty in Miami's Dade County circuit court to charges of possession of cocaine and a concealed weapon. He received probation. His attorney says that the 40-year-old Mr. Santis denies any wrongdoing in connection with Cuba.

Fresh information about M-19's links to the drug trade may surface as a result of the federal indictment of Harold J. Rosenthal and 29 others in Atlanta last January.

Mr. Rosenthal fled to Colombia after escaping in 1981 from a Memphis prison, where he had been serving time for a drug conviction. He was captured by Colombian authorities last September and returned to the U.S., where he was charged with operating a ring that had smuggled five tons of cocaine into the U.S. since June 1982. "He was sharing his profits with M-19," says an investigator familiar with the case. "In turn, the M-19 allowed him to conduct his business." Mr. Rosenthal has denied any wrongdoing.

Back in 1979, when Cuba was considering aiding drug smugglers, one high-level Cuban official branded the plan "barbarous," according to a Central Intelligence Agency report. But according to the CIA's informant, the prevailing view was that by assisting the narcotics trade, Cuba would obtain hard currency while hastening the "deterioration" of U.S. society.

The major Colombian narcotics smugglers long had been eager for an understanding with Cuba. Cuba's vigilance in seizing narcotics boats and confiscating drugs had added burdensome costs to their business.

TOP-LEVEL MEETING IN SPAIN

One former smuggler, interviewed in his attorney's office in Miami, recalls that the leaders of five major Colombian drug gangs met in Spain in 1979 "to see what could be done to get Cuba not to kidnap boats anymore." According to the former smuggler, who says he attended some of the meetings, the smugglers determined to seek help from Jaime Guillot-Lara, in the belief that he "had contacts with the Cubans."

Whether Mr. Guillot-Lara aided the traffickers at that time isn't clear. But his Cuban connection was a Colombian lawyer and an admitted drug dealer, Juan (Johnny) Crump, who was a close friend of Cuba's ambassador to Colombia at the time, Fernando Ravelo.

The 43-year-old Mr. Crump, who was briefly jailed in the U.S. after a guilty plea for a drug violation, testified for the government at the Miami drug trial that stemmed from the indictment of the four Cuban officials.

Interviewed in New York, Mr. Crump, currently a U.S. resident, recalls his association with the former Cuban ambassador to Colombia: "We talked to each other almost daily during the last two or three years I was in Colombia," he says. "We called each other compadre." The tall, lanky Mr. Crump displays a snapshot of his youngest daughter, Viviana, with Ambassador Ravelo at the child's baptism in Bogota in November 1980. "Ambassador Ravelo was the godfather," Mr. Crump says.

GATHERING IN BOGOTA

Mr. Crump figured prominently in the negotiations that led to an agreement between the smugglers and Cuba, according to the interview and trial testimony. The deal was struck at a series of meetings held during 1979 and 1980 at the Bogota Hilton Hotel, Mr. Crump says. In attendance were Mr. Crump, Mr. Guillot-Lara, Ambassador Ravelo and Cuba's minister-counselor to Colombia, Gonzalo Bassols. They agreed that Mr. Guillot-Lara's drug boats, flying the Panamanian flag and bearing the code name Viviana, would be given passage through Cuban waters.

Also privy to those meetings was Mr. Guillot-Lara's girlfriend at the time, Carmen Blanco, whose room at the Bogota Hilton adjoined the conference room. Miss Blanco later told the Miami grand jury that indicted the four Cuban officials what she had overheard. At one point she said, Mr. Guillot-Lara told the Cubans that "he had enough money to do any type of business with them."

She also testified that Mr. Bassols, the Cuban minister-counselor, told Mr. Guillot-Lara that the drug scheme had been cleared by a high Cuban official. "Did he mention that man's name?" the prosecutor asked. "Fidel Castro," replied Miss Blanco, who wasn't accused of any wrongdoing.

A self-described former Cuban intelligence agent Mario Estevez, was a government witness at the Miami trial. Mr. Estevez said he served on the crew of the *Lazy Lady*, a fishing boat that sailed from Florida to Cuba in late 1980 to rendezvous with the *Viviana*, a mother ship laden with 10 million Quaaludes from Colombia. Mr. Guillot-Lara, who had purchased the pills for 10 cents each, intended to smuggle them into the U.S.,

where they would fetch 70 cents apiece, according to information at the trial in Miami.

Mr. Estevez testified that when the *Lazy Lady* pulled into port on Cuba's north coast it was greeted by Aldo Santamaria-Cuadrado, a Cuban vice admiral. The vice admiral allegedly said to the crew: "We are going to fill Miami completely with the drugs." Imprisoned for a drug conviction in 1982, Mr. Estevez has since been released.

Since that incident, U.S. drug agents have seized a number of Mr. Guillot-Lara's ships, thus sharply reducing his drug income and hampering his ability to pay Cuba the required fees. He owed the Cuban government an estimated \$8 million as of October 1981, an official of the U.S. drug agency says.

One trawler, seized off North Carolina in 1981, contained 40,000 pounds of marijuana, worth \$16 million wholesale. U.S. Coast Guard officials say it bore the name *Viviana* and flew a Panamanian flag.

Since 1982, the U.S. Coast Guard has intensified its effort to choke off the flow of drugs by placing its cutters along two major trade routes: the Yucatan Straits between Cuba and Mexico and the Windward Passage between Cuba and Haiti. But the Cubans apparently have devised a plan to undercut the U.S. strategy.

According to a Defense Department intelligence report, Cuba has rented a cargo ship for \$24,000 a month from a Panamanian shipowner. The scheme calls for the ship to move narcotics north from Colombia to a small island off Cuba's southern coast. The drugs would then be flown over the Cuban mainland to an island off the northern coast and from there shipped to Florida. This route would neatly avoid the Yucatan Straits and the Windward Passage. Whether the plan has yet been employed isn't known.

Mr. GILMAN. An additional bit of information is a New York Times article dated May 2, 1984, entitled, "Official Ties Cuba to Drug Traffic in United States, Calling the Evidence Clear."

I quote from that article of the May 1 dateline:

WASHINGTON, May 1.—Lawrence S. Eagleburger, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, asserted today that he "would find it very difficult to believe that the Cuban Government itself is not involved" in drug trafficking in the United States.

The evidence, Mr. Eagleburger said, is "really quite clear that there is major Cuban involvement in the drug traffic in this country," including a role by the Castro Government.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

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

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, certainly there is strong evidence that Cuba is heavily involved in the drug traffic. It would be a terrible signal to send to our friends around the world, certainly to those in Colombia, were we to adopt the amendment of the other gentleman from New York. I hope the House will turn it down.

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

Mr. GILMAN. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished friend and colleague for yielding to me.

I am not sure because of the acoustics if I heard correctly, but I believe the gentleman said he opposed my amendment because I sought to remove that portion which would refer this matter to the United Nations and to the Organization of American States.

I want to assure the gentleman that that is not a part of my amendment. That would remain in the legislation. The only part that I am seeking to remove is that which makes a finding of guilt not only against the four individuals who have been indicted, who have been present or former Cuban Government officials, but beyond assuming their guilt jumps from that and concludes that the Government of Cuba is guilty.

All that I am suggesting, out of respect not for Cuba, but out of respect for our own judicial processes and constitutional processes, that if we refer the matter to an international body before they have a chance to determine what happened, make a finding of Cuba's guilt. I think that demeans us and negates our own constitutional processes.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in opposition to the Weiss amendment. The U.S. Federal grand jury has indicted four Cuban officials on charges of conspiring to smuggle drugs into the United States. Also, solid witnesses have testified at several congressional hearings as has been brought out in the last few minutes that the Cuban Government has made a concerted effort to facilitate the flow of illicit drugs into the United States and other countries of the Western Hemisphere.

Cuban agents have testified that this is so. There is strong evidence that Cuba is an active player in drug trafficking in the United States.

Cuba encourages this multibillion drug trade into Florida by offering safe harbors to Colombian drug smugglers for refueling and maintenance and by using boats with radar to help the smugglers avoid detection by the U.S. Coast Guard.

We just passed a resolution for Colombia just a few days ago commending them on the fine job that they are doing. Why should we continue to do something that allows them to fall prey to Cuba?

□ 1920

First of all, Cuba does not care one bit if it is condemned by the whole world. Cuba has a desperate need for

hard, cold cash, and our intelligence has told us that the Cuban Government makes about \$1.5 billion a year either by direct or indirect involvement in drug trafficking.

As brought out by my colleague from Florida, Cuba allows mother ships laden with illegal drugs from Latin America to operate within Cuban waters. They allow these ships to unload into smaller vessels and run ashore into Florida and other parts of the Southeast United States.

In return, the drug dealers are transporting arms and money to aid Cuban guerrilla operations in our hemisphere. All of this—and Castro's overall objective of weakening and undermining American society—are sufficient motivations to prompt the Cuban regime's involvement in international drug traffic.

If we are serious about the war on drugs in the United States, then let us defeat this amendment and defeat all other amendments and legislation of similar types, because Cuba does not care one iota about the United States, and we should care not one iota about Cuba and its drug traffic.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and just want to rise in opposition to the amendment and extend my commendation to the task force. It has done a very good job on the question of narcotics and trafficking.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEISS).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DYMALLY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DYMALLY: Page 48, after line 13, insert the following:

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF BEIRUT

SEC. 513. (a) The Congress finds that the American University of Beirut, which for more than a century has represented the highest American ideals of free inquiry and service to mankind, has been and will continue to be a valuable contributor to understanding and cooperation between the people of the United States and the people of the Middle East and an important asset in enhancing prospects for peace in the area.

(b) Accordingly, up to \$15,000,000 of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under sections 201 and 501 of this Act shall be provided to the American University of Beirut in the fiscal year 1985.

(c) The Secretary of State shall conduct a study of what means would be most appropriate to continue such a level of financial assistance to the American University of Beirut in future years in view of the university's value to United States interests in the area, including the possibility of establishing a trust fund. The results of this study shall be provided to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the

Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate no later than January 1, 1985.

Mr. DYMALLY (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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment to title V of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act is an amendment designed to assist in insuring the long-term viability of the American University of Beirut. For more than 100 years the American University of Beirut and its affiliated hospital have served as bridges to greater understanding between the peoples of the United States and those of the Middle East. The university enjoys the support of all religious and political groups in Lebanon, and continues to have a vital role to serve in that country and in the region as a whole.

The recent tragic events in Lebanon have posed grave threats to the university's survival. We cannot allow the vital work of this institution to cease.

My amendment first puts the Congress on the record in support of the mission and the service carried out by the American University of Beirut for more than a century.

Second, my amendment calls for the authorization of up to \$15 million for the university in fiscal year 1985. The funds would be authorized under the provisions of section 201 of this act, the economic support fund; and section 501 of this act, American schools and hospitals abroad.

Finally, paragraph (c) of my amendment calls upon the Secretary of State to conduct a study of the means most appropriate for longer term U.S. support of the American University of Beirut. I ask in my amendment that the results of this study be submitted to the Congress no later than January 1, 1985.

The authorization of up to \$15 million for the current fiscal year will assist in meeting the short-term crisis confronting the university, while the exploration of longer term measures, called for in the study will allow us to give proper consideration for a more permanent means of U.S. Government support.

I urge your support for this amendment so that we can take a giant step toward insuring that this precious resource, the American University of Beirut, be allowed to continue its work.

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

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

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman has an amendment which we have had an

opportunity to examine. So far as we are concerned on this side, it is a good amendment. We are strong supporters of the American University in Beirut, and I appreciate the gentleman's interest and his determination in seeing to it that our concern and that our interests and our support for that institution is emphasized in the manner in which he sets forth in his amendment.

We are happy to accept the amendment.

Mr. DYMALLY. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. DYMALLY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I, too, rise in support of the amendment.

I would like, however, to ask the gentleman a couple of questions. If a trust fund is to be created for aid to the American University in Beirut, who would administer that fund?

Mr. DYMALLY. I would say to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROOMFIELD) that was the original amendment I had. This one calls for a study by the Secretary of State to recommend to the Congress the most appropriate way to do it.

There were some Members who felt that it might be premature to set up a trust fund now, so we have backed away from that.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. We support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. DYMALLY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. NIELSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DYMALLY. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. NIELSON of Utah. As one who taught at the American University of Beirut, I commend the gentleman for the amendment and I support it.

Mr. DYMALLY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROOMFIELD), the leader of the minority, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL), and the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Middle East and Europe, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON), and the staff for helping me put this amendment together, and I ask for an "aye" vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DYMALLY).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title V?

If not, the Clerk will designate title VI.

The text of title VI is as follows:

TITLE VI—FOOD FOR PEACE PROGRAM

INCREASING FOOD DONATIONS

SEC. 601. Section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1431) is amended—

(1) by striking out the last two sentences;

(2) by inserting "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 416."; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Agricultural commodities (as defined in section 402 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954) acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation through price support operations, which the Secretary determines meet the criteria specified in subsection (a), may be furnished by the Secretary for carrying out the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. The provisions of section 102 of that Act shall apply to commodities furnished under this subsection to carry out title I (including title III) of that Act, and the provisions of section 203 of that Act shall apply to commodities furnished under this subsection to carry out title II of that Act. The cost of commodities furnished under this subsection and expenses incurred under sections 102 and 203 of that Act in connection therewith shall be in addition to the level of assistance programed under that Act and shall not be considered expenditures under that Act for purposes of provisions relating to classification of expenditures."

EXPRESS AUTHORITY FOR TITLE II DIRECT DISTRIBUTION, SALE, AND BARTER

SEC. 602. Section 202(a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following: "Such commodities may be furnished for direct distribution, sale, barter, or other appropriate disposition in carrying out the purposes set forth in section 201."

ROLE OF PRIVATE VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS AND COOPERATIVES

SEC. 603. (a) Section 202(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) In the case of commodities distributed under this title by nonprofit voluntary agencies, consideration shall be given to nutritional and development objectives as established by those agencies in light of their assessment of the needs of the people assisted."

(b) Section 302(c)(4) of such Act is amended by inserting "and of United States nonprofit voluntary agencies and cooperatives" immediately after "agriculture".

FARMER-TO-FARMER PROGRAM

SEC. 604. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the funds available for the fiscal year 1985 to carry out the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 shall be used to carry out paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 406(a) of that Act. Any such funds used to carry out paragraph (2) of such section 406(a) shall not constitute more than one-fourth of the funds used pursuant to this subsection, shall be used for activities in direct support of the farmer-to-farmer program under paragraph (1) of such section, and shall be administered wherever possible in conjunction with programs under title XII of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

(b) Not later than 120 days after the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of

the Agency for International Development, in conjunction with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall submit to the Congress a report indicating the manner in which the Agency intends to implement the provisions of sections 406(a) (1) and (2) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 with the funds made available pursuant to subsection (a) of this section.

TITLE II PROGRAMING REPORTS

SEC. 605. Section 408(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 is amended by striking out "title I" both places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "titles I and II".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FASCELL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FASCELL: Beginning on page 48, strike out section 601 (page 48, line 15, through line 15 on page 49); and redesignate sections 602 through 605 as sections 601 through 604, respectively.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, as the reading of the amendment discloses, this is in the nature of a technical or conforming amendment. The amendment is offered in view of the action previously taken by the House. The amendment merely removes section 601 from the bill, because this same matter was handled in a separate bill, H.R. 4072, the Agricultural Programs Adjustment Act of 1984, and that bill was recently passed and signed into law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REGULA

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REGULA: Page 51, after line 15, insert the following new section:

SALES OF SURPLUS DAIRY PRODUCTS TO THE PEOPLES' REPUBLIC OF CHINA

SEC. 606. Title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 116. For purposes of sales under this title of dairy products acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation through price support operations, the Peoples' Republic of China shall be considered to be a friendly country."

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, the President has just returned from a journey to China extending the hand of friendship of this Nation. Many of you who are listening to me have been to China and recognized the need of this Nation for additional milk products.

What I would propose in this amendment is to make China eligible for the purchase of milk products under Public Law 480. This, of course, would give China, an opportunity to purchase milk surpluses from the United States.

To illustrate the magnitude of the problem in terms of our surpluses, at the present time the United States has in storage under the Commodity Credit Corporation's program 396 million pounds of butter. We also have in storage 1.4 billion pounds of nonfat dry milk and 805 million pounds of cheese. Obviously these surpluses are a problem for the United States. Legislation of the type proposed in this amendment would afford an opportunity for a country that has a need to purchase from us at a reasonable rate products that are in great surplus.

In 1983 the Commodity Credit Corporation spent \$2.5 billion by virtue of the requirements of law. In 1984 because of the milk program passed by this body it is estimated that the purchase cost will be only \$1.5 billion.

But nevertheless, the surpluses pile up.

In addition, we have the cost of storing these surpluses in various parts of the United States. During the past 3 years we have expended \$173.4 million just for storage costs alone.

To give you an idea of the need in China and the potential market, in 1981 the consumption of dairy products, in China per capita annually was 3.1 pounds, a very minuscule amount. In 1983 in the United States we are consuming 578 pounds per capita.

□ 1930

This illustrates that in the United States in dairy products alone, our consumption is almost 200 times more than that of the people of China.

One of the goals announced by the Government in China is to increase the consumption of milk products to an annual rate of approximately 100 pounds per capita.

It seems to me that this offers an ideal opportunity to bring together the surpluses of the United States, which continue to grow, with a tremendous need that exists in China, while at the same time indicating that we have continuing friendship toward China in the form of the language of this amendment which would designate China as a friendly nation.

For the purposes of exploring the existing law, I wonder if the Chairman would join me in a colloquy.

I would like to request a point of information from the chairman of the committee, with regard to the eligibility for the shipment of agricultural commodities to China under Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

My question is: Is it now possible to send commodities to China, and specifically surplus dairy products held by the Commodity Credit Corporation—CCC—under title I, the concessional sales program, of Public Law 480?

Mr. FASCELL. I am pleased to say that the answer to the distinguished gentleman's question is "Yes." All the

President has to do under Public Law 480, under the provisions of the existing law, is to determine that the People's Republic of China is a friendly country for the purposes of the title I sales, and the shipment can go forward.

This matter came up for congressional review a couple years ago and the three congressional committees of jurisdiction—the Foreign Affairs Committee, the House Agriculture Committee, and the Senate Agriculture Committee—all told the administration the same thing: That the President has the authority to provide title I sales to China under existing law, subject to his determination, and therefore no legislative amendment was necessary.

The Presidential authority applies to all Public Law 480 commodities, not just dairy products. The President has not sent Public Law 480 title I to China yet. But he has the authority in the existing law.

Mr. REGULA. I have a second question, as to what the pending bill, H.R. 5421, does with regard to such shipments to China. Would it allow dairy surpluses to be sent to that country?

Mr. FASCELL. The provision in the bill is not directly related to the Public Law 480 statute, which stands on its own with regard to agricultural shipments to China as I have just explained.

However, the provision in this bill is entirely compatible. The Foreign Assistance Act presently forbids aid under that act from being extended to Communist countries listed in section 620(f) of the act. The People's Republic of China is one of the countries listed in that section. The provision in this bill, section 905, which responds to a Presidential request, would allow the President to waive this provision for any country—not only the PRC, but any country—on the list when he determines this to be in the U.S. national interest.

I thank the gentleman for this opportunity to respond to his questions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. REGULA was allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.)

Mr. REGULA. I would ask one further question, then. If I understand the chairman correctly, the section 905 in this bill is really an expansion of the Presidential authority into another area that would be comparable to what presently exists as far as the Public Law 480 program.

Mr. FASCELL. That is why I said it was compatible with the Public Law 480 provision.

Mr. REGULA. I thank the chairman for his response.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment in light of the information provided.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title VI?

If not the Clerk will designate title VII.

The text of title VII is as follows:

TITLE VII—PEACE CORPS

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 701. Section 3(b) of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2501) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 2."; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

POLICY

SEC. 702. (a) Section 2 of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2501) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 2."; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) The Congress declares that it is the policy of the United States and a purpose of the Peace Corps to provide, to the maximum extent possible, opportunities for service in the Peace Corps to at least 10,000 individuals by the end of the fiscal year 1988 and thereafter."

(b) Section 11 of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2510) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence:

"The President shall also include in the report a description of the plans developed and implemented to carry out the policy set forth in section 2(b) of this Act."

CLARIFYING AMENDMENT RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONAL EMPLOYEES

SEC. 703. Section 7(a)(2) of the Peace Corps Act is amended by inserting the following immediately before the second sentence: "Subparagraphs (A) and (B) do not apply with respect to foreign national employees."

PEACE CORPS PUBLICATIONS

SEC. 704. Section 15(a) of the Peace Corps Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Technical publications produced by the Peace Corps may be sold at cost in furtherance of the purpose of this Act. Up to \$200,000 of the proceeds of such sales in each fiscal year may, to such extent as may be provided in advance in appropriation Acts, be credited to the currently applicable appropriation of the Peace Corps, notwithstanding section 3302(b) of title 31, United States Code."

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title VII?

If not, the Clerk will designate title VIII.

The text of title VIII is as follows:

TITLE VIII—LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

ASSISTANCE AND SALES TO CHILE

SEC. 801. (a) Section 726(b) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1981 is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of subparagraph (B);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon; and

(3) by inserting the following new subparagraphs immediately after subparagraph (C):

"(D) that an elected civilian government is in power in Chile; and

"(E) that the Government of Chile has granted the request of the Government of Israel that Walter Rauff be extradited."

(b) If, prior to the enactment of this section, the President submits a certification with respect to Chile under section 726(b) of that Act, then no assistance, financing, sales, or licenses described in that section may be provided to Chile for fiscal year 1985.

PROHIBITION ON INTERNATIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING FOR URUGUAY AND PARAGUAY

SEC. 802. (a) For the fiscal year 1985, assistance may not be provided for Uruguay under chapter 5 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

(b) For the fiscal year 1985, assistance may be provided for Paraguay under chapter 5 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 only if the Government of Paraguay extradites Joseph Mengele.

PROMOTING THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE HAITIAN PEOPLE AND PROVIDING FOR ORDERLY EMIGRATION FROM HAITI

SEC. 803. (a) To the maximum extent practicable, assistance for Haiti under chapter 1 of part I and under chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 should be provided through private and voluntary organizations.

(b) Funds available for fiscal year 1985 to carry out chapter 1 of part I or chapter 4 or chapter 5 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 may be obligated for Haiti only if the President determines that the Government of Haiti—

(1) is continuing to cooperate with the United States in halting illegal emigration to the United States from Haiti;

(2) is cooperating fully in implementing United States development, food, and other economic assistance programs in Haiti (including programs for prior fiscal years);

(3) is continuing to comply with the fiscal performance targets set by the International Monetary Fund; and

(4) is making a concerted and significant effort to improve the human rights situation in Haiti by implementing the political reforms which are essential to the development of democracy in Haiti, including the establishment of political parties, free elections, and freedom of the press.

(c) Six months after the date of the enactment of this Act and six months thereafter, the President shall report to the Congress on the extent to which the actions of the Government of Haiti are consistent with each paragraph of subsection (b).

(d) Notwithstanding the limitations of section 660 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, funds made available under such Act may be used for programs with Haiti, which shall be consistent with prevailing United States refugee policies, to assist in halting significant illegal emigration from Haiti to the United States.

(e) Assistance may not be provided for Haiti for the fiscal year 1984 or 1985 under chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or under the Arms Export Control Act.

ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE FOR COUNTRIES IN THE ANDEAN REGION AND THE EASTERN CARIBBEAN

SEC. 804. Chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended by section 202 of this Act, is further amended

by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 537. LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN.—(a) Of the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out this chapter for the fiscal year 1985, not less than \$90,000,000 shall be for assistance for countries in the Andean region of South America. Of this amount not less than \$50,000,000 shall be for Peru, not less than \$20,000,000 shall be for Bolivia, and not less than \$20,000,000 shall be for Ecuador.

"(b) Of the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out this chapter for the fiscal year 1985, not less than \$45,000,000 shall be for countries in the Eastern Caribbean."

SCHOLARSHIPS FOR ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS FROM LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

SEC. 805. (a) The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The future of Latin America and the Caribbean depends on the existence of educated and skilled people who are capable of promoting socio-economic development in their countries.

(2) The United States should be concerned that the recent decrease in educational exchanges sponsored by the United States Government for Latin America and the Caribbean will prove detrimental to the development and stability of that region. At the same time, academic exchanges between Latin America and the Caribbean and the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe have increased dramatically.

(3) Economically disadvantaged young people in Latin America and the Caribbean have in the past been excluded from United States Government-sponsored scholarship programs because of the failure of these programs to identify and target such people and because these programs have not been specifically designed to meet the needs of such people.

(4) Because the requirement of an advanced knowledge of English has in the past been a major impediment to the participation of economically disadvantaged people in such programs, it is important for United States Government agencies responsible for administering such programs to develop better methods for providing effective language training. Therefore, efforts to strengthen the English-teaching capabilities of educational institutions in Latin America and the Caribbean should be supported.

(5) The reliance of the United States Government on host country governments to identify and approve scholarship candidates has further tended to exclude able economically disadvantaged people from such programs.

(6) The ability of economically disadvantaged people in Latin America and the Caribbean to qualify for and benefit from advanced education and training in the United States depends on the quality of their prior training in their own countries. Therefore, United States development assistance programs to support higher literacy and school attendance among economically disadvantaged people in Latin America and the Caribbean should be significantly increased.

(7) The needs of economically disadvantaged people in Latin America and the Caribbean are best served by short-term technical training programs, and multi-year undergraduate scholarships are necessary to counteract Soviet and Eastern European programs. Accordingly, the principal emphasis of United States Government schol-

arship programs should be in these areas. However, there is merit in providing opportunities for people from Latin America and the Caribbean to earn graduate and advanced degrees in the United States.

(8) Agriculture is the key to the development of Latin America and the Caribbean and, therefore, a scholarship program should give high priority to training individuals in agriculture and agricultural extension programs.

(b) In addition to amounts otherwise available for such purpose—

(1) \$25,000,000 of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1985 to carry out section 105 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and

(2) \$25,000,000 of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1985 for the United States Information Agency, shall be used to carry out this section.

(c) As used in this section, the term "administering agency" means the Agency for International Development and the United States Information Agency, respectively.

(d) Prior to allocation any of the funds made available to carry out this section, each administering agency shall consult with United States missions in Latin America and the Caribbean on how to implement the guidelines specified in subsection (f) and shall take the recommendations of those missions fully into account.

(e) Of the funds made available to each of the administering agencies to carry out this section, not less than 75 percent shall be used to finance undergraduate education and technical training and not less than 15 percent shall be allocated for students from the Caribbean. Not less than 30 percent of the students receiving scholarships under this section for the fiscal year 1985 shall be primarily involved in educational and technical training programs in agriculture. The primary emphasis of assistance under this section shall be on assistance provided through nongovernmental organizations and private and voluntary organizations.

(f) Programs carried out with the funds made available pursuant to this section shall be carried out in accordance with the following guidelines:

(1) United States missions in Latin America and the Caribbean shall design ways to identify promising economically disadvantaged students in elementary and secondary educational institutions. These missions shall develop and strictly implement specific economic need criteria that will enable them to exclude from the programs those who are able to finance their own studies. In order to ensure maximum participation of the economically disadvantaged, participants shall not be required to pay any part of the cost of participating in the programs.

(2) The administering agencies and United States missions in Latin America and the Caribbean shall seek to develop more effective ways of helping participants in the programs to acquire the necessary skills in English, especially in their own countries. Funds made available under this section may be used for English language training for participants in programs funded under this section. To the maximum extent practicable, programs financed under this section shall utilize educational institutions in Puerto Rico and elsewhere in the United States that can offer appropriate education and training to individuals who are unable to learn English prior to participating in these programs.

(3) United States missions in Latin America and the Caribbean shall select partici-

pants on the basis of the country's manpower needs for development. Such needs shall be determined in consultation with the government of the host country. Scholarships and training opportunities shall be conducted in areas that are critical to the development process, including agriculture, civil engineering, education, public and business administration, health, nutrition, population and family planning, and energy.

(4) The programs shall be flexible in order to take advantage of different training and educational institutions, including universities, vocational training schools, community colleges, labor organizations, community organizations, and businesses. Students receiving scholarships under this section should be geographically dispersed across the United States in order to provide them with quality educational and technical programs from a variety of United States institutions with respected programs in their field of study. In addition to formal education, internships and other on-the-job training opportunities may be included in the programs.

(5) Because the public and private sectors in Latin America and the Caribbean will benefit from programs financed under this section, the administering agencies shall seek arrangements under which the public and private sectors will contribute to the costs of the programs financed under this section.

(6) The administering agencies shall seek to engage the public and private sectors of Latin America and the Caribbean in programs to maximize the utilization of program participants upon their return to their own countries, so that the participants can better contribute to the development of their countries.

(g) The funds made available pursuant to this section shall be available to enhance the educational training and capabilities of the people of Latin America and the Caribbean and to promote better understanding between the United States and Latin America and the Caribbean through programs of cooperation, study, training, and research. Such funds may be used for program and administrative costs for institutions carrying out such programs.

(h) The administering agencies shall, at the earliest practicable date, convene a conference on educational exchange programs sponsored by the United States Government in order to evaluate the effectiveness of such programs and determine lessons for future such programs for Latin America and the Caribbean. Participants in the conference shall include organizations that participate in or administer educational and cultural exchanges, including nongovernmental organizations, private and voluntary organizations, educational institutions, Government agencies, and representatives from the Congress. The findings and recommendations of the conference shall be reported to the Congress and the public.

(i) Not later than January 1, 1985, the President shall submit a report to the Congress—

(1) on the role that educational and technical institutions in the Virgin Islands could play in the development of the Eastern Caribbean region and how those institutions might be upgraded to expand their ability to provide educational and technical training to students from the Eastern Caribbean; and

(2) on the role that educational and technical institutions in Puerto Rico could play in the development of the Caribbean and

Central American region and how those institutions might develop programs to provide educational and technical training to students in that region.

INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION

SEC. 806. (a) Subsection (b) of section 401 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969 is amended—

(1) in the last sentence by striking out "place primary" and inserting in lieu thereof "also place"; and

(2) by inserting immediately before the last sentence the following: "In pursuing these purposes, the Foundation shall place primary emphasis on the enhancement of the access of poor people to resources and services essential to their well-being and on the promotion of social justice and socioeconomic development."

(b) Subsection (c) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The Foundation shall carry out the purposes set forth in subsection (b) through, and in response to, organizations indigenous to Latin America and the Caribbean which are representative of the needs and aspirations of the poor in Latin America and the Caribbean."

(c) Subsection (d) of such section is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "All funding decisions, however, including the identification of organizations for funding, shall be made by the Foundation independently of those entities. The Foundation shall advise the United States Government, through its embassies and missions in the region, and the various Latin American and Caribbean governments of its activities in their countries."

(d) Such section is amended by redesignating subsections (e) through (p), respectively, and by inserting the following new subsection (e) after subsection (d):

"(e)(1) In order to carry out the purposes set forth in subsection (b), the Foundation may make grants, loans, and loan guarantees to any Latin American or Caribbean private or public group, association, or other entity engaged in peaceful activities for—

"(A) the fostering of local development institutions and the support of development efforts initiated by communities themselves;

"(B) the development of self-evaluation techniques by participants in projects supported under this section, for the purpose of transferring experience gained in such projects to similar development activities;

"(C) development research by the people of Latin America and the Caribbean, and the transfer of development resources, expertise, and knowledge within Latin America and the Caribbean;

"(D) the procurement of such technical or other assistance as is deemed appropriate by the recipient of such grant, loan, or loan guarantee, to carry out the purposes of this section; and

"(E) other projects that would carry out the purposes set forth in subsection (b).

"(2) The total amount of grants, loans, and loan guarantees that may be made by the Foundation for a particular project may not exceed \$250,000 in any fiscal year.

"(3) The Foundation may disseminate to the American public and to United States and multilateral development institutions knowledge gained from development projects assisted by the Foundation.

"(4) In making grants, loans, and loan guarantees, the Foundation shall give priority to projects which community groups undertake to foster their own development

and in the initiation, design, implementation, and evaluation of which there is the maximum feasible participation of the poor. Where appropriate and in keeping with its purposes, the Foundation may make such grants, loans, and loan guarantees to indigenous entities which are representative and knowledgeable of, and sensitive to, the needs and aspirations of the poor and which would disburse funds acquired under such grants, loans, and loan guarantees to other entities in Latin America and the Caribbean to carry out the purposes of the Foundation."

(e) Subsection (h) of such section, as so redesignated by subsection (d) of this section, is amended—

(1) by striking out "The management" and inserting in lieu thereof "(1) The overall management"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) All members of the Board shall be appointed on the basis of their experience with, understanding of, and sensitivity to community-level development processes in Latin America and Caribbean."

(f) Subsection (j) of such section, as so redesignated by subsection (d) of this section, is amended by inserting immediately before the period "except that the President of the Foundation, acting through the staff of the Foundation, shall be responsible for the day-to-day management of the Foundation."

(g) Subsection (m) of such section, as so redesignated by subsection (d) of this section, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) The staff of the Foundation shall be employed on the basis of experience in and knowledge of grass-roots, social, and economic development in the region."

(h) Subsection (m)(1) of such section, as so redesignated by subsection (d) of this section, is amended by adding after the first sentence the following: "The Board shall select the President of the Foundation taking into account the following criteria: an understanding and commitment to the Foundation's mandate of promoting socioeconomic development, a strong commitment to and experience working directly with poor people and grass roots development organizations in the region, a demonstrated leadership ability and senior management experience, and a distinguished record of public service."

(i) Existing subsection (p) of such section is repealed.

USE OF PRIVATE AND VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS IN PROVIDING ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

SEC. 807. To the maximum extent practicable, assistance under chapter 1 of part I and under chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for countries in Latin America and the Caribbean for each fiscal year should be provided through private and voluntary organizations which have a proven record of development assistance efforts overseas.

ASSISTANCE FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

SEC. 808. Section 660 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Subsection (a) shall also not apply with respect to any country which has a long-standing democratic tradition, which does not have standing armed forces, and which does not engage in a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights."

RECIPROCAL TRADE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

SEC. 809. The President shall work in close consultation with the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean which are major sources of unauthorized immigration to the United States in order to begin to develop, in partnership with those countries, reciprocal trade and economic development programs of mutual benefit.

REESTABLISHMENT OF DEMOCRACY IN ARGENTINA

SEC. 810. (a) The Government of Argentina should be applauded for its recent reestablishment of democracy. The election of President Alfonsín is a tribute to the resolve of the Argentine people to stand up to those individuals who inflicted terror on their nation. The Congress, therefore, congratulates President Alfonsín and offers its support to him and the people of Argentina.

(b) The Congress finds that—

(1) the restoration of democracy in Argentina sets an important example for the growth of democracy in other countries in both South and Central America;

(2) to insure democracy and the rule of law in Argentina, President Alfonsín must restore order to an economy suffering from over \$40 billion in foreign debt, a current annual debt payment of over \$10 billion, a 400 percent inflation rate, and an unemployment rate of 12 percent; and

(3) the United States could play a constructive role in insuring the consolidation of democracy in Argentina by taking into account its serious economic problems in the event that Argentina seeks to renegotiate its foreign debt.

(c) It is the sense of the Congress that the President should—

(1) acting through United States representatives to appropriate international agencies, take such steps as may be necessary to promote the restructuring of the Argentine debt and that of other democracies in Latin America to allow longer period of amortization and lower rates of interest;

(2) working with and through the appropriate Federal agencies, take such steps as may be necessary to permit the Government of Argentina and other democracies in Latin America to restructure their loan obligations to United States financial institutions; and

(3) acting at international economic forums with the industrialized nations, take actions on a cooperative, multilateral basis to develop plans for reducing the financial pressures on Argentina and other democracies in Latin America resulting from the size and short maturity of their foreign debt.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 811. This title shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title VIII?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LAGOMARSINO

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAGOMARSINO: Page 56, line 10, strike out "EASTERN"; page 57, line 2, strike out the closing quotation marks and the second period; and after line 2, insert the following:

"(c) In addition to amounts otherwise authorized, there are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this chapter \$75,000,000 for the fiscal year 1984, which shall be for assistance for the Dominican Republic."

Mr. LAGOMARSINO (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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment on behalf of myself and Mr. BARNES. The purpose of this amendment is to support the democratic process in the Dominican Republic. This amendment is designed to increase the ESF for the Dominican Republic by \$75 million for the current fiscal year which would help the democratic government surmount the economic difficulties it is now facing.

The Dominican Republic is always described as a showcase of democracy in the Caribbean—a nation of 6.2 million inhabitants that after several decades of dictatorships has made the successful transition to democracy. Unfortunately, the redemocratization of the Dominican Republic is currently being threatened by a potential economic disaster.

In the early 1970's the Dominican Republic underwent an economic recession that was characteristic of other countries in Latin America. With the prices of its traditional exports down, and the cost of imported oil skyrocketing, the Dominican Republic started borrowing heavily. And although a \$2.6 billion external debt might seem insignificant to us here in the United States, it is an appalling figure to the people in the Dominican Republic.

The President of the Dominican Republic, Salvador Jorge Blanco, met with members of the Foreign Affairs Committee during his visit to the United States last month. At that time we discussed the economic conditions in his country and the efforts that his government is making to comply with the International Monetary Fund conditions. During that meeting President Jorge Blanco explained the need for emergency assistance in order to minimize the impact of their compliance with the IMF agreement. Unfortunately, we all witnessed on our television sets the riots that resulted from these austerity programs in a country that has a 40-percent unemployment rate. With more than 60 people killed in clashes between soldiers and rioters, with more than 200 wounded and more than 4,300 arrested, these incidents have dealt a serious blow to the democratic process in the Dominican Republic.

Although the administration was able to put together a \$23 million emergency aid package, additional assistance is needed in view of the immediate and desperate needs of the coun-

try. This amendment increases the emergency aid available to the Dominican Republic. This amendment would increase the total to \$109 million. This is not an unprecedented increase when you compare it to the levels of assistance the United States has given to another showcase of democracy in the Caribbean, Jamaica. Although in 1980 neither country received any ESF, during the past 3 years Jamaica has received a total of \$292.4 million while the Dominican Republic has received a total of \$83 million.

This amendment is supported by Chairman FASCELL, by the ranking member of the committee, Mr. BROOMFIELD, and by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs, Mr. BARNES. It should also be clear that this is new money, we are not taking it from any other country. I trust that my colleagues will support this amendment. It will make the difference for a democratic regime as it struggles to maintain economic and political stability. This is one of the rare opportunities that we have to intervene in a positive way before it becomes a crisis. I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment.

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

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from California and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs for offering this amendment. I thoroughly support it. I think it is absolutely essential that we act in this regard because of the situation in the Dominican Republic. I would urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Maryland has introduced an amendment that I feel confident has bipartisan support. The struggle of the Dominican Republic to maintain democracy has not been easy. Its primary problems, however, have not been political but economic.

The money that this amendment would provide for the Dominican Republic would not solve all that nation's problems, but it would protect the Government from collapsing under the weight of a severely regulated economy.

The Dominican Republic is a poor nation. It is tough to ask the poor to tighten their belts when they are already starving. Yet, President Jorge Blanco tried to meet tough economic guidelines. The result, unfortunately, was chaos.

I understand that things have quieted down somewhat over the past few

weeks. But, it is important to remember that unless we help the people of the Dominican Republic, there will be problems in the future. This money would be an excellent start.

It is funny, on issues affecting Latin America and the Caribbean it has not always been possible for me to agree with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle on this issue; however, I think we see eye to eye.

I believe that we would all like to see democracy thrive in the Dominican Republic. That is not going to happen without a lot of hard work and sacrifice, but neither will it happen without outside support. This money for the Dominican Republic will give them time to make adjustments.

This amendment, this aid, is a gesture not only to the Dominican Republic, but to all the nations of the region—that the United States will come through when called upon; that we do, and will, actively support democracy.

The problems of poverty, of debt crisis, need a fresh approach. But until we can develop that approach, we have got to make use of efforts such as this. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

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

Mr. BERUETER. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to echo the gentleman's praise for the amendment related to the Dominican Republic.

Mr. Chairman, the Dominican Republic has gone through difficult times, and it is always difficult to see a friend in need. The Dominican Republic is a nation that is nothing less than a friend. It is the prime example of the goals and ideals this nation is trying to foster in the region. The Dominican Republic, like many other Latin American nations, also suffered from years of repressive dictatorship. But this small island nation has been one of the leaders of the movement toward democracy which we now witness across the Western Hemisphere.

This democracy, today led by President Salvador Jorge Blanco, who recently visited Washington, has over the past 5 years been in the throes of a worsening economic crisis. It may be true that part of the difficulties that this nation is now experiencing is of its own making. But, for the most part, the Dominican Republic has been overwhelmed by a combination of economic forces which resulted in the riots we witnessed in Santo Domingo last week.

The Dominican Republic's principal export is sugar, and I do not have to remind my colleagues of how dangerously depressed the market for that commodity is and has been. In the meanwhile, the population increase of this small country is one of the largest

in the hemisphere, creating more mouths to feed and an ever-increasing bill for the importation of all types of comestibles. This occurs as agricultural production declined last year. Furthermore, the Dominican Republic produces no appreciable amount of energy of its own. It earned about \$900 million in export income last year and over 60 percent of that income went to pay the service on the rather large debt the country amassed over recent years, and its oil bill. This left precious little for food and productive imports.

The International Monetary Fund is in the process of negotiating an accord with the Dominican Republic which would force its Government to impose severe measures of economic stabilization. Last week, we saw the tragic results that these measures can bring. When the Dominican Government devalued its exchange rate, the price of food tripled. This food is the food of the urban poor and the food of that 45 percent of the Dominican population which works in the depressed agricultural sector.

The increase in economic support funds which the gentleman from California proposes in behalf of himself and for the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARNES) serves a noble purpose. I support it in the strongest terms.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title VIII of the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ACKERMAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ACKERMAN: Page 53, line 24, strike out "extradited" and insert in lieu thereof "expelled".

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, this is a technical amendment to a provision I introduced in the Foreign Affairs Committee, and which was reported by this committee, concerning the Nazi war criminal, Walter Rauff. The language reported by the Foreign Affairs Committee requires that the Government of Chile grant the request of Israel that this man be extradited. Unfortunately, the Chileans have repeatedly rejected the formal requests of Israel and Germany that this case be resolved.

Allow me to give some of the background on Walter Rauff to shed some light on this issue for those of my colleagues who may not be familiar with the circumstances of the case. Rauff is a notorious Nazi leader who was responsible for overseeing the murder of 250,000 Jews in movable gas vans which he personally invented. Yet, he lives openly in Chile today as he has since 1957. Anyone can stand in front of his house on any given day and ob-

serve Rauff enjoying a comfortable life, a privilege that his victims do not have. The fact this despicable individual is protected from having to stand trial for his crimes should be shocking and appalling to every Member of this House. The Chilean Government has every right to expel Rauff, as delineated under Article 24 of the transitory provision of the Chilean Constitution, and it must be forced to take this action.

By making this one-word change, from "extradited" to "expelled," we make clear that we wish the Chilean Government to use the power which exists in its Constitution to expel a man who has lived in freedom and with the protection of the Chilean Government. I ask my colleagues for their support for this amendment.

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

Mr. ACKERMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

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

We have examined the amendment on our side and as far as we are concerned, we are perfectly willing to accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there further discussion on the amendment?

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DENNY SMITH

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DENNY SMITH: On page 70, after line 25, add the following:

"(4) It should not be the policy of the United States government to protect the profits of private financial institutions with loans outstanding to Argentina and other Latin American countries."

On page 71, strike line 3 and all that follows through line 13 and insert in lieu thereof:

"(1) acting through United States representatives to appropriate international agencies and through the appropriate federal agencies, encourage the restructuring of the Argentine debt and that of other democracies in Latin America to allow longer periods of amortization and lower rates of interest; and"

Redesignate following paragraph accordingly.

□ 1940

Mr. DENNY SMITH (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 Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is to clarify that the aim of the language in section 810 is to express support for the democratic government of Argentina. We are all

well aware of the debt problems confronting Argentina and other Latin American nations. This amendment clarifies the language in section 810 by emphasizing that we want to prevent the money-center banks from continuing to charge high interest rates on short-term loans which only perpetuates the international debt crisis. This amendment is consistent with the position Congress has taken in its instructions to the U.S. Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund.

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

Mr. DENNY SMITH. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we have examined the amendment on this side, and we find it thoroughly acceptable and are happy to accept it.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. I thank the committee chairman.

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

Mr. DENNY SMITH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we have examined the amendment also and do not find any problem with it. If it should develop that there is, we can attempt to iron it out in conference and will keep in touch with the gentleman.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DENNY SMITH).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to call the attention of my colleagues to a provision of this bill which would provide Government-sponsored scholarships for students of Central America to attend American universities.

As a result of a trip in this area some weeks ago, I introduced H.R. 4677 to achieve this objective. I commend the members of the committee for including language similar to H.R. 4677 that will develop scholarship programs.

For several years, the Soviet Bloc has been educating Central Americans at their universities. In 1982 alone scholarships offered by the Soviet Union, Eastern European countries and Cuba totaled 7,500. By contrast, the United States offered only meager assistance, primarily to post-graduate and professional programs.

If we are truly concerned about a Soviet consolidation of power in the region, we should provide the future leaders of Central America and the Caribbean with the opportunity to study in the United States.

It would be in the long-term best interests of the United States to correct

this imbalance rather than having the area's future generation of leaders educated by countries which oppose the freedoms we cherish.

I especially commend the committee members for concentrating the programs in agriculture and engineering, for they certainly will increase the economic growth that is so badly needed in this region of the world.

I think this is a very enlightened provision in the bill. If properly implemented it could go a long way toward creating a better feeling toward the United States in the years ahead and insuring that there will be leadership in this part of the world that understands the kind of government we have that values freedom and our system of free enterprise.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUTTO

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUTTO: On page 63, line 20, after the period, insert: "The conference shall also consider the possibility of planning for the establishment of U.S.-sponsored educational institutions in one or more nations in Latin America and the Caribbean."

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues know in many countries in Central and South America the Soviets are offering scholarships to young people there who are going to the Soviet Union to get their higher education and then coming back. And, of course, we feel that this is not a healthy influence for our country.

All this amendment does is to say that the administering agencies which are ordered to hold a conference to evaluate the effectiveness of the exchange programs and other programs relating to education shall consider, when they meet, the possibility of planning for the establishment of U.S.-sponsored educational institutions in one or more nations in Latin America and the Caribbean.

In this way I think that it would be better than perhaps offering so many scholarships in this country. I am not against that and I hope that we will offer more, but oftentimes I think when youngsters are educated in this country they want to stay in this country instead of going back to their own country.

I feel that we ought to look at the possibility. I do not know if we can work anything or not, but perhaps a joint venture with some of the countries in this part of the world would help us to indoctrinate these young people in democracy and our American way of life. I think it would be a healthy thing.

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

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

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We are fully supportive of the efforts of the conference investigating this matter and because of the nature of the kind of competition we face, we think it is urgent that we take a look at that problem.

So on this side we are very happy to accept the amendment.

Mr. HUTTO. I thank the chairman. Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUTTO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we on this side support the amendment also.

I might say that in another committee on which I serve, the Insular Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on the Interior, we are talking about legislation very similar to this with regard to the Virgin Islands. So this amendment is complementary to that effort that we are making. I urge my colleagues to vote for the amendment.

Mr. HUTTO. I thank the gentleman for his support.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HUTTO).

The amendment was agreed to.

Are there further amendments to title VIII? If not, the Clerk will designate title IX.

The text of title IX is as follows:

TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS
EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 901. Except as otherwise provided, this Act shall take effect on October 1, 1984.

SOUTH-WEST AFRICA PEOPLE'S ORGANIZATION

SEC. 902. Chapter 3 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended by section 503 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 308. SOUTH-WEST AFRICA PEOPLE'S ORGANIZATION.—(a) Funds authorized to be appropriated by this chapter may not be available for the United States proportionate share for programs for the South-West Africa People's Organization, except that funds may be made available for the United States proportionate share of programs for the South-West Africa People's Organization if the President certifies to the Congress that such funds would not be used to support the military or paramilitary activities of the South-West Africa People's Organization.

"(b) The Secretary of State shall review, at least annually, the budgets and accounts of all international organizations receiving payments of any such funds and shall report to the appropriate committees of the Congress the amounts of funds expended by each such organization for the purposes described in subsection (a) and the amount contributed by the United States to each such organization."

PROCUREMENT OF CONSTRUCTION AND ENGINEERING SERVICES

SEC. 903. Section 604(g) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end

thereof "and which are not receiving any direct economic assistance under chapter 1 of part I or chapter 4 of part II of this Act".

COMPLETION OF PLANS AND COST ESTIMATES

SEC. 904. (a) Section 611(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended—

(1) by striking out "\$100,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$500,000"; and

(2) by striking out "section 1311 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955 as amended (31 U.S.C. 200)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 1501 of title 31, United States Code".

(b) Section 611(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "the procedures set forth in the Principles and Standards for Planning Water and Related Land Resources, dated October 25, 1973, with respect to such computations" and inserting in lieu thereof "the principles, standards, and procedures established pursuant to the Water Resources Planning Act (42 U.S.C. 1962, et seq.) or acts amendatory or supplementary thereto".

PROHIBITIONS ON ASSISTANCE

SEC. 905. Subsection (f) of section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(f)";

(2) by redesignating clauses (1), (2), and (3) as clauses (A), (B), and (C), respectively; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, the President may remove a country, for such period as the President determines, from the application, of this subsection, and other provisions which reference this subsection, if the President determines and reports to the Congress that such action is important to the national interest of the United States."

REPROGRAMMING REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 906. (a) Section 634A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" immediately before "None";

(2) by inserting "or the Arms Export Control Act" immediately after "disaster relief and rehabilitation)" and immediately after "this Act" the second place it appears; and

(3) by adding at the end of the section the following new subsection:

"(b) The notification requirement of this section does not apply to the reprogramming of less than \$25,000 for use under chapter 8 of part I, or for use under chapter 5 of part II, for a country for which a program under that chapter for that fiscal year was justified to the Congress."

(b) Section 653 of such Act is amended—

(1) by inserting in subsection (a) "or the Arms Export Control Act" immediately after "sections 451 or 637";

(2) by striking out subsection (b); and

(3) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b).

(c) Section 36(a) of the Arms Export Control Act is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5) by striking out "cash" and by striking out ", credits to be extended under section 23, and guaranty agreements to be made under section 24"; and

(2) in paragraph (6) by striking out "cash" and by striking out "and credits expected to be extended".

REPEAL OF PROVISIONS; TECHNICAL AMENDMENT

SEC. 907. (a) The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended as follows:

(1) Section 106(b)(1) is amended by striking out "(A)" and by striking out subparagraph (B).

(2) Section 110 is amended by striking out "(a)" and by striking out subsection (b).

(3) Section 113(c) is repealed.

(4) Chapter 10 of part I is repealed.

(b) Section 636(a)(14) of such Act is amended by striking out "the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 801 et seq.)" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3901 et seq.)".

REPORTS ON ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN EGYPT, ISRAEL, AND TURKEY

SEC. 908. The Congress finds that the Governments of Egypt, Israel, and Turkey each have an enormous external debt burden which may be made more difficult by virtue of financing provided for those governments under various United States assistance programs. In order to assist the Congress in examining United States assistance for these countries, the President shall report to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, not later than January 15 of each year, regarding economic conditions prevailing in Egypt, Israel, and Turkey which may affect their respective ability to meet their international debt obligations and to stabilize their economies.

CODIFICATION OF POLICY PROHIBITING NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE PALESTINE LIBERATION ORGANIZATION

SEC. 909. (a) The United States in 1975 declared in a memorandum of agreement with Israel, and has reaffirmed since, that "The United States will continue to adhere to its present policy with respect to the Palestine Liberation Organization, whereby it will not recognize or negotiate with the Palestine Liberation Organization so long as the Palestine Liberation Organization does not recognize Israel's right to exist and does not accept Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338."

(b) The United States hereby reaffirms that policy. In accordance with that policy, no officer or employee of the United States Government and no agent or other individual acting on behalf of the United States Government shall negotiate with the Palestine Liberation Organization or any representatives thereof, and the United States shall not recognize the Palestine Liberation Organization, unless and until the Palestine Liberation Organization recognizes Israel's right to exist, accepts United Nations Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338, and renounces the use of terrorism.

MIDDLE EAST PEACE

SEC. 910. The funds and authorities provided by this Act for assistance for countries in the Middle East, and sales of defense articles and services under the Arms Export Control Act to countries in the Middle East, should help to promote peace in the Middle East and to encourage all recipient countries to pursue policies that enhance the peace process, which should be based on United Nations Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338, the Camp David Accords, and the principle of direct negotiations without preconditions among the countries.

EGYPTIAN-ISRAELI RELATIONS

SEC. 911. The Congress is concerned about the lack of progress in the normalization of relations between Egypt and Israel. It is the sense of the Congress that all United States foreign assistance to Egypt is provided in the expectation that the Egyptian government will support and fulfill the provisions

of the Camp David Accords and the Egyptian-Israeli Peace Treaty.

CONGRESSIONAL PRESENTATION DOCUMENTS

Sec. 912. The annual congressional presentation documents for international security and economic assistance shall be submitted to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Appropriations of each House of Congress not later than January 31 of each year.

UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

Sec. 913. It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the President should create a bipartisan panel of experts to review United States participation in the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (hereafter in this section referred to as "UNESCO"), including the impact that United States withdrawal from UNESCO would have on Israel's participation in that organization and on freedom of the press, and should report the results of that review to the Congress by October 1, 1984;

(2) the President should take all necessary steps to ensure the upgrading of the United States mission to UNESCO, as well as the appropriate office of the Department of State, in order to further ensure a fair and thorough examination of UNESCO's willingness to implement needed reforms; and

(3) the executive branch shall not make or announce a final withdrawal decision concerning UNESCO until the relevant committees of the Congress have been fully consulted.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title IX?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CROCKETT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CROCKETT: Page 78, line 12, immediately after "Egypt" insert "and Israel"; and line 13, immediately after "Egyptian government" insert "and the Israeli government".

□ 1950

Mr. CROCKETT. Mr. Chairman, in this legislation we propose to give foreign aid in the amount of several billions of dollars to two countries, Israel and Egypt. But we provide in section 911 on page 78 the following:

It is the sense of the Congress that all United States foreign assistance to Egypt is provided in the expectations that the Egyptian Government will support and fulfill the provisions of the Camp David accords and the Egyptian-Israeli Peace Treaty.

My amendment, Mr. Chairman, is very simple. All it will do is include Israel in that section of the bill, so as to hold Israel to the same standard as we hold Egypt and the other Arab States, namely, that Israel also will work for peace in the Middle East. This amendment simply clarifies the sense of this Congress that we expect Israel as well as Egypt to comply with language as well as the necessary intentions of the Camp David accords and the Israeli-Egyptian Peace Treaty.

Mr. Chairman, I have numerous complaints with the provisions of this bill concerning other issues relating to the Middle East. Although I will restrict myself today to offering the one amendment to this section 911 of the bill, there are many other sections of the bill that I find offensive, and there are a host of sections that I think should be brought up on the floor and debated here today. Among those sections is section 122, putting restrictions on assistance to Jordan that makes U.S. policy on Jordan more responsive to the goals of the Israeli Government than to the goals of U.S. policy.

Then there is section 503, governing assistance to international organizations. This section restricts the use of funds for organizations assisting the Palestinian people, among other needy peoples.

Then there is section 801, governing assistance to Chile, which includes a requirement that Chile meet Israel's demands for the extradition of a named former Nazi which, while desirable, certainly should not be a governing condition on the provision of U.S. assistance to that country.

Then there is section 909, Mr. Chairman, which needlessly restates U.S. policy on the PLO and will make it exceedingly difficult for this or any other administration to work with the only generally recognized Palestinian people's organization on the West Bank.

And, finally, there is section 101, which provides U.S. FMS aid to Israel to help provide employment in Israel in the production of a fighter aircraft that will be sold and exported in direct competition with U.S.-produced fighter aircraft.

But as I said before, Mr. Chairman, I am limiting myself to section 911, because section 911 of this bill is typical of most of the sections of the bill concerning assistance to the Middle East. It reflects not U.S. policy concerns and considerations in the Middle East, but rather Israeli policy considerations and concerns. This bill is rife with policy initiatives in the Middle East which conflict with stated U.S. policy, our policy presumably being one of neutrality and one of honest brokerage. It is a bill, then, that seeks to impose on the U.S. Government the foreign policy goals and aims of the Israeli Government. And this is supposed to be a U.S. foreign assistance bill, not an Israeli foreign assistance bill.

Let us take one example, the example of section 801 that I mentioned earlier. I can think of many reasons why we should not provide assistance to Chile. Primary among them would be Chile's deplorable human rights record. I can also see why the U.S. Government should strongly urge Chile to deport any Nazi war criminal

inside its borders. But I see no reason why the United States should make the deportation of one specifically named war criminal a central tenet of its policy toward one of the most important nations in South America. I consider this an outrageous amendment which ignores U.S. foreign policy interests in favor of the desires and the goals of Israeli foreign policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CROCKETT) has expired.

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

Mr. CROCKETT. I think it is very important also to note, Mr. Chairman, that these provisions of the bill which I am discussing today are in the bill in great part because of the failure of the State Department and the rest of this administration to spend any time or effort to oppose these improper Israeli initiatives or indeed protect their own Middle East policies. If the administration had spent one-tenth of the time or effort lobbying this Congress on our declared Middle East policy of neutrality that it spent lobbying this Congress on Central America, most of these provisions would not be in the bill. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, the administration could not even get one single reference to President Reagan's September 1 peace initiative included in this bill. The administration let these provisions go by the board, ignoring the problems which they cause for its policies, and the administration itself is responsible for much of the damage done to its Middle East policy by this bill.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that all my amendment does is to say that we expect Israel as well as Egypt to work for peace in the Middle East. All this amendment says is that we want Israel as well as Egypt to act in accordance with its obligation under the Camp David accords and the Israeli-Egyptian Peace Treaty.

In this bill we hold Egypt to those standards. In this bill we hold Jordan to far higher standards. Let us hold Israel to those same standards.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say at the outset that I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from Michigan who has offered this amendment. I serve with him on both of my committees, and we share a great many common interests. But in this particular arena, on this particular matter, I think there is some divergence of view for a number of reasons. But I think the most telling reason and the most cogent reason to argue against this amendment is to understand exactly what it is in the bill that we are considering.

This particular set of language that we have adopted at subcommittee and at full committee talks only to that which we understand to be the policy of the United States, and that is that there is commitment of those signatories to the Camp David agreement.

Now, in theory, then, the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan would be appropriate because it says that both countries should abide. But the reality is that we understand what has transpired from the day after the signing of that agreement to today.

And why was the language adopted in the first place? The language was adopted because there are many of us who share grave concerns about the commitment and the compliance of the country of Egypt to the Camp David accords. There is in fact documented, verifiable evidence that is there for all the world to see that there have been numerous breaches by the Egyptian Government of the Camp David accords.

Now, we all know that the Ambassador no longer is in Israel. The Camp David accord provides that there shall be an Embassy and there shall be an Ambassador. There is no Ambassador in Egypt. He was recalled almost 2 years ago and has not been returned.

□ 2000

There is, as a matter of fact, today no trade or cultural ties with Israel, as called for in the agreement. There has been a halt of all cultural exchanges. There has been a virtual halt of all Egyptian-Israeli trade. Egypt has stopped issuing import licenses for Israeli goods.

President Mubarak has threatened to cut off diplomatic relations because of a move by this Congress possibly to move our Embassy.

There has been a renewal of large amounts of anti-Israel and anti-Semitic statements documented in the Egyptian press, which is there for all the world to see.

These things, the cultural and trade exchanges, the exchange of Ambassadors which has now been stopped by the country of Egypt, require that the United States take some affirmative action to show that we want this country to continue to be the catalyst for Camp David, and we are doing so with the country which is right now publicly, out in the open, for the whole world to see, breaching the agreement.

That is not to say we are going to denigrate our protocols, our agreements, our help, our diplomatic relations, our friendship with the country of Egypt. All it means is what it says, and be very sure about what this says.

It says that the Congress is concerned about the lack of progress in the normalization of relations between the two countries, and it is the sense of Congress that all U.S. foreign assistance to Egypt is provided in the expectation

that the Egyptian Government will support and will fulfill the provisions of the Camp David accords and the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty.

We are asking them, by virtue of this, to understand that our aid is given with that expectation. It is not conditional. It does not call for them to lose aid in the event they refuse to do that. That will be a decision we will make hereafter.

Let us examine the other side. Let us look at what it is that creates this movement by the gentleman from Michigan to insert Israel in the bill.

Has Israel lived up to its obligations? It has vacated the Sinai. It has given back the oil wells, \$2 billion a year worth of oil that now it has to import that it had previously.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SMITH) has expired.

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

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Israel has complied with each and every term of the Camp David accords. The United States has not made any protocol, diplomatic or other effort to castigate the State of Israel for any supposed breaches in the Camp David accords as they were written, as it is expected the United States expects Egypt and Israel to live up to.

But we cannot say that about Egypt. Israel, in fact, has fulfilled its obligations and continues to do so. Why, then, do we want to insert language which is unnecessary, and that is that Israel is expected to fulfill what we have already agreed as a nation that it is fulfilling, while we have documented evidence of and, in fact, have made numerous diplomatic requests to the country of Egypt about the fact they are not fulfilling their obligations?

That is all this language says. There is absolutely no reason to put into the bill any other language. Why not add anyone else? Why not add ourselves, that we are also expected to fulfill our obligations? Why do we not put that in every piece of language where we have a protocol or a treaty with someone; that we give them aid with the expectation that they are going to fulfill them?

The reason is, we do not because until they make some overt act, a breach, something that causes us to say, "We feel you are not honoring your commitment," we do not ask them to do what they are obligated to do. That is unnecessary. It is foolish. And it is demeaning.

In this case we have already made diplomatic overtures to Egypt to remove the breaches and do what is called for in Camp David. We want them to fulfill the provisions. We want them to be friends with Israel. We want to be friends with both countries, and we want to have our friends be

friends with each other. That is what we are doing by virtue of this bill: Sending the Egyptian Government a signal that the United States considers Camp David to be the framework of peace in the Middle East and will take action to make sure that no one attempts to undermine it.

I would urge all my colleagues to defeat this amendment, which is totally unnecessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SMITH) has again expired.

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

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield,

Mr. SMITH of Florida. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. WEISS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to commend the gentleman and to associate myself with his remarks in their entirety. I only want to offer 1 or 2 additional words of emendation, and that is that in some of the other matters that the distinguished gentleman, our friend from Michigan, made about what he considers extraneous matters, it seems to me that those of us who have lived through the Second World War and who know about the war crimes that were perpetrated by the Nazis, we do not have to be Israelis or concerned about the rights of Israeli people in order to be concerned about a war criminal being harbored by the Government of Chile. That is why that is in this piece of legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if I may reclaim my time, let me just say that the "Dear Colleague" letter that the gentleman from Michigan sent out has a very interesting sentence in it. Let me read that.

As I believe that the Israeli Government has the same obligation to demonstrate its good faith in a general Middle East peace settlement and its adherence to the principles contained in its international obligations, I will seek to amend this section of the legislation by adding clarifying language pertaining to Israel.

Let me just say that I believe that Israel has already demonstrated it is abiding and adhering to full compliance with the Camp David accords. No one has shown us where Israel has in any way, shape or form violated those accords. So I do not see why the language is necessary. As to Israel's adherence to the principles contained in its international obligation, one of the other stated reasons for this amendment: Nowhere is it mentioned or set forth in Camp David that it shall adhere to other international treaties. Camp David was never preconditioned or based upon Israel adhering to any other treaties, neither was Egypt re-

quired to do so either. That should not be part of the basis on which we make a decision now to change the language in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SMITH) has again expired.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Florida. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CROCKETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have the highest respect for my colleague from Florida. Both of us come from the same country originally, the State of Florida.

I had hoped that we would not get into a comparative statement of who has violated and who has not violated the Camp David accords because I do not think that will get us anywhere.

I think there is a substantial portion of the population who believe that Israel's annexation of the Golan Heights, that Israel's continued building of settlements on the West Bank, that Israel's invasion of Lebanon, that all of these, in toto, constitute an infraction of the spirit if not the letter of the Camp David accords.

But I do not want to debate that. My basic point is that ever since the days of Harry Truman, we have tried to maintain a policy of neutrality in the Middle East. Indeed, every time we have increased appropriations for Israel, we have also increased them for Egypt. All I am saying is, let us apply the same standards.

The Government of the United States expects every country, whether it is Egypt or Israel, to abide by treaties, legally negotiated. There is no necessity for the provision in this act that says we expect Egypt to abide by it. It is a gratuitous insult to that one country to say that.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if I may reclaim my time from the gentleman, I would say to the gentleman that while I agree with much of what he has stated and certainly did this year increase aid to Egypt and, in fact, also used the same formula for calculating foreign military sales on all grant aid as we did with Israel, let me just say that in reality, of course, the gentleman's statement with reference to the spirit of Camp David is not what is addressed in this language.

We are talking about the letter of Camp David, and the letter of Camp David calls for, for instance, an Egyptian Ambassador, who no longer resides in the country of Israel.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SMITH) has again expired.

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

Mr. SMITH of Florida. It calls for that to happen, and it has not happened. It calls for increased cultural and trade ties. As a matter of fact, there is evidence continuing that those ties have been closed; that any avenues that started to open are now closed down.

That is not what we consider to be in the spirit of Camp David or certainly in the letter of Camp David.

□ 2010

This is not a gratuitous statement. It is more a statement that we are unfortunately in a position of wanting to get that relationship to happen. The United States was the facilitator in that relationship. We are all very proud of that. The gentleman from Michigan and I both are proud that we have friends in the Middle East like that. We would like to be able to do something to make sure that friendship continues, and that the letter and spirit of Camp David are alive.

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

Mr. SMITH of Florida. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, perhaps the gentleman could shed a little bit of light on the necessity for putting this language in the report.

It would be my understanding that the reason this language was inserted in here was that Members on both sides of the aisle and really of all political philosophies have been very, very concerned about the inability of the Government of Egypt to fulfill its part of the Camp David accords. This was a very specific agreement that particularly the peoples of the free world felt was a real breakthrough for what would ultimately be cooperation within the political problems that exist in the Middle East.

It would be my feeling—and I wish the gentleman would comment on this—that this language was placed in the report to some degree as a compromise with Members who are involved in this debate within this Congress about what the Government of Egypt ought to do in order to facilitate the peace process. In fact, there are a number of people within this Nation who are concerned about the movements of the Mubarak government within the period of the last 6 months, and this was more or less, it seems to me, a degree of compromise involved in terms of this report.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman would comment on that.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if I may reclaim my time, the reality is that there was an element within the committee and within this

Congress who had wanted frankly to cut aid to Egypt.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SMITH) has expired.

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

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, those Members, I believe, had a legitimate concern and that was the way they felt they wanted to choose to exhibit that concern. There are many of us who did not want to do that.

Egypt is a friend and an ally and a partner of this country, and that partnership, friendship, and alliance must be maintained. But that does not give our country any less right to express our sorrow and our frustration over something which we had a hand in forging not working today as it was intended.

As a result, we felt it was appropriate to at least send some message to the Government of Egypt that we felt we wanted them to know of our frustration, without making rash statements and without, like they have done, threatening to break off diplomatic relations. We felt it was a good balance and that it was appropriate for them to understand how we felt, and nothing more.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I think the point of the agreement was that Egypt itself was castigated, and some felt that President Sadat was assassinated because of his efforts to develop a closer relationship between the State of Israel and the nation of Egypt. And when you move into things like Lebanon, Lebanon is an argument that goes well beyond the Egyptian debate. There we have a situation where we are dealing with more radical elements of the Arab community, particularly the Syrians, and, of course, the difficulty between the State of Israel and Iraq and Iran is well documented.

The situation that exists between Egypt and Israel and what everyone was so excited about throughout the world was the possibility of getting a moderate Arab State to sit down and finally put together a solid agreement that gets us on the road toward a long-lasting agreement within the Middle East between the Arabs and the Israelis.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if I may reclaim my time, there is no question in my mind or in the mind of, I think, almost anyone in this Congress that if there is going to be one cornerstone for peace in the Middle East it is going to be the Camp David accords. The United States has an abiding interest in making that happen and as a reality I think we need to communicate with those parties when we are frustrated to some

degree because there is not full compliance with its terms.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SMITH) has again expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CROCKETT).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SOLOMON: Page 79, after line 23, insert the following new section:

SUPPORT BY FOREIGN COUNTRIES OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

SEC. 914. (a) Not later than January 31 of each year or at the time of the transmittal by the President to the Congress of the annual presentation materials on foreign assistance, whichever is earlier, the President shall transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate a full and complete report which assesses, with respect to each foreign country, the degree of support by the government of each such country during the preceding twelve-month period for the foreign policy of the United States. Such report shall include, with respect to each such country which is a member of the United Nations, information to be compiled and supplied by the Permanent Representatives of the United States to the United Nations, consisting of a comparison of the overall voting practices in the principal bodies of the United Nations during the preceding twelve-month period of such country and the United States, with special note of the voting and speaking records of such country on issues of major importance to the United States in the General Assembly and the Security Council, and shall also include a report on actions with regard to the United States in important related documents such as the Non-Aligned Communiqué. A full compilation of the information supplied by the Permanent Representatives of the United States to the United Nations for inclusion in such report shall be provided as an addendum to such report.

(b) The President in making allocations for assistance under this Act shall take into consideration the extent to which a country is not engaged in a consistent pattern of opposition to the foreign policy of the United States as demonstrated by the information required in the report by subsection (a).

Mr. SOLOMON (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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I will not take more than just a minute because actually we have already debated this amendment. Earlier today we had the Walker amendment before us that was amended by Mr. SILJANDER, and what that amendment did was to require the President to report to the Congress through an annual report which assesses the voting

habits of foreign countries regarding their support or lack of support for U.S. foreign policy.

My amendment is existing law, and as I mentioned before, back in the continuing resolution last fall this House overwhelmingly approved that concurrent resolution that has the Kasten amendment in it. Now we have changed the Kasten amendment in one area and that was to conform with the Siljander amendment, which makes this amendment I am offering identical to the Walker-Siljander amendment, but in that language it covers all nine titles.

Mr. Chairman, when the current administration took over at the United Nations we witnessed several improvements. When Ambassador Kirkpatrick arrived she was asked what would be the difference between the new President's policies and those of the previous one. Our Representative replied, "We have taken off our kick me sign." When asked if that meant that if you are kicked, you will kick back? She responded, "Not necessarily. But it does mean that if we're kicked, at least we won't apologize."

Mr. Speaker, we all know that the American people contribute over one and one-half billion tax dollars a year to the U.N. budget, and they contribute additional billions each year in various forms to many of the nations who play important roles in the activities of the United Nations.

If we are spending this kind of money at a time when the deficit is threatening the American economy, we need to know, and the American people certainly deserve to know how countries are voting—which receive assistance from the American taxpayers.

My amendment will provide us a comparison of the overall voting practices in the principal bodies of the United Nations and from this information we can gain a better understanding of the support we received from member states.

I would also like to state that I agree with many of the statements on the floor earlier today. Many of my colleagues on the committee emphasized an important fact which is taken into account by my amendment. This is that in examining the voting record of the U.N. member states, it should be borne in mind that relations with other countries in the United Nations are only one dimension of our relations with these countries.

However, we must not underestimate the importance of these votes. The votes and the debates in the United Nations are covered in the world press and are covered extensively in the press of many less developed nations. They are also followed closely by the media of most European countries. The agenda of the major U.N. organizations influence what is important in the world. These votes are also widely

interpreted as reflecting world opinion. The votes influence opinions all over the world about what is legitimate, what is acceptable, who is lawless and who is repressive.

Actions by the United Nations have greater consequences for American foreign policy than the American people and the Congress realize.

My amendment allows the President to review these U.N. votes and determine which country is engaged in a consistent pattern of opposition to the foreign policy of the United States. If he determines that certain countries are voting in a manner which is in opposition to that of the U.S. foreign policy he can deny assistance. The President has this authority now.

This amendment, as I stated earlier, is identical to a provision accepted in conference last year but which expires on October 1, except that we have added the Siljander language previously added to the Walker amendment and passed by the House.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, do I understand this is the amendment the gentleman was discussing earlier on in the debate today on this question?

Mr. SOLOMON. Yes, it is.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that we have reviewed the amendment and we are happy to accept it.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the committee chairman for his good judgment.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the acting ranking member.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have examined the amendment, too, and I support it. I hope the House will adopt it.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HALL OF OHIO

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALL of Ohio: Page 79, after line 23, insert the following:

EAST TIMOR

SEC. 914. It is the sense of the Congress that the President should take all appropriate measures to—

(1) encourage the Government of Indonesia to allow appropriate international relief agencies increased access to East Timor and to allow such agencies to establish full-time humanitarian relief operations in East Timor;

(2) encourage and assist the Governments of Indonesia, Portugal, and Australia to facilitate the reunification of families separated because of developments in East Timor,

and encourage the involvement of appropriate international agencies in this process;

(3) encourage the Government of Indonesia to allow free access to East Timor by international journalists and international human rights organizations; and

(4) work with Portugal, Australia, and other appropriate countries and international organizations to develop policies to end the ongoing human suffering in East Timor.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering expresses the sense of Congress about the situation in East Timor, the predominantly Roman Catholic former Portuguese colony which was invaded by Indonesia in 1975. It is my hope that this amendment will be acceptable to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL), the chairman of the committee, and to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLARZ), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs.

On September 14, 1982, the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs held a hearing on developments in East Timor and reviewed the provisions of a sense of Congress resolution I had introduced concerning East Timor, House Concurrent Resolution 321.

The amendment I am offering is similar to House Concurrent Resolution 321, which updated an amendment I had offered to the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1980. That amendment became section 408 of Public Law 96-533.

Unfortunately, the plight of the people of East Timor continues to be a matter of international concern. The basic concerns expressed by Members of Congress in 1980 and 1982 are still relevant today.

If those concerns were to be summed up in one word, that word would be "access." Ever since the Indonesian invasion in December 1975, East Timor has been virtually shutoff to the outside world. One cannot go to East Timor without the specific approval of the Indonesian Government.

The isolation of East Timor has made it extremely difficult for the rest of the world to determine exactly what is occurring in the territory. This has led to considerable speculation from time to time as to what really is going on in East Timor. It has been a source of frustration to many international observers over the years that it has been so hard to get the facts about East Timor.

The amendment I am offering expresses the sense of Congress that the President should take all appropriate measures to encourage the Indonesians to allow increased access to East Timor by international relief agencies, international journalists, and international human rights organizations. It also seeks increased efforts to facilitate the reunification of families separated

because of developments in East Timor and the establishment of a full-time humanitarian relief presence in East Timor, rather than occasional visits from groups based elsewhere.

Finally, the amendment calls upon the administration to work with our concerned allies and the appropriate international organizations to develop policies to end the ongoing human suffering in East Timor. Over the past year, the United Nations has been taking a special look at the Timor situation, and there have been efforts in Portugal and in Australia to pursue diplomatic initiatives relating to East Timor.

On December 15, 1983, 105 Members of Congress wrote to President Reagan to call attention to the latest military offensive by Indonesia against Timorese resistance, to seek administration support for greater access to East Timor by the Red Cross, and to urge the administration to work with Portugal and Australia to develop policies to address the problem of East Timor.

The fact that 105 Members of Congress joined in this letter which I initiated indicates that congressional concern about East Timor is growing, rather than diminishing. This concern has been fueled by the reports of renewed fighting and the impact of such fighting on the populace of East Timor.

The amendment I am offering reflects generally the concerns that have been shared by at least 105 of our colleagues. I think it is appropriate these concerns be reflected in the foreign aid authorization bill before us today. Therefore, I would urge that this amendment be adopted.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. Chairman, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, I want to say to our colleagues in the Committee today that we have carefully and closely examined this problem. We share the concerns of the gentleman from Ohio.

I think this amendment is completely acceptable to the Committee insofar as it expresses our continuing humanitarian concern over the problems on East Timor and calls upon governments in the region, particularly the Government of Indonesia, to respond effectively to the problem of Timore.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for offering the amendment and indicate that we are pleased to accept it.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his concern and for his acceptance of the amendment.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) for his continuing concern about this part of the world and for all of his efforts to try to relieve the problems and the suffering in East Timor.

The minority has no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BEREUTER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BEREUTER: Insert the following new section and renumber accordingly:

FACILITATING INTERNATIONAL COMMERCE THROUGH MEXICO

SEC. 914. Recognizing that increased levels of balanced international trade are an essential component in an economic development program for the region and that the United States has traditionally been the most important trading partner for each of the nations of Latin America, it is the sense of Congress that current procedures and laws of the Government of Mexico, and practices of its officials constitute a significant impediment to the transit of vehicles carrying the commodities of international trade through Mexican territory. As the Government of Mexico has played a valuable role in assisting and encouraging the economic and political development of the region, and in offering advice to the United States as to constructive policies this nation might pursue with respect to peace and prosperity in the area, the Secretary of State, acting independently or with representatives of other Latin America nations, shall initiate negotiations with the Government of Mexico aimed at eliminating or reducing those impediments to international trade. The agenda for such negotiations should include discussions to encourage the Government of Mexico to accede to existing international custom conventions on international in-transit shipments. Such actions are to be taken in concert with the institution by the United States and the nations of the region where the transiting shipments originate, of appropriate and cooperative steps to make sealed-truck, no-inspection transit administratively acceptable to the Government of Mexico and other transited countries. Similar bilateral or multilateral negotiations by the Secretary of State with nations respecting the same international customs conventions are also encouraged. The Secretary of State shall report the status of these negotiations to Congress by January 1, 1985.

Mr. BEREUTER (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 Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides for a new section, section 914. It begins by expressing the sense of Congress that current procedures, laws, and practices of certain officials constitute a substantial impediment to international land transit of goods across the territory of Mexico.

Beyond the pure sense of Congress, it does instruct the Secretary of State to attempt to begin negotiations with the Government of Mexico aimed at eliminating and reducing impediments to international trade across Mexico, possibly including requests to Mexico to accede to existing international custom conventions on international in-transit shipments. It authorizes the Secretary of State to engage in both bilateral and multilateral negotiations for that purpose, and it requires a report from the Secretary back to the Congress by January 1, 1985.

□ 2020

I could provide additional details to my colleagues, but I understand that it may be acceptable to both sides.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. I would be pleased to yield to my chairman.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, we have examined the amendment. We agree with the gentleman and we are happy to accept it on this side.

Mr. BEREUTER. I thank the distinguished committee chairman.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. I would be pleased to yield to the gentleman from California.

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

I have not only examined the amendment, but I have talked to the gentleman much earlier about it. I think it is very constructive. This amendment, if adopted, could be the basis for increased commerce and trade throughout Central America. It could be very helpful to the efforts that we are all making on behalf of that region.

I urge my colleagues to adopt the amendment.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee and my colleagues for considering this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title IX?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCOLLUM

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCOLLUM: Page 79, after line 23, insert the following:

CHEMICAL AND TOXIN WEAPONS

SEC. 914. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) evidence accumulated by the United States, France, and other nations, and by the United Nations and other international organizations, indicates that lethal chemical weapons have been employed in the current war between Iran and Iraq;

(2) such evidence also indicates that the Soviet Union has employed lethal chemical and toxin weapons in Afghanistan and has supplied such weapons to its allies in Southeast Asia;

(3) such activities by the Soviet Union and other nations contravene arms control agreements which have been ratified by such nations; and

(4) exposure to lethal chemical and toxin weapons often causes slow and agonizing death, and few antidotes are available to treat exposure to such weapons.

(b) Therefore, it is the sense of Congress that the use and the supplying of lethal chemical and toxin weapons are inhumane and pose grave threats to humanity and that the United States should (1) increase its investigations of suspected instances of lethal chemical and toxin warfare, (2) encourage the development of antidotes for lethal chemical and toxin weapons, especially for the mycotoxin commonly referred to as "yellow rain", (3) urge other nations to investigate suspected instances of lethal chemical and toxin warfare, (4) help United Nations investigators gain access to areas where lethal chemical and toxin warfare is or has been suspected, and (5) negotiate with the Soviet Union and other nations to strengthen existing agreements and treaties regarding lethal chemical and toxin warfare to establish an effective and verifiable ban on the development, production, stockpiling, and use of lethal chemical and toxin weapons.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering states that it is the sense of Congress that the use and supplying of lethal chemical and toxin weapons are inhumane and pose grave threats to humanity, and that the United States should: First, increase its investigations of suspected instances of lethal chemical and toxin warfare; second, encourage the development of antidotes for lethal chemical and toxin weapons, especially for the mycotoxin commonly referred to as "yellow rain"; third, urge other nations to investigate suspected instances of lethal chemical and toxin warfare; fourth, help the U.N. investigators gain access to areas where lethal chemical and toxin warfare is or has been suspected, and fifth, negotiate with the Soviet Union and other nations to strengthen existing agreements and treaties regarding lethal chemical and toxin warfare to estab-

lish an effective and verifiable ban on the development, production, stockpiling, and use of lethal chemical and toxin weapons.

Evidence accumulated by the United States, France, and other nations, and by the United Nations and other international organizations indicates that lethal chemical weapons have been employed in the current war between Iran and Iraq, and also that the Soviet Union has employed lethal chemical and toxin weapons in Afghanistan, and has supplied such weapons to its allies in Southeast Asia.

We are aware of the ongoing controversy over the so-called yellow rain for which some evidence of its use exists in Southeast Asia and Afghanistan. The debate continues over the origin of the mycotoxins; do they exist in nature or are they manmade? The argument is that evidence on either side is inconclusive, because of lack of sufficient scientific evidence, which is reason enough to urge that the United States continue an aggressive sample collection and investigation into the use and production of lethal chemical and toxin weapons.

While there may be debate over yellow rain, there is no doubt that chemical weapons have been used in the Iran-Iraq war, and in Afghanistan. The evidence from Afghanistan clearly points to the employment of lethal chemical and toxin weapons by the Soviet Union. Furthermore, the evidence indicates that the Soviet Union has supplied such weapons to its allies in Southeast Asia.

Such activities by the Soviet Union and other nations contravene existing arms control agreements and must stop. We cannot stand idly by while more and more reports about the use of poison gases and mycotoxins are coming in from all over the world. The effects of chemical and toxin weapons on people are as bad or worse than the effects of nuclear weapons, and countries are a lot more likely to use them because they can be limited geographically and do not destroy the countryside. For this reason, they may be a greater threat to mankind than nuclear weapons.

Chemical and toxin weapons are not only illegal, they are immoral and more inhumane than most of us can imagine. Yellow rain, which is a deadly fungus—for which there is no known antidote—literally causes the entire body to break down and deteriorate, and the victim dies a slow and agonizing death.

During the past two administrations, the United States has taken the lead in attempting to expose alleged use of chemical and toxin weapons in Afghanistan and Southeast Asia. In 1980, the Carter administration published a detailed compilation of the allegations. It also pushed for an investiga-

tion of the charges under the sponsorship of the U.N. General Assembly—having anticipated the Soviet veto of an investigation by the Security Council. Under the Reagan administration, the Department has presented the first evidence based on toxicological testing, and released a comprehensive review of the available evidence in March 1982. Also, evidence has been given to other countries through diplomatic channels, and the matter has been brought up in private meetings with Soviet officials at all levels.

Investigations have been undertaken in the United Nations. In the case of Afghanistan and Southeast Asia, the United Nations sent a team of experts to investigate chemical warfare reports, but were not allowed into Laos, Kampuchea, or Afghanistan. However, they were nevertheless able to conduct a study in spite of this—and the evidence clearly indicated that violations did occur. In the case of the Iran-Iraq war, the U.N. team was able to go the site and conduct a full investigation.

In 1983, then Under Secretary Eagleburger—in a statement here on Capitol Hill—stated that the United States is seeking a verification agreement to complement the biological weapons convention, which presently has no provisions for verification. The 1925 Geneva protocol bans only the use of chemical weapons in war. Experience has shown that current compliance provisions are inadequate.

The most recent effort by the administration is the treaty the President has sent to Geneva banning the development, production, transfer, and stockpiling of chemical and toxin weapons. This treaty seeking a comprehensive ban on chemical weapons worldwide was presented to the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva in April. The Conference has now adjourned until June, at which time member nations will be able to review and discuss the 60-page proposed treaty.

It is important at this time for the Congress to demonstrate its support of this proposed treaty to ban lethal chemical and toxin weapons and to bring to world attention our grave concern over the continuing spread of lethal chemical and toxin weapons which pose inhumane threats to humanity. As strong and as unified a voice as possible must be raised demanding an accounting by the Soviet Union and other countries which are implicated in the use and supply of these weapons.

Now is the time to state our views and I urge the support and vote of my colleagues for this critical amendment expressing the sense of the Congress on this matter.

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

Mr. McCOLLUM. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much.

It is a most laudable amendment that the gentleman is offering, one I assume that everyone would support, but I have a bit of a problem with it.

How does this square with the administration's position of continuing the buildup of chemical weapons?

Mr. McCOLLUM. There is no discussion of it in this amendment. We avoided that entirely. We are encouraging the investigation of what is going on around the world, the exploration of antidotes and the proposal that the President recently made to ban it and have a new treaty to do that.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCOLLUM. I would be glad to.

Mr. MITCHELL. I assume that is not addressed, but people know about the administration's position on the buildup of chemical weapons. We might be accused of some kind of hypocrisy if we go ahead with this laudable amendment, which if I have the chance I will vote for, yet at the same time nations around the world know that the President says we will continue to build up our own chemical weapons.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Well, if I may interrupt the gentleman, it is my understanding that the President's position on that is that we build up our capabilities, not necessarily build up our stockpile of weapons.

This Member knows that we are drawing fine lines here, but it is not the purpose nor the intent of this resolution to deal with that area whatsoever.

Mr. MITCHELL. I thank the gentleman. It is a very, very fine line that the gentleman is drawing and one that might cause some confusion in the international scene.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman please yield before this goes too far?

Mr. McCOLLUM. Certainly.

Mr. FASCELL. The Committee on Foreign Affairs has long led the fight against the use of any form of chemical or biological warfare, I will say, and the gentleman from Maryland raises a very important point with regard to this particular amendment.

We have consistently urged international agreements at eliminating it without regard to the policy of any particular President and the Congress has spoken on that any number of times.

So in light of that and because of that background, although the gentleman from Maryland is absolutely correct, we are happy to accept the amendment of the gentleman from Florida on this side.

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

Mr. McCOLLUM. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. We are very happy to accept the amendment of the gentleman from Florida on this side. We think it is a constructive addition to the bill and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. McCOLLUM).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title IX?

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

Mr. Chairman, it was my intention tonight to introduce an amendment requiring that the President not go forth with his stated intention to withdraw the United States from UNESCO, absent specific authorization from Congress. However, given the opposition of committee leadership of both parties to consideration of such an amendment to this bill and the commitment of Chairman MICA of the International Operations Subcommittee and Chairman YATRON of the Human Rights and International Organizations Subcommittee to push for early consideration of legislation to postpone withdrawal at least a year, I have agreed not to press such an approach at this time. I do think it important, however, to provide a perspective for the record of the UNESCO issue.

The U.S. decision to leave the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) has enormous philosophical as well as practical implications for the foreign policy of the United States. It is therefore incumbent on Congress to review the administration's decision carefully and present alternative perspectives, if warranted.

As a former delegate to the U.N. General Assembly, I have witnessed firsthand the corruption in rhetoric that plagues the U.N. system today. American representatives have a responsibility to stand up foursquarely not only for U.S. interests but for the principle of rational dialog. But in diplomacy, as in sports, it does matter how you play the game, and I am apprehensive that joining too stridently in intemperate word games at the U.N. is not only immature but potentially counterproductive. More profoundly, deserting a principal U.N. agency appears at this time to be an unjustified response to an exaggerated problem.

Quitting is not the American way. Under the circumstances, it implies that we cannot stand the heat in the crucible of North-South and East-West debate.

As its name implies, UNESCO deals principally with international education, scientific and cultural concerns. But our decision to abandon ship has extraordinary strategic implications. Indeed, it might well be argued that the administration's ideological cut-and-run policy imperils U.S. security. After all, in the 20th century, no nation is an island. Security is collective rather than self-willed.

As Americans, we simply must come to grips with the reality that the United States does not now, nor will it ever again, claim as great a percentage of the world's economic and military might as it did at the end of World War II, when the United Nations system was established. Hence, in a very practical sense, our national security today requires that greater emphasis and sensitivity be applied to relations among States and to major international institutions such as the U.N. In a world which appears to have shifted, as Pope John Paul II recently warned, from a "post-war" to a "pre-war" mentality, responsible governments have an obligation to seek to strengthen rather than depreciate the U.N. and its affiliate organizations, like UNESCO.

The administration needs apparently to be reminded that the UNESCO withdrawal decision is being made at the precise time United States-Soviet tensions have returned to dangerous cold war levels and major bilateral arms control talks have been suspended. War rages in two parts of the Middle East, in Afghanistan, in Central America, and in vital areas of Africa. International terrorism is on the rise, placing the internal security of many nations in jeopardy. In addition, UNICEF tells us that some 400,000 children will perish daily from lack of adequate diet and sanitary drinking water. The scale of human suffering, particularly today in Africa, is staggering.

Given the fact that weapons of mass destruction have proliferated and that for the first time in world history civilization itself is jeopardized by man's warmaking capacities, the leadership of restraint has emerged as the only rational philosophical imperative of state-to-state relations. Existing international institutions and procedures may be flawed, but the case for retreat from international dialog is nonexistent.

It is in this larger context that we need to examine the administration's decision to withdraw from UNESCO.

The constitution of UNESCO begins with these well-known words:

The Governments of the States Parties to this Constitution on behalf of their peoples declare: That since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed.

Since UNESCO's inception 37 years ago, the United States has played a

major role in it and the majority of its programs.

As the administration's recently released U.S. UNESCO Policy Review acknowledges: "UNESCO leads the international effort to eradicate illiteracy." UNESCO has done valuable work in education planning and training in developing countries, in collecting statistical data not easily available elsewhere, in coordinating educational efforts internationally, and in the education of the aged disabled, and women.

In the science sector, the administration report notes that "UNESCO has been an effective international forum for encouraging scientific debate and cooperation." UNESCO promotes research, broadens access to research data, organizes international scientific efforts on a cost-sharing basis, and offers scientific and technological help to developing countries. Major UNESCO science programs in which the United States has an interest include the International Brain Research Organization, the International Center for Theoretical Physics, the International Geological Correlation Program, and the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, which provides marine data to the U.S. Navy and the U.S. scientific community. In addition, the Man in the Biosphere program, which fosters an integrated approach to the world's ecosystems, is widely acclaimed as one of UNESCO's most successful projects.

In the cultural sector, the United States has long supported UNESCO's preservation and conservation activities, and major U.S. institutions, such as the Smithsonian Institution, USIA, the National Endowment for the Arts, and National Endowment for the Humanities, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the National Park Service, have participated in UNESCO-related projects. The cultural heritage program, as the administration's report points out, has been exceedingly successful. The United States was one of the major contributors to the preservation of the Abu Simbel monument in Egypt and has, itself, eight natural and four cultural sites on the World Heritage List.

Even in one of the more controversial sectors of UNESCO activities—communications—the administration's report has a number of positive things to say. Because of UNESCO's activities in this area, the United States has had the opportunity to promote and defend U.S. values and methods in communications. The United States has not only not lost in any major debate but has prevailed in efforts to create the International Program for the Development of Communication (IPDC) which has given impetus for Third World countries to focus on practical as contrasted with ideological communications problems. In addition,

UNESCO with our support, assisted in the establishment of Africa's first community radio station in Kenya and was instrumental in giving guidance to the user-owned Caribbean News Agency. UNESCO also funds training fellowships in the United States as well as the procurement of U.S. communications equipment.

I take the time to point out the merits of these UNESCO programs because they have been obscured by the administration's sweeping criticisms and because they are representative of much of the evidence gathered during the administration's policy review of UNESCO. A careful reading of the administration's own documents does not convincingly lead to the conclusion that the weight of the evidence favors U.S. withdrawal. In fact, I would argue quite the reverse.

The administration's singular focus on UNESCO's shortcomings has given short shrift to the interests and views of U.S. domestic constituencies in the educational, scientific, and cultural area. The U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, established by Congress, voted 41 to 8, prior to the U.S. decision to withdraw, in favor of continued U.S. participation in UNESCO. In a November 8, 1983, letter to Assistant Secretary of State Newell, prior to the withdrawal decision, Dr. James B. Holderman, president of the University of South Carolina and Chairman of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, reported that "... the Commission is convinced that the best means of serving U.S. interests in UNESCO is to press for reform from within." It is also interesting to note a sampling of comments which a survey of 20 national associations yielded:

International Reading Association: UNESCO has become a convenient whipping boy ... UNESCO reinforces U.S. interests in many ways.

American Newspapers Publishers Association: ... (W)e feel that in order to continue strong U.S. support for the principles of free expression, freedom of the press and the international free flow of information, the U.S. should remain in UNESCO.

American Association for the Advancement of Science: ... (T)he U.S. should continue and enhance its active participation in UNESCO affairs.

National Education Association: ... (W)e urge the continuance of United States participation in UNESCO. We believe that a means can be found to improve the performance of UNESCO functions without overt financial intimidation of the institution and its Secretariat.

In testimony to Congress on May 2, Dr. Holderman reported that after submitting the results of his survey to Assistant Secretary Newell, Mr. Newell "called me to ask if there weren't some negatives that we could add to our report, to give it what he termed 'credibility.'" It is difficult to escape the impression that the administration chose for ideological reasons to

ignore perspectives which did not match its preselected policy option. It is simply a myth to assume that outside a few political appointees in the administration there is much insitutional support for U.S. withdrawal from UNESCO.

The League of Women Voters, testifying on May 2, stated that it is "opposed to the Administration's proposed withdrawal of the United States from UNESCO" and that the United States, by withdrawing, "would abdicate an important leadership role."

Dr. Walter Rosenblith reported to the Foreign Affairs Committee that an interagency assessment of UNESCO's natural sciences programs prepared under the supervision of the National Science Foundation and submitted to the State Department prior to the decision to withdraw states: "... the scientific benefits the United States derives from participation in UNESCO clearly warrant our continued participation." He noted that the National Academy of Sciences is "deeply concerned" with the potential impact of the U.S. decision to withdraw and that a preliminary review conducted by the Academy last fall concluded that in the area of the sciences at least, at the present time, there is "no real alternative to UNESCO."

Dr. Hans Weiler, a professor at Stanford University, testified that the loss of the U.S. financial contribution would deal a particularly heavy blow to UNESCO's educational programs and that termination of U.S. membership would also deprive UNESCO of the "tremendous pool of professional talent and human resources that is available in the educational community of this country." U.S. withdrawal, he said, would "send a signal to the rest of the world that the United States of America is turning its back on the one international institution which many of the world's poorer countries have come to regard as their last remaining hope for ... their fledgling educational systems."

Professor Weiler also cautioned against the assumption that the U.S. educational community is professionally self-sufficient and notes:

From its beginning, and not just in education, scholarship and professional life in this country has derived much of its vitality from interacting, communicating, and collaborating with professional colleagues and groups around the world. The remarkable influence of people like Montessori, Piaget, Steiner and others upon educational thought and practice in this country would not have been possible without a tradition of wide open channels of communication and interaction. ... (We) can ill afford to place ourselves outside of the one functioning network of communication that is provided by UNESCO.

With respect to the disarmament programs which the administration has criticized, Dr. Harold K. Jacobson,

professor of political science at the University of Michigan and now visiting fellow at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, noted that "In recent years U.S. social scientists have participated in and organized UNESCO sponsored conferences dealing with such topics as arms control and disarmament education * * * Jacobson noted that education about disarmament and arms control is quite separate from the issue of negotiation, which is more properly the responsibility of other U.N. bodies. In this regard, it should be stressed that a growing number of U.S. universities have courses on peace and disarmament subjects and that the U.N. General Assembly has urged UNESCO to increase its consideration of these issues."

Ironically, U.S. opposition to UNESCO activities in this area leaves the impression that peace is a Soviet initiative. This defies our traditions and runs counter to a decade-long effort of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to point out the costliness of the arms race to all countries in the world. Arms control must be led by the superpowers, but it is the responsibility of all, with the cost implications greater in the developing world than in our own society. Far from being irrelevant to UNESCO activities, arms control is central to the capacity of many countries to provide adequate resources to education and development.

Everyone who is familiar with UNESCO is well aware of the problems plaguing that institution. They are serious. The administration's statement of December 29, 1983, announcing the decision to withdraw, charged that UNESCO "extraneously politicized virtually every subject it deals with," "has exhibited hostility toward the basic institutions of a free society, especially a free market and a free press," and "has demonstrated unrestrained budgetary expansion."

Congress has been fully cognizant of the problems in UNESCO as in many other U.N. agencies and in the General Assembly itself. It is precisely because of this awareness and concern that Congress has, by law, authorized the administration to take action if Israel is illegally expelled or in any other fashion denied her right to participate, or if UNESCO implements any policy or procedure which has the effect of licensing journalists or imposing censorship or restrictions on the free flow of information. In the case of the first scenario, involving Israel, Congress has authorized the United States to suspend its participation and withhold payment of its assessed contribution until any illegal action against Israel is reversed. In the case of the second scenario, in which actions might be taken against a free

press, U.S. funding to UNESCO is to be suspended.

Because congressional concern is so deep as to be reflected in statute it is instructive to examine where UNESCO stands on these two issues at present.

In the case of the Israeli question, Assistant Secretary of State Gregory Newell acknowledged at a hearing held by the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations on February 7, 1984, that the Israeli question was not a problem for the United States and that this particular concern was not a reason for the U.S. withdrawal.

Ambassador Edmund Hennelly, head of the U.S. delegation to the 22d General Conference in the fall of 1983, also testified in congressional hearings April 25, 1984, that at the last General Conference "There was no challenge to Israeli credentials. Anti-Israeli rhetoric was nearly nonexistent."

In a report to Congress in February 1983—required under section 108 of Public Law 97-241—the administration stated that, "While there have been a number of unacceptable resolutions on Middle East questions ... the worst excesses have been avoided." It further said that efforts to deny Israel her right to participate, such as had taken place in the IAEA, "have not prospered in recent years in UNESCO." Why? Largely, the report explains, because of the "forceful presentation of U.S. Government views, skillful diplomatic intervention by the Director General, and help of moderates in the Group of 77." Clearly, on this major issue, the United States has forcefully presented its case and successfully carried the day.

Not only has UNESCO moderated on the Israeli issue, but, according to a January article in the *Manchester Guardian*, "The Israeli Government, concerned about the threat to its own membership, made strenuous efforts to stop the United States leaving UNESCO." The Israeli concern, the article went on to say, "was raised in a confidential 'action memorandum' sent to the Secretary of State, Mr. George Shultz, on December 16, last year. ... Later the article says, in quoting the same memorandum, "The Israelis have expressed concern that with the United States absent, Israel would eventually be ejected from UNESCO." As one well-informed diplomat observed, the U.S. decision to withdraw places Israel in a particularly awkward position. Israel's enemies are always looking for ways to deny it participation in international organizations; consequently, Israeli policy is premised on efforts, often strenuous, to join and stay in as many as possible. But, if the United States decides at the end of the year to withdraw, and Israel finds itself forced by

circumstances to follow, it will have a far more difficult time rejoining UNESCO in the future than will the United States. Those who want to delegitimize Israel will be given an enormous boost.

It is unclear to me how the United States can actively defend our own interests, let alone the right of Israel to participate in UNESCO, from an empty chair.

With respect to issues of a free press and freedom of communication, which is the second area in which Congress has taken a firm stand, the administration reported to Congress on February 29, 1984, that "The Department of State concludes that UNESCO is not, at this time, actively implementing any policy or procedure proscribed by section 109 of Public Law 97-241. None of the programs included in the second medium term plan—adopted in late 1982—or approved in the program and budget for 1984-85 pose any active, direct threat to a free press." Section 109 of Public Law 97-241, as my colleagues will recall, states that U.S. funds cannot be used for payments to UNESCO "if that organization implements any policy or procedure the effect of which is to license journalists or their publications, to censor or otherwise restrict the free flow of information within or among countries, or to impose mandatory codes of journalistic practice or ethics."

The administration's February 1984 report continues by saying that marginal gains were made at the 22d UNESCO General Conference in the communications sector:

On the ideological level, our view that any NWICO is "an evolving, continuous process," not an established, defined order, was accepted. Also accepted was our contention that any study of a "right" to communicate must take into account traditional human rights (as opposed to collective, second generation rights). We successfully introduced new studies to the work program for 1984-85 concerning the "watch-dog" role of the press, role of the private media, censorship and self-censorship, and ways to strengthen freedom of information. We were also successful in eliminating projects calling for studies of the "tasks" of the media, safety of journalists and grants to journalist organizations to study "codes" of conduct, and implementation of the Mass Media Declaration.

In the administration's "U.S./UNESCO Policy Review," the administration also admitted that "the recent 22nd General Conference debate on this subject gave evidence of a new and welcome degree of moderation. . . ." Although questions remain whether that moderation will increase or diminish, it does not take skilled guesswork to figure out that the hand of the Soviets and Third World radicals will be strengthened if the pre-eminent advocate of democratic values absents itself from future debate.

Dana Bullen, executive secretary of the World Press Freedom Committee, which speaks for various free press organizations in the West, was also quoted in the New York Times on November 17, 1983, as saying, "If anyone is looking for an assault on the media at this conference serious enough to justify United States withdrawal, they won't find it."

In congressional hearings April 25, 1984, Leonard Sussman, executive director of Freedom House and representative for the United States on many of the most controversial communications issues at the last General Conference, testified that over the years, "The Soviets have been repeatedly rebuffed," and that Director-General M'Bow "has quietly helped block Soviet press-control initiatives." He warned that "if we leave, the chances for greater use of UNESCO's considerable forum to debate press-control measures will increase, not decrease . . ."

To document how the Soviets have been rebuffed, Sussman notes: "In 1970 the U.S.S.R.'s mild communications draft was put off. In 1972, the U.S.S.R.'s stronger draft was put off. In 1976, the U.S.S.R.'s outrageous draft was defeated. In 1978 came the showdown. The harshest Soviet draft of all was killed the night before it was to have been debated. It was killed by Director-General M'Bow's personal intercession. In place of the Soviet draft, a Western-oriented version was substituted."

Like the administration's report, Sussman's testimony indicates that free press advocates at the 1983 General Conference were successful in strengthening UNESCO's communication program. He also reported that a Soviet draft on monitoring the press was negotiated out of existence and thus never received serious consideration. In an earlier radio interview, Mr. Sussman also indicated that it became very clear to him at the General Conference that the word had come down from the UNESCO Director General that the conference was not to be raucous or anti-Western on communications issues and that it was instead to try to accommodate the concerns of the West, particularly those of the United States. In a letter to the New York Times, Sussman again noted that the World Press Freedom Committee, Editor and Publisher magazine, and a number of newspaper editorialists . . . reported that for the first time in years these communications negotiations generally favored the Western free-press position."

We must keep in perspective that UNESCO did not invent censorship, nor the idea of a state-controlled press. Rather, it has become a forum for a debate on these practices. As such, we should not shy away from

the opportunity the institution provides to argue for our values—for a free press and freedom of expression. An activist human rights policy, one would think, would include active advocacy of the principles embedded in our Bill of Rights. The administration is correct to object—and object strenuously—to efforts to sanction controls on a free press. But to retreat when proper advocacy is prevailing strikes many UNESCO observers as an ironic, if not counterproductive, strategy.

It would also appear somewhat ironic for the United States to object too strenuously to the politicization of UNESCO while also advocating freedom of communication and freedom of expression. It would be contrary to Western traditions and democratic principles to imply that fair—perhaps even unfair—criticisms of the United States and the West should not be tolerated in international organizations. Our traditions as codified in the Bill of Rights are based upon the premise of Thomas Jefferson that in the free airing of views, truth would triumph over error. We have a right to be concerned, even enraged at times, over the excessive political rhetoric displayed within the U.N. system, particularly the trashing of the United States, its allies, and Israel by some of its more radical members. But our refusal to participate in UNESCO could well send a message that the United States is reluctant to rely on the outcome of the ongoing battle of words and that we are not confident our philosophical position will prevail. Some might also conclude that the flip side of refusing to do battle with words is a potentially excessive reliance on military means to resolve international disputes.

We must all acknowledge that although the United States may be the target of considerable criticism that lacks justification there is an element to that kind of free expression of views that is quite healthy. To repeat a point made in a different context earlier, it is difficult to understand how we can more effectively protect our national interests in a free press and the free flow of information from an empty chair.

Likewise, the administration also objects to other "statist" concepts debated at UNESCO such as the "New International Economic Order" and the "rights of peoples." The merits of our position aside, I fail to understand how the United States will defend the interests of its business community, promote the idea of a free market and stand up for its human rights principles if it absents itself from the fora at which competing ideas are debated.

Ambassador Hennelly, again in testimony before a congressional committee, noted that there was a "victory" for the free enterprise position when

proposals to bring UNESCO into the business of establishing a "code of conduct" for transnational corporations was, after a great deal of behind-the-scenes maneuvering and debate, reduced to a meager call for further study.

In the area of human rights, Ambassador Hennelly noted that an appropriate distinction was made between traditional human rights and people's rights and that "Language introduced by the United States in key places in the program and budget document was adopted by consensus. The effect," he noted, "is to distinguish between traditional human rights 'which are universally accepted' and 'people's rights,' which require additional study."

Again Leonard Sussman, as executive director of Freedom House, presented a compelling argument in his testimony to Congress for active U.S. engagement in—not withdrawal from—the debate over "people's rights." Sussman noted that the concept of people's rights did not originate with the Soviets but at an all-African conference in 1976 and is incorporated into the Charter of Human and People's Rights of the Organization of African Unity (OAU). He testified that the U.S. position in the human rights debate from 1982 on has essentially been to work toward killing the term "people's rights" rather than influencing the debate to effect a real improvement in its substance. Sussman then continues by saying:

Yet Americans, above all, have a stake in the proper defining of human rights. Which other country has a longer tradition of pressing for self-determination of peoples? Wilson's Fourteen Points are peoples' rights! The Soviet Union cannot possibly support such a traditional definition of the term. The USSR is the largest violator of peoples' rights: in the Baltic countries, Afghanistan, the Ukraine, among the Tartars, the Jews and in Eastern Europe . . . Rightly defined, peoples' rights should be seen as a central aspect of the democratic tradition. The term "peoples' rights" is admittedly ambiguous, but the ambiguity cuts both ways. On the one hand, it seems synonymous with rights of states, particularly economic and security rights, but on the other hand, the new terminology seems to place the existence of "peoples" above and prior to that of states. . . .

It is a continuing scandal that the U.N. has been allowed to see self-determination as applying only to the former colonies of European powers and the United States. "Peoples' rights" offer the West a needed opportunity to redress this mistake. The countries ruling over captive peoples today are generally communist tyrannies and that point should be driven home. . . .

We should not let the implication become accepted that because democracy begins with a consideration of the rights of individuals, it does not recognize as essential to their expression, collective institutions that secure these rights in a community or among communities composed of many individuals with necessarily conflicting rights.

Sussman also states that UNESCO's Committee on Conventions and Rec-

ommendations, which hears in private the complaints of violations of human rights by member states, allows for organizations such as Freedom House to bring human rights cases before the defendant country's peers. He concludes that this committee is "more effective and fairer than the United Nations Commission on Human Rights" and that it has been responsible for the "release of individuals who suffered long and unjust imprisonment, and often torture."

I might add here that while some would argue that if the United States withdraws it could count on other Western and like-minded governments to defend our interests, one of the American delegates to the UNESCO conference observed privately that on a series of international corporate issues, European interests were best served by isolating—not protecting—the U.S. position and that it is risky business to assume that our competitors will not want to take advantage of certain issues where they can. But, even if one were to assume a synonymy of interests, the notion of conducting a global campaign to get others to join us in our walkout leads to the inevitable question that if an empty-chair diplomacy does not make sense, how will a half-empty table make matters better for Western and democratic values?

Finally, some comments on the budget issue are in order. Fiscal restraint is the watchword these days in Washington and around the world. However, it is curious to note that while the administration is correct in charging UNESCO with program growth, the administration's budget figures show an actual decline of some 13 percent in UNESCO's 1984-85 biennium as calculated in nominal dollars. Because of that nominal cut in UNESCO's budget, a rebate on last year's payment and the strength of the U.S. dollar, U.S. assessed payments to that organization will decline from some \$49.79 million in 1983 to \$24.8 million in 1984. UNESCO has done a better job in restraining its budget in the last 2 years than the Reagan administration and Congress have our own. And it may prove to be exceedingly difficult for the administration to argue we should leave UNESCO because of unrestrained budget growth when all the evidence points to a major savings in UNESCO's budget costs to the American taxpayer this year.

It is also important to note that the budget growth has not been as "unrestrained" as the administration asserts. The original budget proposed by UNESCO called for an increase of some 10 percent in program growth but due to efforts by member states to bring that growth rate down, a "Nordic Compromise" was finally accepted by the General Conference which brought the growth rate down

to the 3.8-5.5 percent range. It is precisely because of budget concerns expressed by the United States and other significant donors that UNESCO moderated its position. Again, it would appear that we are cutting and running, despite substantial success in getting our way.

It should also be pointed out that UNESCO expenditures under that budget have significant spinoff benefits for the United States. The administration reported last year that "fellowships to Americans and foreign students studying in the United States, procurement of U.S. equipment, and consultant's fees and payments to American staff, amount to about 40 percent of the value of the U.S. contribution. Similarly, United States prominence in UNESCO's science and education sectors creates markets for U.S. scientific and educational products and materials."

It is worth noting here that the administration has not, to date, conducted an extensive assessment of the potential impact of U.S. withdrawal from UNESCO on U.S. economic interests in international trade and commerce. While the administration argues that it is working to identify bilateral and multilateral alternatives to UNESCO, it is difficult to know how expensive these will be or if the administration can promise OMB support for them, no matter what the cost. A go-it-alone approach appears not only to be irresponsible from a diplomatic perspective, but is almost surely to be the most expensive. The administration is also making the dubious argument that one approach might be to leave UNESCO but continue participating in certain UNESCO-related activities in the area of copyrights, oceanography, and special projects. While that might be possible, the United States would no longer be represented in the main UNESCO policymaking bodies dealing with issues in these areas and thus absent from policy debates which might ultimately have an effect on those activities in which we continue to have an interest. To participate in any serious endeavor while forgoing leadership responsibilities in the making of policy ill befits a great country with great interests.

Other management and personnel complaints are frequently raised by the administration about UNESCO, many of them justified. However, it is important to establish a balanced record in this regard. For example, it is significant that there are roughly twice as many Americans in professional positions at UNESCO as Soviets. At the end of 1983, the United States had over 80 citizens in professional jobs at UNESCO. The Soviets had only 36. Of this number, certainly more than a few are likely, alas, to be agents of the KGB. This is a sorry

aspect of all U.N. organizations. Critics of UNESCO would bolster their arguments for U.S. withdrawal on this sad phenomenon, but it must be pointed out that such an argument applies to all U.N. agencies and the United Nations, itself. The KGB represents tough, no-nonsense opposition, but its existence should be recognized, not cowered from. The United Nations and its specialized agencies provide more advantages to U.S. foreign policy than agents of our principal geostrategic rival can subvert. Care must be taken not to allow the KGB agent argument to set a precedent that could lead either to the ending of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union or to United States withdrawal from the United Nations, itself.

It is difficult to understand what caused the administration to take so drastic an action as to serve notice of its intent to terminate membership in UNESCO. It is unclear what other alternatives—short of total withdrawal—were considered nor why they were rejected in favor of this radical option.

In the report to Congress last year required under section 108 of Public Law 97-241, we were told by the administration that "U.S. interests are generally well served by UNESCO Programs, which are, for the most part, non-political and which can most effectively be pursued through international cooperation." The same administration report also said "UNESCO is a major forum for U.S. multilateral diplomacy. As such, it provides the U.S. with an opportunity to promote U.S. (and Western) values and methods—particularly in the Third World."

Why then has the administration taken the decision it has to withdraw from UNESCO? And, if the latest General Conference was as constructive as the administration reported it to be, why has the United States concluded that UNESCO is more beyond hope this year than last? Why is the United States now engaged in a cut-and-run policy?

As recently as February 3, 1983, at a meeting of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, Assistant Secretary of State Newell discussed the results of a 1982 special meeting of the Commission and recalled that "The 'basic thrust of that special meeting was the unanimous recommendation that the United States should continue to remain a member of UNESCO, but that the effectiveness of U.S. participation in the work of the organization be increased.' He then added: 'I fully support your review then and support the conclusions of that meeting now.' There appeared to be little in the Secretary's prepared statement that would hint of a 180-degree turnabout and a decision within the year to actually withdraw from UNESCO."

It is difficult to conclude anything except that the impetus for withdraw-

al derives as much from an ideological, anti-U.N. bias as a pragmatic concern for certain institutional problems attendant to our participation in UNESCO.

Ironically, the most telling argument against U.S. withdrawal comes by analogy from the first Republican President, Abraham Lincoln. Lincoln, we will recall, rejected the approach of those abolitionists who would have accepted the secession of the Southern States in an effort to rid the Nation of slavery. He did not consider it heroic for an individual or country simply to wash its hands of slavery. To do good took sacrifice and work, not just moral posturing.

It would appear that strong ideological and/or domestic political concerns intervened in a process of what would otherwise have been a rational, professional calculation of U.S. interests, benefits, and problems in UNESCO. The language of U.S. criticism to date has been exceedingly strong but surprisingly ill-defined. For the administration to refuse to produce a detailed case is to acknowledge implicitly that there may be holes in that case. And for the administration to refuse to submit a laundry list of changes it wants in UNESCO procedures is to imply ideological hardheadedness and a desire not be too serious about reform.

As the United Nations Association testified recently: "It is not constructive to voice superficial complaints without offering suggestions for specific remedies."

The decision to withdraw appears to represent as much an indictment of U.S. policy and performance within UNESCO as it represents an indictment of UNESCO itself. The greatest democracy in the world has been brought to its knees in this important international forum as much by irrational forces at home as those abroad. Political leadership in America has appealed to the lowest rather than the highest instincts of the body politic and in this case allowed nationalistic irrationality to prevail.

In testimony before Congress, Leonard Sussman made an apt analogy to the McCarthy era when he expressed his hope that we would "put behind us the scare tactics introduced into UNESCO investigations by former Senator Joe McCarthy. In 1953-54 he conducted the first probe of UNESCO after accusing the American delegates and State Department staffers of being Communists. A full-scale investigation was conducted in 1956 and the charges found to have no validity." Sussman concludes, "The McCarthy approach turned us against ourselves, reflecting our inability to influence the world as some would have liked. This phenomenon will always be with us. Its opposite—accusing other countries of consistent anti-Americanism—

is no less prevalent. The truth generally lies somewhere in between: recognizing that Americans do not always effectively support their own principles and positions, and other countries do indeed have differing national interests which cannot always be accommodated to ours."

Not long ago, we might recall, the U.S. Representative to the United Nations suggested that perhaps we should consider moving the U.N. headquarters to Moscow for 6 months out of the year. Another U.S. Ambassador said he would gladly stand at the dock and wave goodbye to the U.N. delegates. New York Mayor Ed Koch jumped into the fray by calling the U.N. a "cesspool," and the Senate chimed in by adopting the so-called Kassebaum amendment, which called for major cuts in our contributions to the United Nations and four of its agencies, including UNESCO.

Fortunately, cooler heads prevailed and more extremist perspectives were avoided. The President himself went on record opposing the Kassebaum amendment and told a gathering of U.N. delegates in New York that the United States was proud to be the home of the United Nations.

Now, as we face the impending withdrawal of the United States from UNESCO, it is my hope that cooler heads again will prevail and that the President will take a close look at what his subordinates have recommended. There is evidence a review process is under way, but it is unclear how seriously it will be conducted. In a memorandum from NSC adviser Robert MacFarlane to the Secretary of State last December, MacFarlane states that the decision to withdraw was made with reluctance and that the President wants us to continue to make every effort to bring about meaningful change in UNESCO over the next year. That memorandum also indicates the President's desire that the Department of State consider upgrading U.S. representation to UNESCO and appointing a panel of individuals from the academic, media, and corporate world to advise the administration on this matter. Finally, MacFarlane indicated White House willingness to review the decision if concrete changes materialized in UNESCO this year.

In a second memorandum dated February 11, 1984, MacFarlane stated that in order to carry out the President's wishes, a major campaign to turn UNESCO around during 1984 would be needed. He suggests that such a campaign might include an action plan, the mobilization of international support and more involvement in UNESCO personnel assignments.

In this context it would seem particularly appropriate for Congress to exercise a major oversight role this

year. The minimal consultation which took place with Congress about the withdrawal decision reflects unilateral expansion of Executive prerogative. It belies serious efforts to craft bipartisan, bi-institutional approaches to foreign policy.

Accordingly, I have introduced legislation (H.R. 5082) which would go beyond a simple requirement of consultation, to require the President to seek specific authorization from Congress should an Executive recommendation be made to terminate U.S. membership in UNESCO. The Constitution is silent on the subject of terminating international agreements of this nature. Since joining UNESCO in 1946 involved a partnership effort on the part of the executive branch and the Congress and an authorizing resolution passed by both Houses it would seem logical that the decision to terminate our membership would likewise be made on a partnership basis. As it stands now, the Congress has simply been presented a fait accompli.

I have reviewed the constitutional and legal issues raised by the bill with the American Law Division of the Congressional Research Service, which outlined a substantial legal and constitutional case both for and against congressional involvement.

In support for the approach I advocate, it is important to point out that under U.S. law, the international agreement embodying the UNESCO Constitution is considered to be a congressional-executive agreement, not a treaty. President Truman, in accepting membership for the United States in UNESCO pursuant to specific statutory authorization passed by both the House and Senate in 1946, cited that law (Public Law 565, 79th Congress) as the basis of his authority in depositing the U.S. instrument of accession at UNESCO.

Second, it should be noted that the Constitution makes no express provision for the making, let alone termination, of international congressional-executive agreements. Even where the Constitution does speak to the making of treaties themselves, it makes no mention of their termination or whether the Senate, whose advice and consent is required on their making, is similarly required to concur with their termination. Since the Constitution contains no explicit authority for making of agreements which are not treaties, it is difficult to assert with total precision that the President maintains unchallengeable authority in this area. Interestingly, it does not appear that our forefathers ever debated this issue in drafting that document.

Third, if for the purposes of analogy the role of Congress or the Senate with respect to termination of treaties were to be examined, there would appear to be no definitive judicial rul-

ings on the matter. In the 1979 *Goldwater v. Carter* case, the district court held that the President's unilateral termination of our defense treaty with Taiwan was unconstitutional in the absence of the concurrence of either the Senate or both Houses of Congress. However, the court of appeals reversed that decision largely, it seems, on the basis that the President has the authority to recognize foreign governments. In the final analysis, the U.S. Supreme Court vacated the judgment and remanded the case with directions to dismiss the complaint. Thus, there are contradictory and inconclusive judicial pronouncements to which we might turn in the case before us. What is clear, however, is that there has been no judicial resolution of this question.

Fourth, actual practice with respect to the termination of treaties does not offer a clear guide to the situation before us. There are examples where the President has acted to terminate treaties pursuant to prior authorization by Congress, where he has acted but later received legislative approval for his actions, and where he has acted and received no response one way or another from Congress. However, in reviewing the record of practice up to 1979, the District Court in the *Goldwater v. Carter* case concluded—even in the face of some 13 instances cited by the executive branch in support of the President's alleged right to act unilaterally on treaty termination—that as a whole, the "historical precedents support rather than detract from the position that the power to terminate treaties is a power shared by the political branches of this government." *Goldwater v. Carter*, 481 F. Supp. 949, 960 (D.D.C. 1979). The court of appeals observed, however, in reviewing the same historical record, that in no case was a treaty continued in force over the President's opposition.

Fifth, turning to situations much closer to the one before us, it is instructive to consider the U.S. withdrawal from the ILO. However, the situation is not altogether analogous in that there was little congressional opposition and no legislative challenge that I am aware of to the administration's authority like that posed by H.R. 5082.

Thus, in the absence of guidance from the Constitution, case law, or practice, broader, more theoretical arguments become particularly germane. For example, Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution cites the duty of the President to take care that the laws are faithfully executed. If the Congress were to pass this legislation, the President would presumably be bound by the constitutional requirement to honor the law and would be skating on thin ice to proceed with withdrawal from UNESCO prior to obtaining the

required statutory authority from Congress to do so. In a frequently cited concurring opinion in *Youngstown Sheet and Tube Co. v. Sawyer*, Justice Jackson said:

When the President takes measures incompatible with the expressed or implied will of Congress, his power is at its lowest ebb . . .

In addition, Congress possesses a residual foreign affairs power under the Necessary and Proper Clause of the Constitution (Article I, Section 8, clause 18) under which legislative competence could be asserted with respect to international agreements authorizing U.S. membership in international organizations. In the past, Congress has authorized U.S. participation or membership in various international organizations pursuant to joint resolution and has exercised a great deal of authority in the foreign affairs area, as in the War Powers Resolution and Case Act.

The Supreme Court has affirmed the power of Congress to terminate a treaty for purposes of domestic law by enacting inconsistent domestic statutes at a later time. Logically, the same rule could be applied to congressional-executive agreements. Thus, if it can be argued that Congress has the authority effectively to compel the President by statute to stop adhering to certain international treaties, might not Congress have the power through statute to compel the executive to continue adherence?

Membership in international organizations of this nature should never be considered cast in permanent stone. But when termination of involvement in an organization of such stature is under consideration, it is incumbent on the administration to bring its case to the Congress and the American public. A jointly made decision would certainly give any administration a stronger position in its efforts to protect and advance American interests.

Finally, there have been allegations of mismanagement within UNESCO, both with respect to finances as well as personnel, and the General Accounting Office at the request of Congress has just begun a review of the agency's management practices. Congress should rightfully be concerned with these allegations and if there is merit to them we should work to rectify the situation. But let us be careful to keep petty abuses of power in perspective. Problems attendant with human foibles should be rooted out, but let us not allow concern for one director's management style mask an ideological pouting here at home. To refuse to stay and fight corruption from within is a denial of international responsibility. It may be a form of corruption itself. Given the weakness of the administration case as presented to date, I personally welcome the

involvement of the GAO in assisting in evaluating UNESCO's budgetary problems. But whatever the result of an independent investigation of UNESCO's management practices, it should be clear that few in Congress favor the disengagement of the United States from the entire United Nations system.

Here, it must be noted that not only has Director General M'Bow been responsive to U.S. concerns on both the freedom of press and Israeli issues, but just today he has announced a willingness to address certain administrative housekeeping problems. In order to reassess UNESCO personnel procedures, a joint advisory working group composed of UNESCO officials and outside experts will be immediately established by the Director General. In addition, Mr. M'Bow has announced his intention to delegate authority to make personnel appointments up to a certain level to the Assistant Director General for Administration, George Saddler, an American, until the appointment of a Deputy Director General, at which time the Deputy Director General will be granted this authority in consultation with Assistant Directors General responsible for the sectors concerned.

The Director General has also announced that he will create an internal working group to examine existing programs in order to identify duplication and overlap which has already come to light in implementing the 1984-85 program. The group will also study the priorities for consideration in drafting the 1986-87 program and will take into consideration the positions of member states and nongovernmental organizations, the need for program concentration, and the need for orienting UNESCO activities toward concrete action. Mr. M'Bow also plans to establish a joint advisory group of outside high-ranking specialists and UNESCO officials to undertake a complete review of budgeting techniques and to make recommendations on the implementation of new procedures as well as the presentation of the budget of the next biennium. He intends to call together a group of experts to advise him on programing and evaluation matters, and will submit his proposals on this subject to the Executive Board in closed session when discussing the restructuring of the Secretariat.

In any regard, there is no graceful exit from the dilemma the United States now faces. My own view is that, absent congressional restrictions, the prospect of the President reconsidering his decision at the end of the year is not great even if changes occur in the methods of operation of the UNESCO Secretariat. The enthusiasm for withdrawal of certain narrow political groupings within the United States is of such magnitude as to pre-

clude the likelihood of serious political review. What appears to have occurred is a decision of the administration to sacrifice UNESCO as one of an array of social compact issues with the so-called New Right. This is unfortunate not only for advancement of U.S. national interests within UNESCO, but for the implications it carries for similar U.N. institutions. If no serious dissent is registered against the administration's decision, a precedent will be established whereby one by one other international institutions are likely to be targeted by narrow interest groups and a similar approach instigated.

The American people are more deeply committed to the United Nations than many of its critics recognize. A CBS/New York Times poll, for instance, conducted in September 1983 revealed that 89 percent of the public favor the United States staying in the United Nations while only 5 percent favor withdrawal. In commenting on the results of the poll, CBS News noted that the Gallup Organization has asked about U.S. participation in the United Nations since 1951. It has consistently found the public supportive of U.S. participation. But never in its history of asking that question have as few as 5 percent favored getting out.

The American people seem to understand better than American politicians that isolationism has no place in the world today. If there is any hope of diminishing intolerance and hostility among nations, it must come through a greater international commitment to education and mutual understanding which UNESCO symbolizes. Security in the 20th century may in the final measure relate as much to education and cultural advancement as the acquisition of increasingly costly and sophisticated arsenals of war. In a world in which weapons of mass destruction exist, arms control—while a prerequisite—is not enough. It is imperative to build up international organizations and advance international techniques of conflict resolution. Centuries ago, American settlers could draw wagons around a campfire and provide protection against Indians, but today the only real protection against nuclear weapons is an advancement of human understanding. In this context, it would seem to be the height of folly for the United States to renege on our international responsibilities.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title IX?

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the chairman for the hard work he has contributed to this bill and to say I appreciate his efforts; I also believe this is the appropriate time to bring up a serious problem concerning the country of Haiti.

Mr. Chairman, I was fully prepared to offer an amendment here today that would have cut off all foreign aid to Haiti under this bill. From several perspectives, I am opposed to sending 1 more cent to Haiti, a country with an abominable human rights record—those who have power there show no respect for the rights of that country's own citizens and no respect for rights of others, such as U.S. citizens working in Haiti.

I know this not only from reports in the press, reports by our own Government, and reports from international organizations. I know this firsthand because a man from west Texas—a businessman who went to Haiti some years back to pursue a development venture, under a contract with the Government of Haiti—was blatantly victimized by a government showing no regard for his individual and economic rights.

Much more was victimized than Mr. Don Pierson and his company, Dupont Caribbean, Inc., who lost millions of dollars when their property was illegally seized—one more opportunity to help lift the Haitian people out of abject and grinding poverty was also victimized. Mr. Pierson and his company went to Haiti to pursue an island development project that would have brought capital and jobs to one of the poorest places on Earth—only to have their contract canceled on a pretext and their property expropriated.

Perhaps this should not be so surprising. The report of the Foreign Affairs Committee accompanying this bill contains the following findings:

The human rights situation in Haiti . . . has in fact deteriorated. As the Department of State's most recent annual human rights report to the Congress states: "Haiti's political history has been one of authoritarian rule characterized by periods of political instability and human rights abuses. . . . Freedom of speech, press, and association is restricted and due process guarantees relating to judicial procedure are frequently disregarded. . . . The Committee is seriously concerned."

Mr. Chairman, I am seriously concerned, too. Mr. Pierson and his company were never given anything resembling due process in the Haitian courts.

But what surprises me is the reaction of our State Department: It did nothing to defend the rights or property of U.S. citizens in this case. It did not declare an expropriation when one clearly existed. It never inquired into the substantive evidence—if any existed—presented by the Haitian Government in court proceedings that were conducted without any notification to Mr. Pierson or his lawyers. It never investigated egregious due process violations, but simply said that the court record showed the Haitian Government may have had a reasonable case.

In short, the State Department did not do its job.

Mr. Chairman, if this expropriation had happened at the avaricious whim of the government of a Khomeini or a Qadhafi, instead of a Duvalier, our Government would have raised a hue and cry.

Why, then does such an illegal act by a country with whom we are supposed to have a little leverage merely prompt our State Department to look the other way?

For these reasons, as I say, I was fully prepared to offer an amendment to stop sending U.S. dollars to a country that steals U.S. property and tramples the rights of U.S. citizens.

It is only my respect for the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee that persuades me, after bringing the matter up with his staff, and because this particular Haitian situation has not been examined by his committee before, that there may be one more constructive avenue left to pursue, short of such an amendment.

□ 2030

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

Mr. STENHOLM. I am happy to yield to the committee chairman.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding. I want to take this opportunity to assure the gentleman from Texas that the Committee on Foreign Affairs will make an inquiry into the claim of his constituents.

Frankly, I am not familiar with the facts on it but it sounds horrible and something needs to be done if there is anything that can be done. But certainly we will make every effort to ascertain whether or not a satisfactory settlement can be achieved.

Mr. STENHOLM. I thank the chairman very much.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BEREUTER. I thank my colleague for yielding.

The matter the gentleman has brought up is of grave concern to many of us, including, of course, the two of us that are speaking. We discussed this at substantial length, the general problem of human rights violations in Haiti, during the deliberations of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee. As a result of that I offered an amendment, unsuccessfully, again to try to use the carrot approach since the stick approach you might say ends up penalizing the Haitian people. And, of course, the Haitian standard of living and per capita income is the lowest of any nation in the hemisphere.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) has expired.

(On request of Mr. BEREUTER and by unanimous consent Mr. STENHOLM was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Will the gentleman continue to yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BEREUTER. So it seemed to me that we might offer instead an incentive with additional funds being available earmarked for economic development activities. I was unsuccessful in that for several reasons.

I did, however, feel a little bit better about the situation when I found out that over 65 percent of the developmental aid that the U.S. Government is providing to Haiti goes through private voluntary organizations. To my knowledge this is probably the highest percentage of funds that we are channeling around a government through private voluntary organizations of any nation in the hemisphere, and perhaps in the world. And it is for some of the reasons the gentleman brought to our attention here again that we have had to use the private voluntary organizations, the multid denominational church, and other humanitarian groups.

That is not the full answer to the problems the gentleman is presenting. But it is one way that we are attempting to cope with the problem that he has presented to us.

I would hope that we might investigate next year in the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee an incentive approach to try to bring some appropriate pressure for the benefit of the Haitian people to bear.

I thank the gentleman for bringing up this matter.

Mr. STENHOLM. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I think your points you make are extremely valid and the concern if we are going to continue to have voluntary effort in Haiti and other countries is that our Government must stand a little closer, shoulder to shoulder with our citizens when they make those investments so in fact they get their day in court. And that is what I am asking. I appreciate the chairman's assurances to that effect.

I thank the gentleman.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COLEMAN OF TEXAS

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLEMAN of Texas: Page 79, after line 23, insert the following:

ACCOUNTABILITY OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE FUNDS

SEC. . Chapter 1 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by inserting the following new section 618 immediately after section 617:

"SEC. 618. Accountability of Foreign Assistance Funds.—The President shall establish appropriate accountability procedures

to ensure that all funds made available to carry out this Act are used for the purposes intended."

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas (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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, my amendment to H.R. 5119 requires that the President establish standards of financial accountability for foreign aid funds disbursed under this act. I believe that it is important that we begin to exercise some control over the money we send to foreign governments to insure that it actually be used for the purposes for which it is intended. Too often we hear of the incidence of fraud and abuse of the funding, or its diversion for purposes that may not be in the best interests of the American people.

The foreign aid we provide to other countries may be in the best interest of our own security but we have to recognize the disruptive impact this aid can have on the internal and regional political balances of the countries to which we grant it. The massive amount of funding that we have directed to other countries is often not used as we would wish. We cannot afford to have our military assistance linked to domestic terrorism or the development of nuclear arsenals far beyond our strategic interests. Therefore, I believe that insuring the financial accountability of the funds we disburse will guarantee a closer approximation of our own strategic goals and cut down on the incidence of its misuse.

Since I took office I have held over 40 town meetings with my constituents. They tell me over and over again that they are concerned with domestic security. But they are also angered at reports that the money to further that goal is wasted or directed for purposes contrary to our national interest. As we debate the merits of the foreign aid authorization, and soon the supplemental appropriation for El Salvador, we will be debating the abstract equation between military aid and political influence. What we do not consider, and what ultimately will reduce our best intentions to the lowest common denominator of achievement, is the huge gray area that exists between the point where we sign this bill into law and the ultimate destination of the money we sign away with it. What control do we really have over our security when we use these funds as if by themselves they guaranteed that our interests are served?

The lessons of conflict in Central America, the Middle East, and Viet-

nam showed us that regional wars can undercut the best laid strategies of East-West politics. We may focus on the Soviet Union in our foreign policy, but the countries we provide military assistance to may have different motivations. Cultural and political patterns that differ from the ones we value can lead to widely different strategic conclusions from those we would consider prudent. We may stipulate funds for a specific outcome but once they leave our hands we have had no real control over their use. What proportion of the money we spend goes for developing an Islamic bomb, or quells a civilian unrest, or beats up on the country next door? How much of this money just disappears through the wide cracks of an opportunistic bureaucracy? The potential for argument is endless but the fact of the matter is that we just do not know.

The United States is involved in power politics by default of its size and influence. We cannot retreat into isolationism and as long as we assume that our security revolves around the division between ourselves and the Soviet Union we will continue to arm the world in anticipation of that conflict. If this is the way that we must operate then we should start doing it prudently.

My amendment is designed to attach some strings to the money we send out. By requiring financial accountability to the greatest extent possible we will tighten our control over the results we can expect. If nothing else, we can prove that the foreign policy we legislate in Congress is actually implemented. Accountability and security are not contradictions in terms and this amendment will bring the two goals into closer alignment.

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

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. I am happy to yield to the committee chairman.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, we have examined this amendment that the gentleman has presented, and I thoroughly agree with him. We are all in support of the necessary accountability procedures for whatever assurances might be needed.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. I thank the chairman of the committee.

Mr. FASCELL. We accept the amendment on this side.

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

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, the minority has no problem with the gentleman's amendment. We understand that is what is being done or should be being done anyway, so we accept the amendment.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. I thank the gentleman very much and, Mr.

Chairman, with that I ask for adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COLEMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEWIS of California: Page 79, line 4, immediately after "that" and before the dash, insert the following: "because there have been serious concerns raised regarding how the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (hereafter in this section referred to as "UNESCO") is fulfilling its constitution, because of UNESCO's attacks on Israel on certain Western institutions, values, and interests (including freedom of the press), and because there are vital questions regarding the way UNESCO funds have been expended".

Page 79, beginning in line 8, strike out the following: "(hereafter in this section referred to as "UNESCO")".

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, as I think most of the Members of the House know, the Secretary of State under the direction of the administration has sent a letter to UNESCO indicating our intention to withdraw from that organization. And their reasons are very important in terms of the future of our House's relationship with not just the United Nations specifically but other agencies of the U.N.

UNESCO in recent years has become increasingly politicized, has become anti the Western industrialized nations. It is of great concern to the House that we send a message to UNESCO which would indicate that while we have been in great support of their original constitution and purpose, the reality is in recent years that their antagonism to Western values, their willingness to use their forum to attack democratic principles, their insistence upon continually relating to questions of human rights in terms of people's rights which would tend to increase the power of the state, are undermining the very values for which the organization was formed in the first place.

It is very clear that UNESCO needs to get our message.

Mr. Chairman, the evening is drawing nigh and the House has worked many an hour. I frankly feel there will be some limited opposition to my amendment. I would like to hear from them and then continue this debate in as short a fashion as possible.

So I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

As a representative of the limited opposition, let me assure the gentleman from California that my views are deeply felt, although they may not

represent the majority of the Members in this body.

It is difficult to oppose something that represents prefatory language, that is not of a real policymaking nature in this bill. But I would stress three points.

The gentleman's amendment goes to the Israel question in UNESCO; it goes to the freedom of the press issue in UNESCO; and it goes to certain financial aspects of UNESCO.

On the first question, the Assistant Secretary of State, Gregory Newell acknowledged at a hearing recently that the Israel question was not a factor in the U.S. decision to withdraw from UNESCO.

□ 2040

Ambassador Edmund Hennelly, head of the U.S. delegation to the 22d General Conference in the fall of 1983, also testified in congressional hearings April 25, 1984, that at the last General Conference, "There was no challenge to Israeli credentials. Anti-Israeli rhetoric was nearly non-existent."

Interestingly, the Manchester Guardian has reported a memo from the U.S. mission to UNESCO to the State Department in which, according to this publicly reported memo, the Israel Government argued vehemently to the U.S. Government against the U.S. withdrawal. Israel representatives pointed out that they will be put in the peculiar position of perhaps having to follow suit and that this will lead to delegitimization of the State of Israel in other international fora.

So exactly what the Israel Government wants in international organizations this U.S. policy works against.

As far as the freedom of the press issue, I think it should be clear again as the administration testified before the Congress that this was not a factor in their decision to withdraw, that never in the last decade have they done better at UNESCO than they have this past year.

Dana Bullen, executive secretary of the World Press Freedom Committee, which speaks for various free press organizations in the West, was also quoted in the New York Times on November 17, 1983, as saying, "If anyone is looking for an assault on the media at this conference serious enough to justify United States withdrawal, they won't find it."

In Congressional hearings April 25, 1984, Leonard Sussman, Executive Director of Freedom House and representative for the U.S. on many of the most controversial communications issues at the last General Conference, testified that over the years, "The Soviets have been repeatedly rebuffed," and that Director General M'Bow "has quietly helped block Soviet press-control initiatives." He warned that "if we leave, the chances for greater use of UNESCO's considerable forum to debate press-control measures will increase, not decrease..."

The question therefore arises: How does the United States better defend itself from an empty chair? This cut and run policy is particularly ironic,

because we are cutting and running after winning; not after losing on these important issues.

Finally, with regard to the third issue, that of the UNESCO budget, there is concern in this country that it has grown too fast, but I would caveat that with the observation that the President's budget envisions a 10-percent growth in the Federal budget this year, while UNESCO's growth will be less than 6 percent. Just today the Director General of UNESCO, Mr. M'Bow, announced several steps toward setting up committees to change the accounting procedures at UNESCO as well as several procedures that will put the United States in a better position to assure that responsible people are appointed to the UNESCO staff.

So I would urge defeat of this amendment as mischievous; it is not enormously significant in that it is prefatory language, but it does not accurately portray the view of the administration nor does it portray the reality of UNESCO events at this time.

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

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

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

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman from California inclined to accept the amendment? We have examined it on this side and that is our inclination.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, we will accept the amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I appreciate the chairman's willingness to accept the amendment, as well as the ranking member's willingness to accept it.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that I briefly respond to some of the comments made by my colleague from the Republican side of the aisle.

I think it is inaccurate to suggest that the administration would oppose this language and this position. It is very clear that during the last session of UNESCO that the session went much better than in recent memory and the reason for the improvement in that dialog without any question is a direct reflection of the letter from the Secretary of State which suggested we are going to withdraw.

They began to get their act together. There was no evidence, however, that they have really permanently changed their ways. So they do need additional

messages. This is not a heavy message by any matter of means. But the Members should know for the record that the Soviet Union has been using UNESCO very effectively for their purposes.

You will recall that there were 47 Soviet agents expelled last year from France, 12 of whom were from UNESCO. The Members should recognize that three of those members, now home in the Soviet Union, are still on the UNESCO payroll.

Mr. FASCELL. Will the gentleman from California yield?

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I would be happy to yield to the chairman.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I hate to interrupt the gentleman from California (Mr. Lewis) but the hour is late. We have accepted the amendment. I want to point out that the subcommittee is having hearings on the subject. We have a General Accounting Office investigation going on. I can assure the gentleman that as far as this Member is concerned, I am not advocating the automatic expulsion of the United States or anybody else out of UNESCO, but I do support the concept of letting them know that this is not going to be an easy road if they continue without making any changes.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we could go on and get this amendment adopted and get to the next two amendments before it gets much later.

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

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I thank the gentleman.

I want the chairman to know that I appreciate his courtesy. I could not commend him more for the way he has handled this bill and certainly I appreciate his accepting my amendment.

I will terminate further conversation.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. Essentially this amendment provides the bill of particulars that have made UNESCO the subject of national controversy and congressional scrutiny. Without the language this amendment provides, there is no expression either here or elsewhere in the bill that provides a justification for the creation of the bipartisan study commission that will review the U.S. participation in UNESCO. The language added by this amendment provides a specific focus for the review and recommendations of the commission.

Frankly, it should come as no surprise that advocates of U.S. participation in UNESCO would not want to advertise the reasons why UNESCO should be subject to investigation. I believe that even the most casual

glance at UNESCO will reveal an organization that has strayed far from its original mandate, that routinely engages in political manipulation and propaganda exercises, and that has become a bureaucratic and administrative nightmare. It is very important to note that 24 other Western countries, who together with the United States contribute 85 percent of UNESCO's budget, have also submitted proposals calling for major reforms at UNESCO.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from California cites four specific areas where UNESCO has come under criticism.

First, is the organization's constitution. UNESCO was mandated to serve three functions: To develop programs aimed at eradicating illiteracy, to assist in the preservation of historic sites and monuments, and to facilitate the exchange of scientific information. These purposes are praiseworthy and deserving of our support. But UNESCO has too often strayed from its mandate, guided by a Secretariat that has increasingly usurped the legitimate functions of UNESCO's General Conference and Executive Board. The lack of accountability in UNESCO is reflected, for example, in the fact that less than half of the organization's budget in educational programs actually goes into efforts to fight illiteracy. What subjects does UNESCO find more important than its own mandate? Here are some examples from the 1984-85 biennial budget: \$106,000 to study the educational uses of leisure time, \$183,000 to promote an international convention on the recognition of studies—whatever that means; \$158,000 to improve the educational content of the mass media; and \$2.5 million to promote education in peace and disarmament, including a \$273,000 study to help educators develop—"a frame of mind conducive to the strengthening of disarmament."

I need not belabor the point. Where the efforts to fight illiteracy figure in all of this is anybody's guess.

The second point in this amendment concerns an anti-Israeli bias at UNESCO. This should come as no surprise to anyone familiar with the U.N. system. Columnist George Will once described the U.N. General Assembly as—quote "the moral equivalent of a Nuremberg rally"—the end of quote. If you think UNESCO is any different, listen to this: The latest UNESCO budget includes a \$120,000 study to keep on Israel's activities in occupied territories. Israel is the only country in the world singled out for that privilege. The budget includes a \$454,000 political training project, with prospective trainees to be provided by the PLO and other so-called national liberation movements.

The latest budget earmarks \$226,000 in projects for Palestinian refugees

and \$76,000 for all of the other refugees throughout the world. We can all detect the pattern in this. Let me go on.

A third point in the amendment mentions an anti-Western flavor in UNESCO's activities. We are all familiar with the proposed "New World Information Order," that UNESCO is promoting. Less well known are UNESCO's bizarre forays into the area of human rights, where so-called people's rights, human rights understood in a collective sense, are emphasized in opposition to individual rights and dignity. If you detect in this an effort by Third World elites to perpetuate themselves and their regimes by means of these sophistries, you can understand why UNESCO has become a sacred cow, an organization in which fully half of the membership contributes less than 1 percent of the budget.

UNESCO's programs invariably have a statist emphasis, with a strong element placed on building up the public sector in Third World countries. The Western values that focus on individual freedom, responsibility, and enterprise are given short shrift by the bloated bureaucracy that attempts to manage UNESCO.

And that brings up the final point: UNESCO's budget and administration are simply out of control. UNESCO has been the least responsive component in the entire U.N. system to the demands by member states for belt tightening and accountability. What the UNESCO budget defines as "general administration" absorbs a larger share of the organization's money than do the programs in the natural sciences. For every dollar that UNESCO spends on education, it spends 54¢ on what is called cooperation and external relations. That is probably another way of saying PR.

Fully 80 percent of UNESCO's employees and 80 percent of UNESCO's budget are represented at the headquarters in Paris. Is there anyone here who could support a private, volunteer philanthropy or charity that sustains this kind of overhead? Of course not. No volunteer organization could survive this kind of mismanagement.

Three known KGB agents remained on UNESCO's payroll for more than a year after they were publicly exposed in early 1983.

A total of \$25 million that was budgeted in 1982 to fill 322 staff positions disappeared through the cracks. No accounting has been made for this money and no one was hired, either.

A recent poll of UNESCO employees showed that only 3 percent of them believe that well-qualified persons are recruited by the organization and that promotions are based on merit.

Twenty senior staff officials have left the organization in disgust since 1980.

Only one American was hired at UNESCO in 1983, out of more than 120 recommendations for positions.

I can only sum up by saying that a comprehensive review of UNESCO's programs, policies, and procedures is long overdue. I hope the gentleman's amendment will be agreed to.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title IX?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RITTER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RITTER of Pennsylvania: At the end of title 9 (page 79, after line 23) insert the following new section:

CONDEMNATION OF SOVIET WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

SEC. 914. The Congress deplores the continuing and unjustified war against the people of Afghanistan by the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union, using morally indefensible actions has caused the death of hundreds of thousands of innocent civilians, the indiscriminate destruction of entire villages, the unconscionable displacement of 3-4 million Afghan refugees, and the destruction of irreplaceable food resources such as crops, livestock and food stores needed to maintain even the barest minimum of subsistence. The Congress therefore, strongly expresses its condemnation of the Soviet war against Afghanistan and states that it should be United States policy to secure the removal from Afghanistan of Soviet troops and return Afghan sovereignty to the Afghan people.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. RITTER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. SOLARZ. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, having read the amendment, I want to compliment the gentleman for the amendment. I want to accept it faster than the Mujahadin can slip through the Khyber Pass. It is entirely acceptable to the committee and in the interest of time I just wanted the gentleman to know that he faces no resistance on this side of the aisle.

Mr. RITTER. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from New York. I also appreciate some of his leadership on the subject of the fight for freedom in Afghanistan.

I will take some of the time, because I do feel that it is an important sub-

ject that the American people should hear about in some detail.

My colleagues, the people of Afghanistan are crying tonight; their children are crying, their parents are crying, they are crying for the destruction of their families, their villages and their nation. It has been nearly 4½ years that the Soviet Union has waged a morally indefensible war against the people of Afghanistan.

This war knows no limits. There is no press in Moscow to curtail the actions of the Soviet leaders. The Soviet Union has engaged in a war of genocide. No only in the indiscriminate mass destruction of Afghanistan villages, but in a migratory genocide which has forced some 3 to 4 million Afghan refugees to the borders of Pakistan and Iran.

□ 2050

The Soviet Union is attempting to systemically destroy the infrastructure of Afghanistan, taking away the supplies, food, and that which is necessary for bare subsistence of the people of Afghanistan. The Soviet Union wants Afghanistan, but they want Afghanistan without Afghans. This is a great crime, not only against the Afghan people, but against humanity.

Soviet troops recently have entered into a battle in the Pansjir Valley for the first time. Soviet bombers have engaged in blanket or carpet bombing of Afghan villages. There were no guerrillas left in these villages. They simply leveled a whole series of villages in this important valley north of Kabul. The Soviets have used weapons to disable and dismember children. Mines in the form of toys when picked up or stepped on by a child or a woman disabling that person and causing havoc in the family.

The Soviet Union seeks Afghanistan not for the purposes of somehow countering an Islamic movement in the region. The American people should know that the Soviet Union seeks Afghanistan because it is the high ground above South Asia.

Afghanistan brings them far closer—

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

Mr. RITTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I hate to interrupt the gentleman, but since we have both accepted the amendment and we know the gentleman's long and sincere interest in the long fight that he had led with respect to the freedom in Afghanistan and I am happy to join him in that.

I would trust that all of us who feel as strongly as we can would extend our remarks in the RECORD on this very important subject at this point.

I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate it. I hesitated, because I

know how deep the gentleman's conviction is. I hated to interrupt him. But I felt that I wanted to express support also for this and give others an opportunity to that before we shut down here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RITTER) has expired.

(At the request of Mr. GILMAN and by unanimous consent, Mr. RITTER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. RITTER. I understand the chairman's desire. The hour is late and everybody is tired.

The American people hear hour upon hour upon hour of debate over Central America. The American people do not hear about what is happening in Afghanistan. Yet what the Soviets do in Afghanistan relates to Central America, it relates to Europe, it relates to our foreign policy, it relates to arms control.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania. (Mr. RITTER), for bringing this important issue to the floor at this time.

Our Select Committee on Narcotics had the opportunity of meeting with hundreds of Afghan elders at a refugee camp in Peshawar in Pakistan last January. We were highly impressed with their courage and devotion to their fight for freedom.

Just this week I received a poignant appeal from the Committee for a Free Afghanistan, stating:

On April 20 the Soviets launched their fifth major spring offensive in Afghanistan. The only difference between this year's offensive and those of the past four years is a tremendous increase in the massive firepower being brought to bear against the Afghan people, and the fact that several major resistance centers in the country are being attacked simultaneously. Clearly, the Soviets intend to turn Afghanistan into a vast parking lot as quickly as possible.

This is not counter-guerrilla warfare. It's genocide. It's a scorched earth operation nonpareil. Mao Tse-tung said that "the guerrilla moves among the people as the fish moves in the sea." In Afghanistan, the Soviets can't catch the fish, so they're draining the sea.

The freedom fighters cannot survive and fight without the popular support—food, shelter, intelligence and supplies—given them by the people in this harsh land. Ergo, kill or drive out the people, destroy the agriculture life support base, wreck or poison the water distribution system. Then the guerrillas, the universal resistance, will be crushed. It is war against a land, to denude that land of all forms of life: vegetable, animal, and human.

These valiant, suffering people look to us, America, defender of freedom, as their only hope.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment which keeps before the American public the plight of these brave Afghan freedom fighters.

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

Mr. RITTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I not only accept the gentleman's amendment on behalf of the minority, I strongly urge my colleagues to support it, to pass it.

The gentleman is to be commended for his strong leadership not only today on this item, but unfortunately for many years, as this has gone on and on. The gentleman is exactly right. This is something that has dropped out of the public news because reporters are not allowed into Afghanistan. That is the way the Soviets operate.

Mr. RITTER. It is very difficult to go from a comfortable hotel room in Afghanistan to an afternoon worth of TV footage filming and back for cocktails and dinner. It does not happen that way in Afghanistan, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Unlike El Salvador.

Mr. RITTER. Unlike some other places in our hemisphere.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RITTER) has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. PRITCHARD and by unanimous consent, Mr. RITTER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mr. RITTER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington, who has assisted me in my efforts on Afghanistan throughout these years and I am very grateful. I know the people of Afghanistan are very grateful to him.

Mr. PRITCHARD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman for the work that he has done over the last 4 years and say this is a disgrace, it is a world disgrace. Somehow the media must do a better job of bringing this disaster to the public's attention.

I do not know how they do this, but it seems to me that if they took their responsibilities right, somehow they would find a way to put it before the world's attention.

I thank the gentleman for what he has done in this area.

Mr. RITTER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the cost to the American people of a Soviet victory in Afghanistan could be enormous. Picture Afghanistan stabilized, the high ground above Asia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RITTER) has again expired.

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

Mr. RITTER. The high ground above Asia, within striking distance of the oil shipping lanes, by air simply 300 miles. But beyond that, the Province of Baluchistan has seen several uprisings against the Pakistan Federation. It is quite possible and quite achievable that Soviet armor would punch through the Arabian Sea and that sitting in the Port of Qatar, one of the finest warm-water ports in that part of the world, would be the Soviet Navy, the dream of Tsars, going back 1,000 years, not just Commissars. Think of the cost to the NATO alliance, think of the cost to the European Community, think of the cost to the world dependent on oil from that region, somehow defending against this new presence, new and threatening presence.

I thank my colleagues for their support for this resolution.

I am including for the RECORD a letter I received recently from someone very familiar with the situation in Afghanistan, Karen McKay, executive director of the Committee for a Free Afghanistan. I urge my colleagues to read it because it provides the very human details of the Soviet aggression.

COMMITTEE FOR A FREE AFGHANISTAN,
Washington, D.C.
Representative DON RITTER,
124 Cannon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE RITTER: On April 20 the Soviets launched their fifth major spring offensive in Afghanistan. The only difference between this year's offensive and those of the past four years is a tremendous increase in the massive firepower being brought to bear against the Afghan people, and the fact that several major resistance centers in the country are being attacked simultaneously. Clearly, the Soviets intend to turn Afghanistan into a vast parking lot as quickly as possible.

This is not counter-guerrilla warfare. It's genocide. It's a scorched earth operation nonpareil. Mao Tse-tung said that "the guerrilla moves among the people as the fish moves in the sea." In Afghanistan, the Soviets can't catch the fish, so they're draining the sea.

The freedom fighters cannot survive and fight without the popular support—food, shelter, intelligence and supplies—given them by the people in this harsh land. Ergo, kill or drive out the people, destroy the agriculture life support base, wreck or poison the water distribution system. Then the guerrillas, the universal resistance, will be crushed. It is war against a land, to denude that land of all forms of life: vegetable, animal, and human.

These valiant, suffering people look to us, America, defender of freedom, as their only hope.

As much as weapons and ammunition, they need that which sustains life.

They need boots, for they are barefoot on the Hindu Kush. They need food and vitamins and high protein supplements. Hunger and malnutrition-related disease is rampant in the land. They need medicines and medical equipment. There is not even aspirin for the child who has picked up a Soviet bomb disguised as a toy and blown away her hands and face.

Tents, blankets and cooking supplies are needed by those whose homes and villages have been bombed or shelled by artillery. In the area of Urgan this past winter, hundreds of children froze to death when their villages were destroyed in retaliation for guerrilla operations against the Soviet outpost there.

Warm winter clothing—jackets, long underwear, socks and gloves—is desperately required. In Maidan, where this winter the cold killed the wheat because the protecting snows did not fall, freedom fighters lost their feet to frost bite. A nine-year-old girl huddled in her mother's arms on a horse, fleeing their burning village to refuge in Pakistan, froze to death just a day's ride from safety.

Animals are the lifeblood of the Afghan economy and way of life. Breeding livestock are urgently needed to replace the herds and flocks killed by bombing and poison gas. Last fall in the beautiful Kunar Valley, a medical doctor witnessed 5,000 sheep and goats suddenly go into convulsions and begin to die. Some of the animals were slaughtered in a desperate attempt to save the meat. But the flesh was black, unfit for human consumption.

Pack animals must be had as they are the only means of transportation of relief supplies from the outside. Radio equipment—shortwave transmitters—is urgently required to communicate both inside Afghanistan and to the outside.

Lest a generation of children grow up illiterate to inherit their liberated land, schools must be re-established throughout the country. School supplies like texts, pencils, paper, blackboards must be had.

The land itself must not be allowed to die. High-yield seeds, fertilizers, farm tools and tractors must be gotten in time to keep farm production going as fast as it is destroyed.

Channels for direct humanitarian support to the freedom fighters and the civilian population inside Afghanistan exist. The Committee for a Free Afghanistan stands ready to assist anyone wishing to help the Afghans.

I urge Congress to address the need, this staggering human need, without delay. Using the precedent of African and Polish relief, Congress can appropriate humanitarian relief funds to be channeled through private sector groups to the needy.

I urge church and private organizations concerned with human rights to open their hearts and their reserves of resources to the Afghans in their great tragedy. Every private citizen should concern himself with what is happening to his fellow man in this ancient land. The suffering of the women, children and old people is greatest, for they are the first victims, for them there is little hope of escape.

Sincerely,

KAREN MCKAY.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RITTER). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ZSCHAU

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ZSCHAU: On page 78, after the period in line 7 the following new sentence: "Not later than January 15, 1985, the President shall report to the Congress the extent to which each such country is pursuing policies that enhance the peace process based upon the principles set forth above, and he shall recommend to the Congress such actions as he deems appropriate to advance the peace process based upon those principles."

Mr. ZSCHAU. Mr. Chairman, Section 910 of the bill before us stresses that the \$4.8 billion of aid being provided to the four countries in the Middle East—Egypt, Israel, Jordan, and Lebanon—should help promote peace in the region and encourage all recipient countries to pursue policies that enhance the peace process. Recognizing that, my amendment would require the President to report to Congress on or before January 15, 1985, on the status of the peace process in the region. In particular, it would require him to report on the extent to which each such country is pursuing policies that enhance the peace process and to make recommendations to Congress for advancing the peace process.

Is this amendment necessary? Probably not. Congressional hearings could be called to solicit this information.

Would it be helpful for achieving peace in the Middle East? I believe it would be. It would emphasize and focus proper attention on the specific actions that are being taken or that might be taken to deal with the conflicts in the Middle East and bring lasting peace to that troubled region.

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

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

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the language of the amendment is self-explanatory, and we are prepared to accept it on this side.

Mr. ZSCHAU. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that.

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

Mr. ZSCHAU. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the minority accepts the amendment as well.

Mr. ZSCHAU. Mr. Chairman, given that the chairman and the minority has accepted the amendment, I would just like to express my appreciation to both and particularly my compliments to the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) for the skillful way he has handled this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ZSCHAU).

The amendment was agreed to.

● Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I had the privilege of heading a House delegation from the House Armed Services Committee to visit some countries of South America looking into the military of these different countries and to check on our military interests in South America especially the sea lanes of the Atlantic and Pacific.

In Chile both the junta in power and the opposition to the military junta were in agreement that the military arms embargo on Chile should be lifted. Because we were told how long do you punish a country for one act that happened several years ago.

Our eight Members felt that this arms embargo should be lifted and at least let the Chilean military buy parts for the ships and planes we sold them. For the safety of the equipment we ought to do this.

Our group felt if you keep putting restrictions on Chile you push them further toward Marxism and communism and we will never get a democracy.

Let us get off of Chile's back and let them move toward the democratic process. ●

□ 2100

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEWIS of California: Page 79, after line 23, insert the following:

CONDITIONS ON ASSISTANCE FOR ZIMBABWE

SEC. 914. (a) The President shall ensure that foreign assistance provided to Zimbabwe by the United States is furnished in a manner which fosters demonstrated progress toward the political development, economic development, and security of that country and its people. To this end, the President in every appropriate instance shall impose conditions on the furnishing of military and economic assistance to Zimbabwe in order to achieve these goals and the objectives described in subsection (c).

(b) Before providing any assistance to Zimbabwe under this Act, the President shall submit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a detailed report fully describing the policies of the Government of Zimbabwe for achieving political development, economic development, and conditions of security. This report shall include—

(1) the President's detailed assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the policies of the Government of Zimbabwe in protecting and advancing the human rights and civil liberties of all persons in Zimbabwe regardless of race, creed, or tribal affiliation;

(2) a comprehensive review of the factors contributing to the political, economic, and security situation in that country, including such factors as human rights, the economy

of that country, the integration of racial and tribal minorities into the electoral process, the protection of minority tribal units, refugees and displaced persons, guerrilla activity, and the influence and impact of third countries in the fighting currently going on in Zimbabwe; and

(3) a determination by the President that the Government of Zimbabwe has demonstrated progress in achieving the objectives described in subsection (c).

Assistance may be provided to Zimbabwe under this Act only if the Congress enacts a joint resolution stating that the Congress agrees with the President's determination pursuant to paragraph (3).

(c) The objectives for the Government of Zimbabwe referred to in this section are the following:

(1) Removal from the government military and security forces of those individuals responsible for or associated with the atrocities committed against civilians in the Matabeleland region of that country, and the establishment of effective controls over those military and security forces charged with the maintenance of domestic security, thereby ending the involvement of those forces in indiscriminate violence, secret and unlawful detentions, abductions, torture, summary executions, and murder.

(2) Compliance by the Government of Zimbabwe with the 1949 Geneva Conventions and the 1977 Protocol relating to the Protection of Victims of Non-International Armed Conflicts.

(3) Participation by the Government of Zimbabwe in direct negotiations with all major parties involved in the current conflict in that country, in good faith and without preconditions, for the purpose of establishing a multi-party political system and for the purpose of achieving an equitable political solution to include free and fair elections, with such changes in the government military and security forces as are necessary to ensure the physical security of those political, racial, and tribal groups who chose to participate in the negotiations.

(4) Elimination of the practice of detaining political prisoners, and the repeal of the laws which allow for such detention.

(5) The elimination of the current practice of withholding food and other non-military supplies from regions of that country where fighting is currently underway.

(6) Protection of legitimate freedom of the press and freedom of association, including enforcement of measures to assure against intimidation of opposition and minority leaders.

Mr. LEWIS of California (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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, this amendment addresses itself to the some \$200 million in aid we have extended over the last 4 years to the country of Zimbabwe. Specifically, this amendment is designed to apply to future U.S. funding programs directed toward Zimbabwe. Specifically, to place the same sort of requirements of progress in human rights on the Marxist government of Zimbabwe that

currently are required of countries such as El Salvador.

The reason for bringing up this amendment at this moment is based on the fact that tomorrow we are going to spend the day discussing Central America, and we are going to have before us Member after Member parading to the well, discussing why we should put all kinds of unlimited restrictions upon the small democracy of El Salvador.

Mr. Chairman, just on Sunday I had the opportunity of witnessing the elections in El Salvador, an emotional experience as we watch a democratic government attempt to survive in our own Hemisphere. In this House, day after day, we suggest that there is some special rule that this Congress should apply to only that country. I am here to suggest that we are in reality, applying a double standard toward human rights around the world.

Let me share just a few items with you. According to the Roman Catholic bishop's report compiled by the church in Zimbabwe, Government forces have killed and kidnapped hundreds of innocent civilians. Villagers in that country maintain that army trucks come every night in Matabeleland to dump bodies down the old abandoned Antelope gold mine shaft. The army has promoted a campaign of starvation in the southern region by closing down food stores and stands except during a few daylight hours, not coincidentally in that region where the primary opposition leader, Joshua Nkomo, has his greatest tribal and political support.

Consistently in Zimbabwe, journalists have been restricted in their ability to communicate uncensored, the human rights violations taking place in that country.

It is very clear that Zimbabwe, a Marxist country, has received a great deal of support from this House, though the House has chosen to ignore the sort of human rights violations that normally would foster concern and debate on the floor of the House.

It is critical for us to recognize, ladies and gentlemen, that if we are going to hold a tight standard to countries in our own Hemisphere, who are heavily involved in attempting to work for the survival of democracy, that the least we should do is to have a uniform standard that applies to other areas of the world.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear that the night is running long and the House is impatient with extended debate. It does seem appropriate to me, however, that at this moment we seriously consider this amendment which would only suggest that we treat a Marxist government in Africa, a government which has abused its own people and used our money in the process, with

the same standard that we apply to a struggling democracy in our own hemisphere.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DELLUMS. I appreciate my colleague's yielding, and I would like to say to him that I think his statement is a very thoughtful one. I have always felt that we should have a set of human rights standards that we should be able to apply across the board. I think the gentleman makes a good statement, that wherever we provide resources, to whatever country, it seems to me that our human rights standards ought to reflect the principles and integrity that we perceive as important to be enunciated in the world community, whether that is a government that we perceive to be the left of center or the right of center or in the middle of the road. We ought to be consistent. And if that is the thrust of the gentleman's statement, I certainly support it, and I support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that what the gentleman is doing makes eminent sense. We ought to really decide which way we are going to do it. It kind of reminds me of a number of years ago I offered an amendment which was adopted, and it is now the law, that said if we are going to do human rights reports on countries, we do them on all countries not just friends, sort of the opposite of what the gentleman is talking about.

It seems to me that what the gentleman is really doing is making a strong case against the arbitrary use of very tough and, in some cases, unmeetable standards for our friends.

I hope the gentleman withdraws his amendment, but I understand the point he is making.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) has expired.

(On request of Mr. SOLOMON and by unanimous consent, Mr. LEWIS of California was allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and again I want to commend him for offering this amendment. Although I do not agree with the procedure that he is using, I think it does point out the debate that will

take place tomorrow on Central America and the remarks that the gentleman from California made.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I have often criticized the tendency, what might even be called the compulsion, of congressional subcommittees and individual Members of Congress to write their own priorities and agendas into the foreign aid bill. And if we are ever to develop a coherent foreign policy, we are necessarily going to have to develop a more coherent process of arriving at a foreign aid bill.

With that caveat in mind, I would like to address the issues raised by the amendment that is being offered by my good friend from California.

As a member of the African Subcommittee, the ranking Republican on that committee, I share fully the concerns that have been expressed about recent developments in Zimbabwe. Because our Government supported the sanctions against the previous Rhodesian Government and then became a part of the diplomatic initiative that resulted in Zimbabwe's independence, we have a vested interest in the development within Zimbabwe of a pluralistic, multiracial society.

I might also add that since Zimbabwe became independent, the United States has provided more assistance than has any other country.

When I visited Zimbabwe last August, I became very concerned about all of the talk I was hearing about the establishment of a one-party state.

The smug explanations given by members of Prime Minister Mugabe's party that the people of Zimbabwe would vote all of the other parties out of any role in government, thereby making the Mugabe party the only one in the country, were not at all reassuring.

Throughout the winter, reports from Zimbabwean citizens reached my office that confirmed what has also been widely reported in the press: that the supposed evolution of a one-party state in Zimbabwe is actually getting a rather substantial push from the military.

I have noted with increasing concern the recent statements by the Catholic bishops in Zimbabwe that have been severely critical of the government's political activities and human rights practices.

All of this is cause for concern, even alarm. I must also remind the House that the Reagan administration shares these concerns and has been willing to act accordingly. Last fall, a number of Members expressed outrage to the administration about Zimbabwe's cavalier attitude toward the United States, as demonstrated in the United Nations and elsewhere.

The administration responded by cutting \$35 million from the \$75 mil-

lion program that was allocated for Zimbabwe in fiscal year 1984. For fiscal year 1985, the administration is requesting a program for Zimbabwe that totals some \$30 million.

The message is clear: If the Government of Zimbabwe wants to follow the same road into the same swamp that so many other countries have found when human rights are abused and democratic processes are trampled, then they can do it without American support.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution.

It is very clear that the current abuses in Zimbabwe are symbolic of the problems that exist in many other countries in the world. But tomorrow's debate will take approximately 6 hours, in which people will be sitting here beating over the head a small democratic republic that is struggling for survival. I would suggest that all of us should recognize that this House consistently applies a double standard to the question of human rights, singling out a few countries more than others equally deserving our attention.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to, first of all, commend the gentleman from California for raising a very important question both with respect to the human rights problems that exist within Zimbabwe and with respect to the broader issue of the double standard that I think we do apply too frequently as we approach countries around the world in our evaluation in our response to human rights concerns.

Having said that, it would still be my hope that the gentleman would consider withdrawing the amendment, offering the amendment as an opportunity to make some very important points for the following reasons:

The Subcommittee on Africa and the Foreign Affairs Committee have been concerned for some period of time with the issue of human rights problems in Zimbabwe. We in fact have had committee hearings on the subject. We have had staff and committee Member visitations to Zimbabwe. Just this week, in fact, two members of staff returned from Harare.

□ 2110

Moreover, the administration and the Congress really have already responded in a very concrete and very specific way to concerns about Zimbabwe's Government policy. There have already been some very substantial reductions, as the gentleman from California is aware, in the aid that is being provided to Zimbabwe.

The situation at the moment is somewhat different than the situation as described. There have clearly been significant atrocities occurring in Zim-

babwe, particularly by military action directed against dissident elements within Matabeleland. That there have been excesses by the military, there can be, in fact, no question.

But what has also happened, and this is the other part of that picture, is that there is also evidence of government response to the atrocities that have in fact occurred. There are in fact military personnel who are being prosecuted criminally, under criminal law, for their participation in atrocities.

We have also a situation in which very recently the problem of food distribution has in fact been addressed. We have now had reports from Catholic relief organizations and other service organizations that food now in fact is being deliverable without inhibition into the affected areas.

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

Mr. WOLPE. I would be pleased to yield to the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comments, but I do have continuing and serious concerns. For example, a Methodist Bishop, Mr. Muzorewa, has disappeared. Can the gentleman tell me where he is at this moment and what his condition is in?

Mr. WOLPE. If I may reclaim my time, my understanding is that Bishop Muzorewa is still under detention. He has not disappeared; he is under detention. That is a matter that I personally have raised with the Zimbabwe Government, have expressed concern in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, as has the administration, as well.

Mr. LEWIS of California. What is the Government of Zimbabwe's response to the position of Bishop Muzorewa? When will he receive a fair trial? When will he be released? Do you receive a response from the Government?

Mr. WOLPE. The concern that I have personally raised is that he is being detained without specific charge, although the concerns of the Government, as reported, relate to alleged treasonous or subversive activities in which he is reported to have engaged. We have made very clear that that does not sound like due process and that, to the extent that Zimbabwe seeks international credibility and a positive response from within the United States, that is a terribly destructive kind of initiative.

I might also point out, though, that Zimbabwe, particularly in contrast to many other governments, if one takes the point about the equality of standards which we apply, also has in many instances a surprisingly independent judiciary in which the Government

has actually appointed to the judiciary people who are clearly in no way associated with the Government in any respect and, in most instances, the decisions of the judiciary have in fact let stand.

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

Mr. WOLPE. I would be pleased to yield further, but if I could perhaps just continue making a few more observations, then I will be glad to respond to any further questions the gentleman from California might put.

My point is not that there are not serious problems. I think the gentleman is performing a very major service in laying those out in the debate today, just as we have discussed them within our own committee on other occasions and as we have raised them with the Zimbabwe Government directly.

My point is simply twofold: First of all, there is evidence of a very positive response forthcoming as these matters have come to the attention and have been brought to the attention of the Zimbabwe Government. The administration has been making initiatives. There has been response. The Congress has been taking initiatives. There has been response.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WOLPE) has expired.

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

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Chairman, only this past week Michigan's trade delegation, I will tell the gentleman from California, was in Zimbabwe, in fact, was in Bulawayo in Matabele country, pursuing a very broad ranging discussion about expanded trade and investment between the State of Michigan and the United States more generally and the country of Zimbabwe.

There is testimony, I think, to the growing normalcy that exists within that particular country.

The final point that I would make with respect to the remedy under the circumstances is that the discussion of El Salvador that we will be embarking upon tomorrow, and I understand the intensity of the gentleman's opposition, apparently, to some of the proposals with respect to El Salvador, but in that particular instance it is essentially the military, and ESF-related military assistance that is at issue. El Salvador is a country that is clearly engaged in an all-encompassing civil war, and the conditions that are being attached by way of the joint resolution of approval, by way of presidential certification, relate to the military assistance, or military-related activities of El Salvador.

In the case of Zimbabwe, there is virtually no military assistance program outside of \$150,000 that is going for

IMET to train Zimbabwean officers in the United States.

So I submit that those are distinguishable in terms of appropriate remedies. I would go to the point that in this instance I do not think that the remedy that is being advanced is really appropriate both to the progress that is being made and to the response that has already been made by our own Government.

Mr. LEWIS of California. If the gentleman will yield further, I appreciate the chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa expressing his concerns. I must say to the chairman that I am very concerned that while the gentleman's subcommittee may have held hearings regarding human rights in Africa, there is an endless string of problems that continue to arise in these developing countries.

I do not hear the expression of concern on the floor of this House regarding the strict and often excessively unrealistic standard of those human rights that we have unilaterally placed on a small, fledgling democracy in our own hemisphere, namely El Salvador.

The chairman heard me refer earlier to Zimbabwe's Roman Catholic bishops' report which has accused government forces of killing, kidnaping, beating, illegal detaining, raping, and intimidating minority tribesmen, et cetera. Setting that aside, for the gentleman from Michigan has said he protested these abuses; what has happened to the two Americans, two British citizens, and two from Australia which were kidnaped 3 years ago in Zimbabwe? Can the gentleman tell me what happened to those six human beings, if we care about the rest? Has the Government of Zimbabwe responded to the gentleman concerning this kidnaping?

Mr. WOLPE. If I may reclaim my time, first of all, I would tell the gentleman from California that when we were in Zimbabwe we actually met with the Catholic Council of Peace and Justice and raised precisely the issue that the gentleman is referring to right now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WOLPE) has again expired.

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

Mr. WOLPE. The response of the Catholic Council was that, indeed, there were atrocities; that although in many instances unsubstantiated, there were a number of instances of substantiation of the kinds of atrocities to which the gentleman refers.

The Catholic Council also told us that when the Government was approached by the Catholic bishops, Prime Minister Mugabe was directly involved in those conversations and the Government responded not only by investigations but by prosecutions

of the military and the police who were involved in those atrocities.

Second, with respect to the other question, on that we discussed with the Prime Minister directly as well, and the Zimbabwe Government, according to our own Government, to our own Embassy, has taken every conceivable initiative to try to identify the kidnapers, to rescue those who were taken hostage in that situation. Every account received by everyone, both within the Zimbabwe Government and within the American Government, testified to the good-faith efforts that the Zimbabwe Government made to secure the release of those individuals.

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

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

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

Mr. KEMP. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I know the hour is late and we are all anxious to go home, and the debate is going to be fast and furious tomorrow, and that is all to the good. I think the country is well served by a vigorous debate over this issue and I congratulate both sides of the aisle for the effort that has been made today to bring to the attention of not only our colleagues, but the American people, some of the issues surrounding this very critical issue.

□ 2120

I appreciate my friend's yielding because I wanted to rise and compliment the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS). He and I serve on the same subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. There is no more consistent advocate of human rights in this country than the gentleman from California, and the point he is making is essential to the understanding of what is at stake in Central America. Central America is not our back door, it is our front door. The independent nations of Central America are on our side. They are, as President Reagan said, Americans; and to hold them to a standard that is higher than we are holding other countries that receive foreign aid from the U.S. Congress is frankly disingenuous and hypocritical.

The gentleman from California has made a very critical point here tonight, and I think it should be emphasized by expanding upon this just for a second.

Now, imagine this: We celebrated yesterday the 100th anniversary of the birth of a great President, a Democratic President, Harry S. Truman. What do you think Harry Truman would be saying to the Congress today about his program, if it were his program, to try to get some assistance for Central

America? What was it that impelled Harry Truman to ask the Congress to support aid to Greece and Turkey, to NATO, and to the Atlantic alliance?

Let us go back one other administration, and let me ask you what Franklin Roosevelt, another great American and a great President, would have done.

I say to my colleagues that just about 50 years ago there was a debate in another body such as this, only it was an international body. It was the League of Nations. A black leader from a small black country in Northern Africa came to the League of Nations and begged for help, and everybody said,

Well, don't worry about Abyssinia. That is too far away. Who cares if the Fascists are attacking Abyssinia? That is in another part of the world. Besides, they are of a different color, they are of a different race, they are of a different culture, they are of a different religion, and don't worry, this is all just Fascist Mussolini interested in expanding his economic base. We shouldn't overreact.

Nobody did anything, no one cared, and ultimately, when Haile Salassie went to the League of Nations, to a world that shut its eyes to what was happening in 1935 he said,

Don't weep for me, Western Democratic Governments. Weep for yourselves.

No one asked Haile Salassie, no one asked Austria, no one asked the Sudetenland, no one asked the Rhineland, no one asked Czechoslovakia, no one asked the Danzig Corridor, no one asked the Poles what type of a government they had before we tried to stop Nazi aggression. We did not ask people whether or not they had achieved Jeffersonian democracy. We went to the aid of those countries when they needed our help.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt reminded the American people about their obligation to the security of our allies, as did Harry Truman, as did John F. Kennedy, and as did Ronald Reagan tonight on television.

I would not even be up here speaking, I say to my colleagues, if it were not for the fact that immediately after the President's speech several of our colleagues in the Senate, the other body, and in this body rushed to judgment, claiming that the President was trying to militarize the war. The President is not seeking a military solution to the problems of Central America. He wants to give the people some security assistance with which they can prosecute an end to the war and build themselves a democracy. He wants to make sure that the ultimate question is not asked, because the real question of assistance in Central America is not whether or why not. It is when. Is it going to be now, at some cost? Or is it going to be later, at much greater cost to this country?

But, I urge my colleagues to correctly judge the costs as they answer for

themselves these important questions. Keep in mind the President's words: "If the Soviet Union can aid and abet subversion in our hemisphere, then the United States has a legal right and a moral duty to help resist it. This is not only in our strategic interest; it is morally right." Are any of the Members of this body willing to allow the Soviet Union free reign to subvert the nations of Central America, to export violence and revolution, because they fear involvement? The costs of noninvolvement are far higher.

There is not a single Member who does not wish for negotiations to end the violence in Central America. But negotiations are not possible when one side continues to believe that it can take by force the total control which it could never achieve in negotiation and democratic processes. The admirable goals of the Contadora nations can not be achieved so long as the Communist governments of Nicaragua and Cuba believe that they can achieve domination. They have no incentive to negotiate or to allow an open and free electoral process if faced by weak and poorly defended neighbors. Negotiations are possible but only when those who choose to perpetrate violence are shown that it will not yield victory. As the President said in his speech tonight, "It would be profoundly immoral to let peace-loving friends depending on our help be overwhelmed by brute force if we have any capacity to prevent it." I submit that to allow this force to prevail in the hope that the Marxist regimes which have openly announced their intentions to spread revolution will lay down their arms for negotiation is profound folly.

We must not take the view that the crisis in Central America will find its own solution if only we remain aloof. The United States cannot ignore the threat of the Soviet-Cuban forces pressing upon the borders of our neighbors and ourselves. I believe the President placed the feelings of the American people before us tonight.

There are those in this country who would yield to the temptation to do nothing. They are the new isolationists, very much like the isolationists of the late 1930's, who knew what was happening in Europe but chose not to face the terrible challenge history had given them.

I do not believe that the American people are willing to avoid the challenge we face today in Central America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO) has expired.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, may the gentleman have a couple of additional minutes? May I ask unanimous consent that he have 2 additional minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from California

(Mr. LAGOMARSINO) is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the Speaker.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, it is apparent to me that the gentleman and I did not get the same message that the President of the United States sent to the people of America. I think it was that he wanted more arms, more involvement, more ammunition, more force, and more deaths. I think it was a call to arms.

I am looking for a call to peace, and I think that is what America is looking for, a call to peace.

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

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

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, it is an honor, it really is an honor to a mere Member of the minority party to have the distinguished Speaker take part in the debate, and I am glad he was listening. I have great respect for the gentleman from Massachusetts, great respect. He is a great American.

But to stand up here and to suggest that the way to peace is to turn our backs on those countries reflects little understanding of the realities of the world. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts, for whom I have the highest admiration, want to say to a country such as Costa Rica, "Go it yourself"?

Costa Rica has no army. They barely have a police force.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEMP. Now, I want to hear the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts tell us what the solution to peace is in Costa Rica, which has no army? What is he going to tell our Sandinista friends in Nicaragua?

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. O'NEILL. I am sure this whole matter is going to be debated for 5 or 6 hours tomorrow, but I just returned from visiting five capitals of the world where I talked to the leaders. Each one of them, the heads of governments, all friends of ours, said:

How does America get involved the way it gets involved? How do you get on the wrong side of the issue? Why is it you think of guns and you think of strength and you think of might when you have the Contadors down there and you haven't used them?

The way to peace is a diplomatic matter; it is not flexing the muscles and sending more ammunition down there.

I am giving you the message that was given to me by the leaders of different nations around the world who agree exactly as I do. America's policy on this is wrong.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO) has again expired.

(On request of Mr. KEMP, and by unanimous consent, Mr. LAGOMARSINO was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, before I yield further, I want to just respond to the Speaker.

The newly elected president of El Salvador is certainly asking for additional military and economic support. He knows the situation, and he told us, "You have given us just enough to survive. We need more so we can carry out what we need to do here."

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, again I thank my colleague for yielding. I want to go back to the analogy I was making about history.

When Harry Truman asked for the ability to establish the hopes for peace and democracy in Greece and Turkey, he was not only asking for economic assistance, he asked for some guns and he asked principally for security assistance. Was Harry Truman a warmonger? Was Harry Truman trying to prosecute a war? Was Harry Truman turning his back on diplomacy? Is that the legacy of the Truman doctrine?

What about when Kennedy asked for assistance of a security nature to Central America? The Alliance for Progress was not just economic assistance. It was fashioned against the background of the OAS, and the Rio Treaty, providing for mutual defense.

What about the good neighbor policy of Franklin Roosevelt's when Nazi shipping was in the Caribbean? Even then, following in the tradition of the Monroe Doctrine, America's strength guaranteed the security of the nations of our hemisphere.

President Reagan reminded us tonight that half of all the oil coming into the North American Continent comes through the Caribbean shipping lines. Does anybody doubt that when Franklin Roosevelt asked for a good neighbor policy, he was not just concerned about economic assistance to Central America, he was concerned about the Nazis.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will be in order.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, may I ask, who has the time?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO) has the time, and the Chair would appreciate the Committee being in order.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, the President tonight appealed to the American people and the Congress for partnership, and bipartisan cooperation, in meeting our vital foreign policy objectives in Central America.

He also supported the Contadora position. He is strongly in support of the Contadora efforts.

How can you negotiate with those with whom there are no negotiations possible? How is Costa Rica going to negotiate with Nicaragua, which is sending arms and revolution into its neighboring country? How can there be negotiations between Duarte and Ungo if Ungo decides to stay in the fields and the mountains and shoot his way into power?

Let us pursue negotiations. The Speaker is right. But how can a country pursue negotiations without having the strength to defend itself against those who seek illegitimate power whether through negotiations or other means?

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman, would you join me in requesting the President to send the junior Senator from Connecticut and the Speaker of the House as a team to go to Northern Ireland and negotiate between the IRA and the Protestant forces over there and solve that problem?

Then they can go to Panmunjom where they have been negotiating for 25 years and solve that problem. Then they can go to Kabul and negotiate some peace in Afghanistan, because there is no relationship between the power structure and the willingness of those wonderful Soviets to negotiate peace.

□ 2130

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

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I yield to the Speaker.

Mr. O'NEILL. The gentleman was talking about Ireland.

Mr. HYDE. And I would like to accompany the Speaker on that journey of peace.

Mr. O'NEILL. The Chairman has asked if we can finish the bill.

I just want to answer the question with respect to Northern Ireland. You know, with regard to Northern Ireland, I am bitterly upset about it. I think I have played a part in America of stopping the IRA flow of funds that are going over there. I know that I have done that.

Not only that, I went to Northern Ireland. I went to Belfast. I saw Mr. Paisley. I saw all the five Irish leaders in one house at one time. I am the only individual in the history of what has happened over there that did that.

Mr. HYDE. When is the peace treaty to be signed?

Mr. O'NEILL. I am the only one that had the guts to go over there and talk about it.

Mr. HYDE. When are we signing the peace treaty?

Mr. O'NEILL. But at least I attempted, and I am not a native there.

I am merely asking, what I ask in this is what the leaders of different nations have said to me. The Presidents and the leaders of the Contadora down there, they are the same culture, they are the same background, they are the same race. They speak the same language. They all know each other.

Why are we not using them? That is what they ask all over the world. Do we have to do it with guns? Why is the American policy wrong?

Mr. HYDE. We are using them, Mr. Speaker, but they do not want to participate in the electoral process. They want power so that they can have a Vietnam power seizure. They do not want elections.

Now, the minute the Sandinistas will go for an honest, free, open election, we have got peace, but that is the last thing they want.

Now, negotiations mean talk, but if you want peace and they want a piece of your country, you are not going to get very far.

Mr. O'NEILL. Of course, I do not agree with the gentleman. The gentleman at the mike was talking about Harry Truman in Greece. How you love to bring in the Democratic names. Remember when Harry Truman came to the Congress of the United States, the Greek people—

Mr. KEMP. He was an American first and a Democrat second.

Mr. O'NEILL. I said he came to the Congress of the United States. The Greek people were not butchering each other. It was a different story.

Mr. KEMP. The Soviets were attempting to butcher the people of Greece.

Mr. HYDE. Wait a minute, I have the time and I would say those 1,400,000 people that voted last Sunday are not interested in butchering either. They are interested in democracy. They put their hand out and I suggest we grasp their hand, not spit on it.

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

Mr. HYDE. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEMP. I want to make one other point. Again, the Speaker has made, I think, a very serious charge against this President when he said that the President is only interested in a military solution. I think that is patently absurd. I think it is at odds with the facts and the effort that the President is making is five times on the economic side what it is on the military side.

Let me tell you something else. Two out of three El Salvador troopers, two out of three of those El Salvador young men are dying in the fields from wounds that otherwise could have been cured had they had the medical evacuation equipment to bring them back into San Salvador, and proper medical supplies to guard against infection in the field.

This is not an effort to impose a military solution. It is responding to real human needs.

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

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

It is apparent to the House that while the evening is drawing nigh, there was reason to raise this amendment. The amendment specifically addressed itself to Zimbabwe, an African country that clearly has been time and time again in violation of human rights.

The purpose of the amendment, however, was to suggest that this House operates with a double standard in terms of human rights.

Rarely do we hear the Members of the Speaker's party raise such questions about developing nations such as those in Africa. We could be talking about countries like the Philippines, Mozambique, Ethiopia, Zambia, any number of countries who fundamentally violate human rights; but instead, our leadership chooses to take on a small country of 5 million people that has dramatically demonstrated its commitment to try to survive in a democracy. As a result of that, she is being bled to death by our policies, with the Congress being involved in a piecemeal attempt to extend its viewpoint over that which would possibly allow the survival of democracy.

Mr. Chairman, it was my purpose to raise this amendment to set the stage so that all of us in the House will tune in tomorrow and watch the hypocrisy of that double standard.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is not as exciting as our Central American policy and what happened in the days of Harry S. Truman, so perhaps my comments can tone down the debate for a moment.

I would like to offer some comments concerning the Trade and Development Enhancement Act of 1983.

The Trade and Development Enhancement Act of 1983, which the Congress adopted last November, directed AID, in cooperation with the

Eximbank, to establish a program of tied aid, or mixed credits for U.S. exports. The Foreign Affairs Committee had jurisdiction over the part of this act relating to AID. Earlier this year, the International Economic Policy and Trade Subcommittee conducted hearings on the administration's implementation of this important legislation.

Because the committee completed work on the foreign assistance authorization bill before the subcommittee had finished its hearings, the subcommittee did not have the opportunity to make any recommendations to the committee on this program. I would now like to offer several comments on AID's response to the congressional mandate on mixed credits.

The use of mixed credits by our foreign competitors has grown by leaps and bounds over the last 3 years. France alone has a program approaching nearly \$2 billion per year. If United States efforts through the OECD to negotiate an end to this practice are to be successful, then we must establish a credible program of our own. This was the principal objective of the legislation enacted last year. AID's active participation in this effort is essential.

AID has taken some positive steps in setting up a program. The Agency's activities are set forth in a recent letter from Administrator McPherson, which I would like to include in the RECORD at this point:

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL
DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., April 25, 1984.

Hon. DON BONKER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on International
Economic Policy and Trade, Committee
on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of March 16, 1984, concerning the implementation of the Trade and Development Enhancement Act of 1983. Let me assure you that AID shares your view that the United States must make every effort to negotiate, through the OECD, an end to the use of tied aid credits for exports, and that the development of a credible mixed credit program is essential to such efforts.

In that regard, I am pleased to inform you that on March 13, 1984, the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies (NAC) approved the guidelines and criteria of AID's tied aid credit program. As part of this program, AID's Deputy Assistant Administrator for the Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination has been designated as the Agency's coordinator for tied aid credits. In addition, NAC procedures for implementing tied aid credits were approved on April 24, 1984 and it is expected that NAC policy guidelines for mixed credits will be approved on May 8.

1. SUMMARY OF TIED AID CREDIT PROGRAM

AID's tied aid credit program includes eight of the eleven countries that have Commodity Import Programs (CIPs) financed from the Economic Support Fund (ESF) account in fiscal year 1984. Moreover, our Trade Finance Facility in Egypt, funded out of the CIP for that country, provides

AID with the capability of countering predatory financing offered in Egypt. Two countries, Mauritius and Seychelles, with combined CIPs totalling only \$4 million, have been exempted from the tied aid program. The amount of the country CIPs included in the program, however, totals \$223.5 million. The attached Table II identifies the included countries, and the amount of their CIPs, with a plus (+). Such amounts will remain available to provide funding for AID's tied aid credit program until otherwise expended for CIP purposes. The guidelines that govern the operation of our program are fully consistent with Section 645 of the Trade and Enhancement Act of 1983. A financing must be for a defensive purpose, must take place within the existing country allocation of an ESF-financed CIP, and should reasonably be expected to contribute to the advancement of the development objectives of the importing country as set forth in the CIP agreement with AID.

2. LEGAL INTERPRETATION OF ESF-CIP LANGUAGE

With respect to the question of whether AID should finance tied aid credit activities with ESF in excess of that allocated to CIPs, we find ourselves in a difficult position. Your letter expresses the view that the legislation did not limit funding "only" to the amount of ESF funds allocated to CIPs. As you know, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee (SFRC) has sent us a letter indicating their view that AID's mandate is limited to the total amount of ESF allocated to CIPs and that the language in the legislation was the result of a printer's error. This conclusion recently was reaffirmed in the SFRC report on the fiscal year 1985 foreign assistance authorization legislation. In view of this difference in opinion between the House and the Senate, we believe it is proper for us to adhere to the more narrow view, since both the House and the Senate do agree that ESF allocated for CIPs can be used for mixed credits. Moreover, in light of the letter we have received from the SFRC and their report on the fiscal year 1985 bill, we believe that in fact the legislation was not limited to CIP merely by a technical misstep and that it was the intent of the Congress to do so.

In this regard, your letter appears to make a distinction between CIP funds and ESF. Please note that a CIP is a type of program assistance and ESF normally is the source of funding used to finance such a program.

3. DEVELOPMENT IMPACT OF ESF

Your letter also distinguishes between ESF and Development Assistance funds, implying that ESF has little, if any, development impact. This is not the case. Section 531(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act directs the President, in planning assistance intended for economic development under the ESF chapter, to take into account, to the maximum extent feasible, the policy directions of section 102 of the Foreign Assistance Act (basic human needs). The SFRC has highlighted this developmental aspect of ESF by including in both last year's enacted authorization bill (S. 1347), as well as the bill it is currently considering, an amendment to section 531 which requires, to the maximum extent feasible, that the President provide ESF assistance "consistent with the policy directions, purposes, and programs of part I" of the Foreign Assistance Act.

AID's efforts to carry out the intention of the Congress that ESF resources be used for developmental purposes are evidenced by

the fact that more than 32 percent of ESF resources have been projectized in fiscal year 1984 and more than 31 percent will be projectized in fiscal year 1985. Taking away the amount earmarked for Israel, which is provided in the form of a cash transfer, approximately 45 percent of ESF resources provided in fiscal year 1984 have been projectized. Thus, any effort to increase the amount of ESF to be set aside for mixed credit purposes would impair AID's developmental efforts.

4. CONSTRAINTS ON USE OF ESF

With respect to ESF in general, it should be noted that there are legislative and institutional constraints that govern the use of ESF resources that impinge upon our ability to make funds available to finance a tied aid credit program. Specifically, these constraints arise from the need to make provisions for Congressional earmarks, base payments (on behalf of the Executive Branch), and the above-mentioned legislative requirement that to the maximum extent feasible ESF resources are to be programmed to address specific development problems. Given these constraints, I believe that the tied aid credit program we have established represents a credible response to our mandate.

The impact of the constraints I have referred to above can be clearly seen by applying them to our ESF program level of \$3,181,690,000 for fiscal year 1984.

TABLE I.—Summary table ESF—fiscal year 1984

Congressional earmarks	\$1,793,000,000
Best efforts pledges	117,000,000
Other ESF:	
Project grants	487,540,000
Latin America cash transfer	304,000,000
Other cash transfer ¹	252,650,000
CIP's	227,500,000
Total	3,181,690,000

¹ Of which \$60 million goes to a country with a sizeable CIP. For country-by-country details, see table II.

a. Congressional earmarks

Right off the top of the ESF program level must be taken the amounts earmarked by Congress for specific countries, Cyprus, Egypt and Israel. This sum comes to \$1,793,000,000 for the fiscal year 1984, equivalent to about 60 percent of total ESF. Pursuant to section 531(a)(1) of the FAA, we have been able to projectize the full amount of the ESF for Cyprus. These projects are designed to address specific development problems. For Egypt, most of its ESF allocation is also projectized, and, as stated above, out of the amount that is allocated for a CIP we have been able to reach an agreement with that Government to set aside funds to finance the operation of our Trade Finance Facility (TFF) in that country. The specific purpose of the TFF is to provide defensive financing in cases in which U.S. exporters encounter predatory financing that would cause the loss of sales to the public sector in Egypt. Interestingly, since the establishment of the TFF in late 1981, we have had only two opportunities to make use of it. As already mentioned, all of the ESF allocation for Israel is made in the form of a cash transfer.

b. "Best Efforts" pledges

In addition to Congressional earmarks, we also make allocations of ESF to countries to which the Executive Branch, in consultation with Congress, has made best efforts

pledges in consideration for the unhampered availability to the United States of specific military facilities. In fiscal year 1984 this comes to \$117,000,000. We have had some success in projectizing a good part of these resources for development purposes (see Table II) and the part that is in cash transfers is for countries, Portugal and Spain, where we probably do not have sufficient leverage to negotiate the implementation of CIP's, and thereby make them eligible for inclusion in our tied aid credit program.

c. Other ESF

After providing for preemptive allocations in fiscal year 1984, there is an ESF remaining balance of \$1,271,690,000 and this has been allocated on the basis of economic, security, and political criteria. On an aggregate basis, \$487,540,000 has been programmed for specific projects, \$556,650,000 for cash transfers, and \$227,500,000 for CIP's. The programming for individual countries is shown on Table II. The amount involved in cash transfers is to countries of strategic security and political importance to the United States that are in need of immediate balance of payments assistance. The use of this mechanism has assured disbursement in a manner that is expected to contribute importantly to most of these countries staying in compliance with respective IMF agreements which, on balance, serve United States security and political interests. In addition to speed of disbursement, the cash transfer mechanism provides flexibility in servicing the most urgent foreign exchange needs of an economy, as well as leverage for the United States to influence a recipient government's management of its total foreign exchange flow. Attempts to shift these funds to CIP's and/or for tied aid credit purposes would substantially slow down timeliness of disbursement.

Further, the majority of the cash transfers flow to Latin America. These countries are already large markets for the United States. In fact, the economic impact of our aid is to provide them with balance of payments resources which directly support their imports. While not identified to specific purchases, the result is clearly that without our aid they would have less foreign exchange and would import less. Since the United States supplies most of Latin America's purchases, the loss would fall on U.S. exporters. The only effect of a mixed credit CIP fund in lieu of a cash transfer would be to shift the benefits from one U.S. exporter to another. Someone would benefit but other U.S. exporters would suffer. (Since funds allocated for CIP's generally are slower in disbursement, there also would be a temporal shift.)

The country distribution that emerged from the ESF allocation process for fiscal year 1984 includes only 9 of the 23 countries that in the January 1, 1980–September 26, 1983 period have been identified as receiving 3 or more mixed credit offers. These 9 countries are identified on Table II by an asterisk (*). The ESF allocation for 5 of the 9 countries is fully projectized, and for the remaining country, Turkey, ESF is in the form of a cash transfer. Two of the nine countries are included in our tied aid credit program, and the TFF in Egypt gives us the capability of countering predatory financing in that country.

It is quite clear that the ESF allocation process and the other constraints under which we operate can have an important bearing on our financial capacity to under-

take an operation in countries that have been particular targets for mixed credits. Take, as an example, the two most recent mixed credit cases that Eximbank has undertaken to counter in Cyprus and Indonesia. While Cyprus has an ESF allocation for fiscal year 1984, it was not available to finance an A.I.D. participation in Eximbank's defensive counter offer because all of its ESF is projectized, leaving aside the question of the developmental character of the goods to be financed (i.e., digital switching equipment). Indonesia is a country that under present criteria is not eligible for an ESF allocation.

The above discussion attempts to set forth the constraints on our discretion in both the allocation and programming of ESF resources. While I fully agree that there should be a concerted U.S. effort to bring about an elimination of the use of predatory financing on behalf of our foreign competitors, I believe that the program we have established is about as far as we can go within the context of our present constraints if we are to remain faithful to our developmental mandate.

5. CONCLUSION

I appreciate your suggestions with regard to the provision of standby commitments and the creation of a mechanism for exchanging information between the U.S. Government and the private sector. One of my reasons for designating an A.I.D. tied aid coordinator was to have the Agency in a position to act on an expedited basis where there is a need. As a practical matter, in most mixed credit cases, U.S. exporters will look to Eximbank for the bulk of their financial support in the form of fixed rate loans or guarantees. Thus, operations in which we are involved are also likely to be with Eximbank. In those cases that satisfy the criteria of our program we will be quite willing to join with Eximbank in the issuance of a preliminary commitment on an expedited basis. We are also willing to do the same in the case of an operation with a private financial institution so long as we are comfortable with the reasonable evidence presented. Before providing standby commitments, however, we must assure ourselves that this will not be inconsistent with AID's Congressional notification requirements. I will have my staff give serious thought to your suggestion on the creation of an information exchange and we will work with Eximbank on the practicability and mechanism for such a system.

Thank you for your letter and your suggestions. If I can provide you with further information, please let me know.

Sincerely,

M. PETER MCPHERSON.

My major concern with AID's program had been that the Agency appeared to favor the most narrow interpretation of the law—section 645—regarding the funds to be made available to counter foreign mixed credit offers. In practice, this narrow interpretation would have limited AID's program to only three—Egypt, Kenya, and Zimbabwe—of the dozens of countries which have been recipients of tied aid credits in the past.

I am pleased, therefore, to note that on May 9 I received a letter from AID's Director of Legislative Affairs

which clarifies that the Agency will make more than \$220 million in commodity import program funds available in fiscal year 1984 for defensive mixed credit offers in any country in which the United States has an ESF program. This will broaden potential participation to a number of countries,

such as Cyprus, the Philippines, Tunisia, and Turkey, which have been among the largest beneficiaries of mixed credits. At the same time, it will greatly strengthen the hand of our negotiators at the OECD in seeking to eliminate this aid and trade distorting practice.

I wish to commend Mr. McPherson for the positive commitment his Agency has demonstrated to establishing this new program, and look forward to your cooperation, Chairman FASCELL, in continuing to exercise oversight over this important initiative.

TABLE II.—ESF, FISCAL YEAR 1984 COUNTRY ALLOCATION AND PROGRAMING

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	Amount	Projects	Cash transfer	Commodity import program (CIP)	Percent distribution
Total ESF, fiscal year 1984	\$3,181,690				
Less:					
A. Congressional earmarks:					
Cyprus	15,000	(15,000)			
Egypt *	868,000	(450,000)	(\$118,000)	(\$300,000)	
Israel	910,000		(910,000)		
Total A	1,793,000	(465,000)	(1,028,000)	(300,000)	56
ESF after A	1,388,690				
B. In support of military base agreements:					
Philippines *	50,000	(50,000)			
Oman	15,000	(15,000)			
Portugal	40,000		(40,000)		
Spain	12,000		(12,000)		
Total B	117,000	(65,000)	(52,000)		4
ESF After A + B	1,271,690				40
Total					100
Programing of unencumbered ESF:					
Africa:					
Botswana	800	800			
Chad	3,000	3,000			
Djibouti	3,000	3,000			
Kenya **	40,000			40,000	
Liberia	34,150		34,150		
Mauritius	2,000			2,000	
Niger *	5,000			5,000	
Senegal	10,000		10,000		
Seychelles	2,000			2,000	
Somalia *	35,000	17,500		17,500	
Sudan *	120,000	3,000	60,000	57,000	
Zaire *	8,000			8,000	
Zambia *	20,000	5,000		15,000	
Zimbabwe **	40,000	9,000		31,000	
Africa Regional	16,000	16,000			
Total, Africa	338,950	57,300	104,150	177,500	
Asia:					
Pakistan *	225,000	175,000		50,000	
Thailand *	9,200	9,200			
Total, Asia	234,200	184,200		50,000	
Near East:					
Jordan *	20,000	20,000			
Lebanon	140,440	140,440			
Morocco *	7,000	7,000			
Tunisia *	1,500	1,500			
Turkey *	138,500		138,500		
Near East Regional	14,000	14,000			
Total, Near East	321,440	182,940	138,500		
Latin American and Caribbean:					
Costa Rica	70,000		70,000		
Dominican Republic	34,000		34,000		
El Salvador	120,000	25,000	95,000		
Grenada	15,000		15,000		
Haiti	5,000	5,000			
Honduras	40,000		40,000		
Jamaica	55,000	5,000	50,000		
East Caribbean Region	25,000	25,000			
Latin American and Caribbean regional	2,000	2,000			
Total, Latin American and Caribbean	366,000	62,000	304,000		
Other:					
Italy	10,000		10,000		
Oceanogr. Rsch	1,100	1,000	10,000		
Total, Other	11,100	1,000	10,000		
Total unencumbered	1,271,690	487,540	556,650	227,500	
Distribution of total ESF	3,181,690	1,017,540	1,636,650	\$27,500	

* 1 of 23 countries identified as having received 3 or more mixed credit offers in the Jan. 1, 1980 to Sept. 26, 1983 period.

** Included in AID's tied aid program.

Note.—Please note that the numbers for Egypt include amounts furnished pursuant to AID's deob/reob authority. Excluding these amounts would result in the percentages on p. 3 of the letter being higher.

TABLE III.—ESF, FISCAL YEAR 1985 COUNTRY ALLOCATION AND PROGRAMING

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	Amount	Projects	Cash transfer	Commodity import program (CIP)	Percent distribution
Total ESF, fiscal year 1985	\$3,438,100				
Less:					
A. Congressional earmarks:					
Cyprus	(3,000)	(3,000)			
Egypt ¹	(750,000)	(450,000)		(300,000)	
Israel	850,000	(65,000)	(785,000)		
Total A	1,603,000	(518,000)	(785,000)	(300,000)	47
ESF after A	1,835,100				
B. In support of military base agreements:					
Philippines ¹	95,000	47,500	47,500		
Oman	20,000	20,000			
Portugal	80,000		80,000		
Spain	12,000		12,000		
Total B	207,000	67,500	139,500		6
ESF after A + B	1,628,100				47
Total					100
Programming of unencumbered ESF:					
Africa:					
Botswana	10,000	10,000			
Chad	10,000	10,000			
Djibouti	3,500	3,500			
Kenya ¹ ²	55,000			55,000	
Liberia	45,000		45,000		
Mauritius	2,000			2,000	
Niger ²	7,000			7,000	
Senegal	15,000			15,000	
Seychelles	2,000			2,000	
Somalia ²	35,000	15,000			
Sudan ²	120,000			120,000	
Zaire ²	15,000			15,000	
Zambia ²	20,000	5,000		15,000	
Zimbabwe ¹ ²	15,000			15,000	
Africa regional	37,000	37,000			
Total, Africa	391,500	80,500	45,000	266,000	
Asia:					
Pakistan ²	200,000	140,000		60,000	
Thailand ¹	5,000	5,000			
Total, Asia	205,000	145,000		60,000	
Near East:					
Jordan ¹	20,000	20,000			
Lebanon ¹	20,000	20,000			
Morocco ¹	15,000	5,000		10,000	
Tunisia ¹	3,000	3,000			
Turkey ¹	175,000		175,000		
Near East regional	15,000	15,000			
Total, Near East	248,000	63,000	175,000	10,000	
Latin America and Caribbean:					
Belize	4,000		4,000		
Costa Rica	160,000		160,000		
Dominican Republic	45,000		45,000		
El Salvador	210,000	25,000	185,000		
Guatemala	35,000		35,000		
Haiti	5,000	5,000			
Honduras	75,000		75,000		
Jamaica	70,000	5,000	65,000		
Panama	20,000		20,000		
East Caribbean regional	20,000	20,000			
C.A. Regional (ROCAP)	136,600	136,600			
Latin America and Caribbean regional	2,000	2,000			
Total, Latin America and Caribbean	782,600	1,936,000	58,900		
Other:					
Oceanogr. Rsch	1,000	1,000			
Total, other	1,000	1,000			
Total Unencumbered	1,628,100	483,100	809,000	336,000	
Distribution of total ESF	3,438,100	1,068,600	1,723,500	636,000	

¹ 1 of 23 countries identified as having received 3 or more mixed credit offers in the Jan. 1, 1980 to Sept. 26, 1983 period.² Included in AID's tied aid program.

Note.—Please note that the numbers for Egypt include amounts furnished pursuant to AID's deob/reob authority. Excluding these amounts would result in the percentages on page 3 of the letter being higher.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title IX?

The Clerk will designate title X.

The text of title X is as follows:

TITLE X—CENTRAL AMERICA

ADDITIONAL FISCAL YEAR 1985
AUTHORIZATIONS—CENTRAL AMERICA

SEC. 1001. (a)(1) In addition to amounts otherwise available, there are authorized to

be appropriated \$30,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985 to carry out section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act, and the aggregate ceiling on credits (or participations in credits) extended under that section for the fiscal year 1985 is hereby increased by \$30,000,000.

(2) In addition to amounts otherwise available, the following amounts are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1985

to carry out the following provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961:

(A) \$199,800,000 to carry out chapter 2 of part II.

(B) \$3,510,000 to carry out chapter 5 of part II.

(C) \$479,000,000 to carry out chapter 4 of part II.

(3) Section 515(c)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by inserting "El

Salvador, Honduras," immediately before "Indonesia."

(b)(1) In addition to amounts otherwise available, the following amounts are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1985 to carry out the following provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961:

- (A) \$65,562,500 to carry out section 103.
- (B) \$14,183,750 to carry out section 104(b).
- (C) \$38,975,000 to carry out section 104(c).
- (D) \$81,803,750 to carry out section 105.
- (E) \$82,275,000 to carry out section 106.
- (F) \$6,016,000 to carry out section 667.

(2) The ceiling on the total principal amount of guaranties outstanding at any one time under title III of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is hereby increased by \$80,000,000.

(c) In addition to amounts otherwise available, there are authorized to be appropriated \$9,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985 to carry out the Peace Corps Act.

(d) Amounts appropriated pursuant to this section are authorized to remain available until expended.

SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORIZATIONS—CENTRAL AMERICA

SEC. 1002. (a) In addition to amounts otherwise available, the following amounts are authorized to be appropriated:

(1) To carry out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 with respect to Central America for the fiscal year 1984:

- (A) \$7,200,000 to carry out section 104(c).
- (B) \$4,000,000 to carry out section 105.
- (C) \$19,088,000 to carry out section 106.
- (D) \$18,250,000 to carry out chapter 4 of part II.

(2) To carry out the purposes of Peace Corps Act with respect to Central America \$1,000,000 for the fiscal year 1984.

(3) For purposes of the reserve fund established pursuant to section 223 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985.

(4) For the United States Information Agency to carry out international information, educational, cultural, and exchange programs for Central America under the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, and Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1977, and other purposes authorized by law, \$17,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985.

(b) Amounts appropriated pursuant to this section are authorized to remain available until expended.

CONDITIONS ON SECURITY ASSISTANCE FOR EL SALVADOR

SEC. 1003. (a) The President shall ensure that military assistance and financing and economic support assistance are furnished to El Salvador in a manner which fosters demonstrated progress toward the political development, economic development, and security of that country. To this end, the President in every appropriate instance shall impose conditions (in addition to those specified in subsection (d) of this section) on the furnishing of military assistance and financing and economic support assistance to El Salvador in order to achieve those goals, including the objectives described in subsection (c) of this section.

(b)(1) Not later than September 30, 1984, the President shall submit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a detailed report fully describing the policies of the Government of El Salvador for achieving political development, economic development, and condi-

tions of security. This report shall also include—

(A) a determination by the President whether the Government of El Salvador has made demonstrated progress in achieving the objectives described in subsection (c);

(B) the President's detailed assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the policies of the Government of El Salvador in protecting and advancing the human rights (in particular, the right to security of person) of all persons in El Salvador with respect to each of those objectives; and

(C) a comprehensive review of the factors contributing to the political, economic, and security situation in that country, including such factors as human rights, land reform, the economy of the country, refugees and displaced persons, the military situation, and guerrilla activity.

(2) If, at any time during the fiscal year 1985, the President determines that the Government of El Salvador—

(A) has achieved the objectives described in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (c), and

(B) since the report was submitted pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection, has made additional demonstrated progress in achieving the objectives described in paragraphs (4), (5), (6), and (7) of subsection (c), the President shall submit a second report to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate containing the material described in paragraph (1) of this subsection.

(c) The objectives for the Government of El Salvador referred to in subsections (a) and (b) are the following:

(1) Removal from military, security, and police forces of those individuals responsible for or associated with the death squads, and establishment of effective control over those forces and over paramilitary groups which receive any assistance or support from those forces, thereby ending the involvement of members of those forces and groups in indiscriminate violence, secret detentions, abductions, torture, and murder.

(2) Compliance by the Government of El Salvador with the 1949 Geneva Conventions and the 1977 Protocol relating to the Protection of Victims of Non-International Armed Conflicts.

(3) Participation by the Government of El Salvador in negotiations with all major parties to the conflict in El Salvador, in good faith and without preconditions, for the purpose of achieving an equitable political solution, elements of which would be free and fair elections at a time to be determined in the negotiations and reforms within the security and police forces of El Salvador necessary to assure the physical security of all participating groups before, during, and after elections, unless the Government of El Salvador is unable to engage in such negotiations because of the refusal of the major opposition groups to participate.

(4) Elimination of the practice of detaining political prisoners, and repeal of legislation or decrees providing for such detention.

(5) Establishment of the rule of law and an effective judicial system, as demonstrated at a minimum by vigorous steps to bring to trial and discipline—

(A) all those directly or indirectly responsible for the murders and disappearances of United States citizens or for any related coverup; and

(B) substantial numbers of those directly or indirectly responsible for the abduction, torture, or murder of Salvadoran citizens.

(6) Protection of effective freedom of the press and freedom of association, including enforcement of measures against intimidation of the press and labor and peasant union members and leaders.

(7) Documented progress in implementing the land reform program (including the taking of measures against illegal evictions and the furnishing of necessary credits, administrative support, technical assistance, and services to beneficiaries), with no action taken which would modify, suspend, or terminate the land reform program in a manner detrimental to the rights of the beneficiaries or potential beneficiaries.

(d) Military assistance and financing and economic support assistance may be provided for El Salvador for the fiscal year 1985 only as follows:

(1) Up to \$64,800,000 of military assistance and financing, and up to one half of the economic support assistance approved by the Congress for El Salvador, may be provided if the President determines and states in the first report required by subsection (b) that the Government of El Salvador has made demonstrated progress in achieving all the objectives described in subsection (c).

(2) Not to exceed an additional \$124,500,000 of military assistance and financing, and the remaining amounts of economic support assistance approved by the Congress for El Salvador, may be provided if—

(A) the President submits a second report pursuant to subsection (b) stating that the President has determined that the Government of El Salvador has achieved the objectives described in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (c) and, since the first report was submitted, has made additional demonstrated progress in achieving the objectives described in paragraphs (4), (5), (6), and (7) of subsection (c); and

(B) the Congress enacts a joint resolution stating in substance that the Congress agrees with the President's determinations.

(e) As used in this section—

(1) the term "military assistance and financing" means any assistance provided under chapter 2 or chapter 5 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and any credits or loan guarantees provided under the Arms Export Control Act; and

(2) the term "economic support assistance" means assistance under chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

(f) The total number of United States military advisers in El Salvador may not exceed 55 at any time. For purposes of this limitation, United States military advisers include any members of the United States Armed Forces performing defense services, conducting international military education and training activities, or performing management functions under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or the Arms Export Control Act, but do not include members of the Armed Forces who are in El Salvador solely for the purpose of performing medical training or services.

(g)(1) The special drawdown authority of section 506 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 may not be used with respect to El Salvador during the fiscal years 1984 and 1985.

(2) The authority of section 21(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (relating to delayed billing for sales from stocks) may not be exercised with respect to El Salvador during the fiscal years 1984 and 1985, unless the President first reports to the Congress that an emergency has arisen which requires immediate military assistance to El

Salvador and that the emergency requirement cannot be met under any other law.

(3) If the authority of section 614(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is used to waive any provision of this section, that waiver shall take effect on the date on which the President submits the written notification required by that section and shall cease to be effective 30 days thereafter unless, during that 30-day period, the Congress enacts a joint resolution approving the waiver.

ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUNDS FOR EL SALVADOR

SEC. 1004. (a) For the fiscal year 1985—

(1) all local currencies generated in El Salvador with funds appropriated to carry out chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall be deposited in accordance with section 609 of that Act in a special account established by the Government of El Salvador and shall be available only for purposes of agrarian reform, employment generation, restoration of public services, policy development, assistance for displaced persons, and other humanitarian assistance;

(2) funds made available under that chapter for El Salvador may not be credited directly to the Central Reserve Bank of El Salvador or mixed in any way with its foreign exchange reserves; and

(3) not less than one quarter of the balance of payments support provided under that chapter for El Salvador shall be in the form of a Commodity Import Program, as generally administered by the Agency for International Development.

(b) The following criteria shall apply to the Commodity Import Program for El Salvador for the fiscal year 1985:

(1) Eligible importers under the program shall include agencies charged by the Government of El Salvador with implementing the land reform program and businesses in El Salvador which employ less than 25 people.

(2) All imports under the program shall be appropriate to the development needs of El Salvador.

(3) The prices charged in El Salvador for imports acquired under the program shall be their fair market value.

(c) As part of the annual congressional presentation materials, the Agency for International Development shall report on the activities and commodities financed pursuant to this section.

(d)(1) Each fiscal year, prior to expending any funds under chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide assistance for economic stabilization purposes to the Government of El Salvador, the President shall be satisfied that the Central Reserve Bank of El Salvador has implemented or taken appropriate steps toward implementing the major recommendations contained in the study entitled "Foreign Exchange: Policy and Management Within the Central Reserve Bank of El Salvador" relating to management, allocation, and controls on the use of foreign exchange.

(2) Not later than January 31, 1985, the President shall report to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate on the implementation of this report and on ongoing efforts to improve the management, allocation, and control of foreign exchange.

RESTRICTIONS ON THE INTRODUCTION OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES INTO HONDURAS AND LIMITATIONS ON MILITARY ASSISTANCE FOR HONDURAS

SEC. 1005. (a) United States Armed Forces may not be introduced into the territory of Honduras for training exercises and, except as provided in subsection (d), may not be introduced into the territory of Honduras for any other purpose unless—

(1) they are responsible for providing security at the United States embassy in Honduras; or

(2) they are performing functions pursuant to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or the Arms Export Control Act, except that not more than 300 members of the Armed Forces may be in Honduras under this paragraph at any one time.

(b) Funds appropriated by the Congress may not be obligated or expended for the introduction of United States Armed Forces into the territory of Honduras except as provided in this section.

(c) Any members of the United States Armed Forces in Honduras on the date of enactment of this Act who are not covered by one of the exceptions provided in this section shall be immediately withdrawn from that country.

(d) Consistent with section 3 of the War Powers Resolution, the President shall consult with the Congress before introducing United States Armed Forces into hostilities in Honduras or into situations in Honduras where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances.

(e) The aggregate total of the assistance provided for Honduras under chapter 2 and chapter 5 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 may not exceed \$56,000,000 for the fiscal year 1984 and may not exceed \$41,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985. Credits may not be issued and loans may not be guaranteed for Honduras under the Arms Export Control Act for the fiscal year 1984 or the fiscal year 1985.

LIMITATIONS ON MILITARY ASSISTANCE AND SALES FOR GUATEMALA AND ON JOINT MILITARY EXERCISES WITH GUATEMALA

SEC. 1006. (a) For the fiscal years 1984 and 1985—

(1) funds may not be obligated for assistance for Guatemala under chapter 2 or chapter 5 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961;

(2) letters of offers may not be issued to and credits may not be extended and guarantees may not be issued for Guatemala under the Arms Export Control Act;

(3) licenses for exports to Guatemala may not be issued under section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act;

(4) licenses for exports for the armed forces of Guatemala may not be issued under the Export Administration Act of 1979;

(5) members of the United States Armed Forces may not be assigned or detailed to Guatemala to carry out functions under the Arms Export Control Act or the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, except that this paragraph does not apply with respect to functions performed pursuant to section 515 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; and

(6) United States Armed Forces may not participate in joint military exercises with the armed forces of Guatemala, and funds appropriated by the Congress may not be obligated or expended for participation by United States Armed Forces in any such exercises.

(b) The prohibitions contained in subsection (a) do not apply with respect to (1)

sales of construction equipment and mobile medical facilities to assist in development programs that will directly assist the poor in Guatemala, (2) sales of training, to be provided outside of Guatemala, which is related to the sales described in clause (1), or (3) a total for both fiscal year 1984 and 1985 of no more than \$10,000,000 in loan guarantees and direct credits under the Arms Export Control Act for sales described in clauses (1) and (2). The exceptions to the prohibition on military assistance and sales for Guatemala provided by this subsection are provided only to enable the military forces of that country to obtain equipment and training for civilian engineering and construction projects and mobile medical teams.

FUND FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT OF CENTRAL AMERICA

SEC. 1007. (a) It is the sense of the Congress that the achievement of democracy, human rights, peace, and equitable economic growth in Central America depends primarily on the cooperation and the human and economic resources of the people and governments of Central America. The Congress recognizes that the United States can make a significant contribution to such peaceful and democratic development through a consistent and coherent policy which includes a long-term commitment of assistance. This policy should be designed to support actively democracy, political reform, and human rights; to promote equitable economic growth and development; and to foster dialogue and negotiations to achieve peace based on a reduction in armaments and on national reconciliation.

(b) In recognition of the principles described in subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 \$250,000,000 for the fiscal year 1984, to be used for bilateral and regional economic assistance programs of reconstruction and development with respect to Belize, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador, and Nicaragua. These funds may be obligated only if the President determines and reports to the Congress that—

(1) the countries of the region have entered into a comprehensive peace agreement based on the principles of noninterference in the affairs of another country, national reconciliation, and democracy;

(2) a regional development plan has been formulated by the countries of Central America which includes detailed proposals for each country and includes plans for the reestablishment of the Central American Common Market; and

(3) a donor coordination group has been established which includes individual donor countries as well as multinational development institutions and which is responsible for coordinating all development and reconstruction assistance funds for the region in order to assure the most efficient uses of all funding and assistance programs.

Assistance under this section shall be provided consistent with the purposes of the Central American Development Organization.

(c) Amounts authorized to be appropriated by this section are in addition to amounts otherwise available for the purposes specified in subsection (b), may be appropriated in subsequent fiscal years if not appropriated for the fiscal year 1984, and are authorized to remain available until expended.

(d) The Congress expects that, in seeking the goals described in paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (b), the efforts of the Contadora countries (Venezuela, Colombia, Panama, and Mexico) will be encouraged and supported and the United States will actively assist the Contadora countries in seeking a regional settlement to the conflict in Central America.

(e) Consistent with the recommendations of the National Bipartisan Commission on Central America, the Congress expects that, once the goals described in paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (b) have been attained, United States economic assistance for Central America for future years will continue at a level comparable to the aggregate level authorized for economic assistance for Central America by this section and other sections of this Act.

CENTRAL AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

SEC. 1008. (a) The Congress finds that participation by Central American countries in an effective forum for dialogue on, and the continuous review and advancement of, Central America's political, economic, and social development would foster cooperation between the United States and Central American countries.

(b) It is the sense of the Congress that—
(1) The President should enter into negotiations with the countries of Central America to establish a Central American Development Organization; and

(2) The establishment of the Central American Development Organization should be based upon the following principles:

(A) Participation in the Organization should be open to the United States, other donors, and those Central American countries that commit themselves to, among other things, progress on human rights, building democracy, and encouraging equitable economic growth through policy reforms.

(B) The Organization should be structured to include representatives from both the public and private sectors, including representatives from the labor, agriculture, and business communities.

(C) The Organization should meet periodically to carry out the functions described in subparagraphs (D) and (E) of this paragraph and should be supported by a limited professional secretariat.

(D) The Organization should make recommendations affecting Central American countries on such matters as—

(i) political, economic, and social development objectives, including the strengthening of democratic pluralism and the safeguarding of human rights;

(ii) mobilization of resources and external assistance needs; and

(iii) reform of economic policies and structures.

(E) The Organization should have the capacity for monitoring country performance on the recommendations issued in accordance with subparagraph (D) of this paragraph and for evaluating progress towards meeting such country objectives.

(F) For each fiscal year after that in which the President has completed negotiations and agreed to participate in the Organization, the disbursement of 25 percent of the economic assistance funds allocated by the United States directly for each Central American country should be deferred until the United States and the Organization have both approved disbursement.

(G) The President should encourage other donors similarly to designate a percentage

of their direct economic assistance for Central American countries for joint approval with the Organization.

(H) The administrator of the agency primarily responsible for administering part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, or his designee, should be chairman of the Organization and should carry out his functions in that capacity under the continuous supervision and general direction of the Secretary of State.

(c) Subject to subsection (d)(3), the President is authorized to participate in the Central American Development Organization.

(d)(1) The administrator of the agency primarily responsible for administering part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of State, shall prepare a detailed proposal to carry out this section and shall keep the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate fully and currently informed concerning the development of the proposal.

(2) To facilitate full congressional involvement in the establishment of the Central American Development Organization, the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives shall designate at least three members of that committee, and the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate shall designate at least three members of that committee, who shall be kept fully and currently informed by the executive branch of all negotiations or discussions with donor countries and recipient countries concerning the establishment of that Organization.

(3) The President shall transmit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a copy of the text of any agreement which the President proposes to sign providing for the establishment of and United States participation in the Central American Development Organization no less than sixty days prior to signing such agreement. The United States shall not participate in the implementation of any such agreement for at least 60 days after such transmittal. During that 60-day period there shall be full and formal consultations with and review by those committees in accordance with the procedures applicable to reprogramming notifications pursuant to section 634A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

LAND REFORM PROGRAMS

SEC. 1009. Section 620(g) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "This prohibition shall not apply to monetary assistance made available for use by a government or political subdivision or agency of such government to compensate nationals of that country in accordance with a land reform program, if the President determines that monetary assistance for such land reform program will further the national interests of the United States."

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

SEC. 1010. Chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended by sections 202 and 804 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 538. ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.—
(a) The President may furnish assistance under this chapter to countries and organizations, including national and regional institutions, in order to strengthen the admin-

istration of justice in Central American countries and the countries of the Caribbean. Assistance under this section may only include support for specialized professional training, scholarships, and exchanges for continuing legal education; programs to enhance prosecutorial and judicial capabilities and protection for participants in judicial cases; strengthening professional organizations in order to promote services to members and the role of the bar in judicial selection, enforcement of ethical standards, and legal reform; increasing the availability of legal materials and publications; seminars, conferences, and training and educational programs to improve the administration of justice and to strengthen respect for the rule of law and human rights; and revision and modernization of legal codes and procedures.

"(b) Not more than \$20,000,000 of the funds made available to carry out this chapter for any fiscal year shall be available to carry out this section, in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes."

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

SEC. 1011. It is the sense of the Congress that funds appropriated for the fiscal years 1984 and 1985 to carry out section 103 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 should be used for a comprehensive rural electrification program in Central America in order to establish conditions of stability and a foundation for economic development.

TRADE CREDIT INSURANCE PROGRAM

SEC. 1012. Title III of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 224. TRADE CREDIT INSURANCE PROGRAM.—(a) The agency primarily responsible for administering part I of this Act (hereafter in this section referred to as the 'agency') may, pursuant to the authority of this section, provide a guarantee or insurance covering the risks of loss or nonpayment under short-term trade credits, which are provided for the purpose of financing goods and services for the use of the private sector in Central American countries, in any case in which a proposed guarantee or proposed insurance under the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 covering such risks does not, in the judgment of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, offer reasonable assurance of repayment as required under section 2(b)(1)(B) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945.

"(b) The agency may not provide a guarantee or insurance under this section with respect to short-term trade credits unless those credits are repayable within a period not to exceed one year from the date of such guarantee or insurance.

"(c) The agency may not enter into any commitments to guarantee or insure under this section after September 30, 1989.

"(d) Of the funds authorized to be appropriated to carry out chapter 4 of part II of this Act, such sums as may be necessary may be made available for payments by the agency under any commitments to guarantee or insure entered into under this section.

"(e) Commitments to guarantee or insure may be made under this section only to such extent or in such amounts as may be provided in advance in appropriation Acts, not to exceed \$300,000,000 in the fiscal year 1985.

"(f) Recoveries, after deduction for expenses related thereto, accruing under guarantees and insurance authorized by this sec-

tion shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"(g) The Export-Import Bank shall provide such administrative and technical assistance to the agency as the Bank and the agency deem appropriate to assist the agency in carrying out this section."

ELECTIONS IN PANAMA

SEC. 1013. Since the upcoming elections in Panama are crucial to the democratic process in that country, it is the sense of the Congress that the United States should support, in the strongest terms possible, elections which are free, fair, and honest. It is the further sense of the Congress that if the elections are not held or if there is an attempt to tamper with the election results, the President should consider options to demonstrate to the Panamanian authorities the deep concern of the United States. One such option should be whether it is in the interest of the United States to terminate military assistance to Panama.

RELATIONS BETWEEN BELIZE AND GUATEMALA

SEC. 1014. It is the sense of the Congress that the United States should use its good offices and influence to encourage the Government of Guatemala to recognize the independence of Belize and to enter into a mutual nonaggression treaty with Belize.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 1015. This title shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. AuCOIN, 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. 5119) to authorize international development and security assistance programs and Peace Corps programs for fiscal year 1985, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

WILL HISTORY REPEAT ITSELF IN CENTRAL AMERICA?

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

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, tonight President Reagan will go on national television to make yet another plea for support for his failing policies in Central America. His timing is truly ironic.

It was 22 years ago today that Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara uttered these words: "There is no plan for introducing American combat forces in South Vietnam." Now the administration is using virtually the same words with respect to Central America.

Yet the same forces that propelled us into South Vietnam despite those words are also present with respect to Central America. The administration has proclaimed at every opportunity that our prestige and our national se-

curity depend on the survival of a weak, repressive regime that is unwilling and unable to prosecute the war adequately and to conduct itself in a manner that could win the loyalty of its own people. They have said that they will not "lose a country to communism on our watch." But they steadfastly refuse to pursue the policies of negotiation and accommodation that could avert that outcome without the commitment of troops.

Mr. Speaker, those who do not remember history are condemned to repeat it. We could be headed for war in 1984 as surely as we were in 1962. I hope my colleagues in the House will continue to increase their efforts to educate the American people to the reality that the Reagan administration is leading us down the same road that has brought us to disaster in the past.

As for myself, I am today introducing a bill with my colleague TED WEISS to prohibit the participation of United States Armed Forces in combat activities in El Salvador or Nicaragua. It is similar to the language of an amendment supported by 36 Members of the other body during debate of the urgent agricultural supplemental appropriations bill. I hope my colleagues will support this bill, the text of which follows:

H.R. 5632

A bill to prohibit the introduction of United States Armed Forces into or over El Salvador or Nicaragua for combat, and to prohibit United States support for military and paramilitary operations against Nicaragua

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress finds and declares that—

(1) there are increasing signs of incremental involvement of United States military personnel in military operations in both El Salvador and Nicaragua;

(2) current United States policy with respect to the resolution of the conflict in Central America depends to a dangerous degree on military involvement, not on negotiated settlements;

(3) it is in the vital interests of the United States to bring the conflict in Central America to a peaceful, equitable, and negotiated settlement;

(4) the Congress is on record in support of the Contadora process, which explicitly calls for a negotiated settlement to the conflicts in Central America; and

(5) the Congress has the constitutional right and responsibility to participate in any decision or decisions by the United States to use combat troops in El Salvador or Nicaragua.

SEC. 2. (a) United States Armed Forces shall not be introduced into or over El Salvador or Nicaragua for combat purposes unless—

(1) The Congress has declared war or enacted specific authorization for such use of United States Armed Forces; or

(2) such introduction of United States Armed Forces is necessary—

(A) to meet a clear and present danger of hostile attack upon the United States; or

(B) to meet a clear and present danger to, and to provide essential and immediate evacuation of, citizens of the United States.

(b) If United States Armed Forces are introduced into or over El Salvador or Nicaragua under subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (a)(2), the President shall describe the reasons for such introduction in the report required by section 4(a)(1) of the War Powers resolution.

(c) No funds appropriated by the Congress may be obligated or expended for any introduction of United States Armed Forces into or over El Salvador or Nicaragua for combat purposes except under the circumstances specified in subsection (a).

(d) For the purposes of subsection (a), the introduction of United States Armed Forces for combat purposes means the introduction of United States Armed Forces for the purpose of delivering weapons fire upon an enemy.

(1) Any joint resolution or bill introduced at the request of the President pursuant to subsection (a)(1) shall become the pending business of the House in which it was introduced and shall be voted on within 3 calendar days thereafter, unless such House shall otherwise determine by the yeas and nays.

(2) Such a joint resolution or bill passed by one House shall become the pending business of the other House and shall be voted on within three calendar days after it has been received, unless such House shall otherwise determine by the yeas or nays.

(3) In the case of any disagreement between the two Houses of Congress with respect to any such joint resolution or bill passed by both Houses, conferees shall be promptly appointed and the committee of conference shall make and file a report with respect to such resolution or bill not later than 2 calendar days after the appointment of the committee of conference. In the event the conferees are unable to agree within 48 hours, they shall report back to their respective Houses in disagreement. Notwithstanding any rule in either House concerning the printing of conference reports in the Congressional Record or concerning any delay in the consideration of such reports, a conference report on a joint resolution or bill under this section (including any amendments reported in disagreement) shall be acted on by both Houses not later than 1 calendar day after the conferees report back to their respective Houses.

SEC. 3. No agency or instrumentality of the United States Government may provide any assistance of any kind, or otherwise make any expenditure of funds, for the purpose or which would have the effect of supporting, directly or indirectly, military or paramilitary operations in or against Nicaragua by any nation, group, organization, movement, or individual.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BROOMFIELD, following remarks of Ms. SNOWE on the Feighan amendment to H.R. 5119 in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. HUBBARD, immediately prior to the vote on the Feighan amendment to H.R. 5119, in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. PEPPER, prior to the vote on the Lagomarsino amendment to H.R. 5119 in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, prior to the vote on the Rahall amendment to H.R. 5119 in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. GARCIA, on the Lagomarsino amendment to H.R. 5119 in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. SOLOMON, prior to the vote on the Lewis of California amendment to H.R. 5119.

SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

A bill and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2100. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to sell ammunition for use for avalanche-control purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S.J. Res. 258. Joint resolution to designate the week of June 24 through June 30, 1984, as "National Safety in the Workplace Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 260. Joint resolution designating the week beginning on November 11, 1984, as "National Blood Pressure Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 273. Joint resolution to designate the week of August 5, 1984, through August 11, 1984, as "Smokey Bear Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 274. Joint resolution, to authorize and request the President to designate May 6, 1984, as "National Nurse Recognition Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 279. Joint resolution to designate the week of November 11, 1984, through November 17, 1984, as "Women in Agriculture Week"; to the committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 283. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate the week of May 7, 1984, as "National Arson

Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 10, 1984, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports of various House committees concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by them during the fourth quarter of calendar year 1983 and the first quarter of calendar year 1984 in connection with foreign travel pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1983

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Sander M. Levin	12/1	12/3	Czechoslovakia						14.17		14.17
	12/3	12/5	Austria						17.48		17.48
	12/12	12/15	Turkey						62.81		72.81
Committee total									94.46		94.46

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN, Chairman, Apr. 27, 1984.

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1983

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Rep. Bill Nelson	11/12	11/13	Grenada		100.00						100.00
Committee total					100.00						100.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Reimbursement for actual expenses in lieu of per diem. (Treasury check No. 8,927,779.)

JAMES R. JONES, Chairman, Apr. 9, 1984.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1984

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		* Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. E. Thomas Coleman	1/8	1/11	Spain	35,460	225.00						225.00
	1/11	1/14	Morocco	1,842.62	225.00						225.00
	1/14	1/17	Turkey		324.00						324.00
	1/17	1/19	Italy	326,016	192.00						192.00
	1/19	1/21	France	1,446.48	168.00						168.00
	1/21	1/24	England	209.55	297.00						297.00
Military transportation							4,283.77				4,283.77
Hon. Ron Marlenee	1/6	1/13	Honduras	1,250	625.00						625.00
Commercial transportation							927.70				927.70
Hon. Thomas S. Foley	1/15	1/17	England	188.84	264.00						264.00
Hon. Cooper Evans	1/2	1/4	South Africa	181.50	150.00						150.00
	1/4	1/8	Zambia	308.92	234.03						234.03
	1/8	1/11	Zimbabwe		225.00						225.00
	1/11	1/15	Gabon	158,976	368.00						368.00
Local air transportation						60,000	139.53				139.53
Translation services								65,000	151.87		151.87
Ground transportation						33,300	77.44				77.44

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1984—
Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Lunch								8,500	19.76		19.76
Interpreter	1/15	1/18	Ivory Coast		225.00						225.00
	1/18	1/21	Liberia						100.00		100.00
Commercial transportation							2,783.00				2,783.00
Robert M. Bor	1/18	1/22	Jamaica		418.00						418.00
Local transportation							18.00				18.00
Commercial transportation							423.50				423.50
Committee total					3,940.03		8,652.94		271.63		12,864.60

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

E. DE LA GARZA, Chairman, Apr. 30, 1984.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1984

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
VISIT TO THE MIDDLE EAST AND EUROPE											
Aspin, Cong. Les.....	1/3	1/4	Egypt.....	98.30	84.00					98.30	84.00
	1/4	1/5	Cyprus/Lebanon.....								
	1/5	1/8	Italy.....	405,840	240.00					405,840	240.00
Paid by DOD.....	1/8	1/11	Germany.....		87.13						87.13
	1/11	1/12	England.....	70.46	99.00					70.46	99.00
	1/12	1/14	Belgium.....	13,682	237.00					13,682	237.00
Transportation, Department of the Air Force.....							4,294.33				4,294.33
Barrett, Mr. Archie D.....	1/3	1/4	Egypt.....	98.30	84.00					98.30	84.00
	1/4	1/5	Cyprus/Lebanon.....								
	1/5	1/8	Italy.....	405,840	240.00					405,840	240.00
Paid by DOD.....	1/8	1/11	Germany.....		101.13						101.13
	1/11	1/12	England.....	70.46	99.00					70.46	99.00
	1/12	1/13	Belgium.....	5,800	100.00					5,800	100.00
Transportation, Department of the Air Force.....							4,294.33				4,294.33
Delegation expenses, Department of the Army.....									1,276.47		1,276.47
Transportation, Department of State.....							1,305.00				1,305.00
VISIT TO FRANCE AND GERMANY											
Battista, Mr. Anthony R.....	1/9	1/12	France.....	2,465	288.00					2,465	288.00
	1/12	1/14	Germany.....	468.12	166.00					468.12	166.00
Transportation, Department of the Army, Commercial.....							3,497.00				3,497.00
Transportation, Department of the Army, Military aircraft.....							449.82				449.82
Bayer, Mr. Carl T.....	1/9	1/12	France.....	2,465	288.00					2,465	288.00
	1/12	1/14	Germany.....	468.12	166.00					468.12	166.00
Transportation, department of the army, Commercial.....							3,497.00				3,497.00
Transportation, Department of the Army, Military aircraft.....							449.82				449.82
VISIT TO THE FAR EAST											
Dickinson, Cong. W. L.....	1/17	1/19	Hong Kong.....	1,383.10	178.00				6.38	1,383.10	184.38
	1/19	1/22	Korea.....	231.985	291.00					231.985	291.00
Other expenses, Department of the Air Force.....									98.84		98.84
VISIT TO MIDDLE EAST AND EUROPE											
Byron, Cong. Beverly B.....	2/9	2/18	Saudi Arabia, Cyprus, Lebanon, Italy.....		^a 53.25						53.25
	2/18	2/20	Germany.....		^a 103.40						103.40
Transportation, Department of the Air Force.....							5,901.50				5,901.50
VISIT TO CENTRAL AMERICA											
Aspin, Cong. Les.....	2/10	2/12	Panama.....		150.00					0	150.00
	2/12	2/13	Costa Rica.....		37.50					1,618	37.50
	2/13	2/14	Nicaragua.....	1,618	41.00						41.00
	2/14	2/17	El Salvador.....	577.50	150.00					577.50	150.00
Paid by Department of Army.....	2/17	2/19	Honduras.....		45.00						45.00
	2/19	2/20	Guatemala.....	150	150.00					150	150.00
Transportation, Department of the Army, Commercial.....							1,348.00				1,348.00
Transportation, Department of the Army, Military aircraft.....							650.53				650.53
Barrett, Mr. Archie D.....	2/10	2/12	Panama.....		150.00						150.00
	2/12	2/13	Costa Rica.....		37.50					1,618	37.50
	2/13	2/14	Nicaragua.....	1,618	41.00						41.00
	2/14	2/17	El Salvador.....	577.50	150.00					577.50	150.00
Paid by Department of Army.....	2/17	2/19	Honduras.....		45.00						45.00
	2/19	2/20	Guatemala.....	150.00	150.00					150	150.00
Transportation, Department of the Army, Commercial.....							1,348.00				1,348.00
Transportation, Department of the Army, Military aircraft.....							650.53				650.53
DELEGATION TO SOUTH AMERICA											
Montgomery, Cong. G. V.....	2/11	2/13	Barbados.....	523.25	312.00					523.25	312.00
	2/12	2/12	Grenada.....								
	2/13	2/15	Brazil.....	179,820	162.00					179,820	162.00
	2/15	2/16	Uruguay.....	3,465	75.00					3,465	75.00
	2/16	2/18	Argentina.....	6,165	150.00	822	20.00			6,987	170.00
	2/18	2/20	Chile.....		190.00						190.00
	2/20	2/22	Peru.....	393,000	150.00					393,000	150.000

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1984—

Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Transportation, Department of the Air Force							4,758.74				4,758.74
Spence, Cong. Floyd D.	2/11	2/13	Barbados	523.25	312.00					523.25	312.00
	2/12	2/12	Grenada								
	2/13	2/15	Brazil	179,820	162.00					179,820	162.00
	2/15	2/16	Uruguay	3,465	75.00					3,465	75.00
	2/16	2/18	Argentina	6,165	150.00	822	20.00			6,987	170.00
	2/18	2/20	Chile		190.00						190.00
	2/20	2/22	Peru	393,000	150.00					393,000	150.00
Transportation, Department of the Air Force							5,094.00				5,094.00
Stump, Cong. Bob	2/16	2/18	Argentina	6,165	150.00	822	20.00			6,987	170.00
	2/18	2/20	Chile		190.00						190.00
	2/20	2/22	Peru	393,000	150.00					393,000	150.00
Transportation, Department of State, Commercial Aircraft							1,862.00				1,862.00
Transportation, Department of the Air Force							1,708.96				1,708.96
Holt, Cong. Marjorie S.	2/11	2/13	Barbados	523.25	312.00					523.25	312.00
	2/12	2/12	Grenada								
	2/13	2/15	Brazil	179,820	162.00					179,820	162.00
	2/15	2/16	Uruguay	3,465	75.00					3,465	75.00
	2/16	2/18	Argentina	6,165	150.00	822	20.00			6,987	170.00
	2/18	2/20	Chile		190.00						190.00
	2/20	2/22	Peru	393,000	150.00					393,000	150.00
Transportation, Department of the Air Force							5,094.00				5,094.00
Leath, Cong. Marvin	2/11	2/13	Barbados	523.25	312.00					523.25	312.00
	2/12	2/12	Grenada								
	2/13	2/15	Brazil	179,820	162.00					179,820	162.00
	2/15	2/16	Uruguay	3,465	75.00					3,465	75.00
	2/16	2/18	Argentina	6,165	150.00	822	20.00			6,987	170.00
	2/18	2/20	Chile		190.00						190.00
	2/20	2/22	Peru	393,000	150.00					393,000	150.00
Transportation, Department of the Air Force							5,094.00				5,094.00
Ortiz, Cong. Solomon P.	2/11	2/13	Barbados	523.25	312.00					523.25	312.00
	2/12	2/12	Grenada								
	2/13	2/15	Brazil	179,820	162.00					179,820	162.00
	2/15	2/16	Uruguay	3,465	75.00					3,465	75.00
	2/16	2/18	Argentina	6,165	150.00	822	20.00			6,987	170.00
	2/18	2/20	Chile		190.00						190.00
	2/20	2/22	Peru	393,000	150.00					393,000	150.00
Transportation, Department of the Air Force							5,094.00				5,094.00
Campbell, Mr. Donald	2/11	2/13	Barbados	523.25	312.00					523.25	312.00
	2/12	2/12	Grenada								
	2/13	2/15	Brazil	179,820	162.00					179,820	162.00
	2/15	2/16	Uruguay	3,465	75.00					3,465	75.00
	2/16	2/18	Argentina	6,165	150.00	822	20.00			6,987	170.00
	2/18	2/20	Chile		190.00						190.00
	2/20	2/22	Peru	393,000	150.00					393,000	150.00
Transportation, Department of the Air Force							5,094.00				5,094.00
Heath, Ms. Karen S.	2/11	2/13	Barbados	523.25	312.00					523.25	312.00
	2/12	2/12	Grenada								
	2/13	2/15	Brazil	179,820	162.00					179,820	162.00
	2/15	2/16	Uruguay	3,465	75.00					3,465	75.00
	2/16	2/18	Argentina	6,165	150.00	822	20.00			6,987	170.00
	2/18	2/20	Chile		190.00						190.00
	2/20	2/22	Peru	393,000	150.00					393,000	150.00
Transportation, Department of the Air Force							5,094.00				5,094.00
Steffes, Mr. Peter M.	2/11	2/13	Barbados	523.25	312.00					523.25	312.00
	2/12	2/12	Grenada								
	2/13	2/15	Brazil	179,820	162.00					179,820	162.00
	2/15	2/16	Uruguay	3,465	75.00					3,465	75.00
	2/16	2/18	Argentina	6,165	150.00	822	20.00			6,987	170.00
	2/18	2/20	Chile		190.00						190.00
	2/20	2/22	Peru	393,000	150.00					393,000	150.00
Transportation, Department of the Air Force							5,094.00				5,094.00
Delegation expenses in Barbados						348.32	173.33	1,679.41	834.49	2,027.73	1,007.82
Delegation expenses in Grenada						1,000	372.00			1,000	372.00
Delegation expenses in Peru							526.00		439.00		965.00
VISIT TO GERMANY											
Stratton, Cong. Samuel S.	2/12	2/13	Germany	204.73	75.00					204.73	75.00
Transportation, Department of the Air Force							4,654.00				4,654.00
VISIT TO HONDURAS											
Dellums, Cong. Ronald V.	2/25	2/27	Honduras	384	192.00					384	192.00
Transportation, Department of the Air Force							2,854.25				2,854.25
Spratt, Cong. John M., Jr.	2/25	2/27	Honduras	384	192.00					384	192.00
Transportation, Department of the Air Force							2,854.25				2,854.25
Won Pat, Cong. Antonio B.	2/25	2/27	Honduras	384	192.00					384	192.00
Transportation, Department of the Air Force							2,854.25				2,854.25
Tsonpanas, Mr. Paul L.	2/25	2/27	Honduras	384	192.00					384	192.00
Transportation, Department of the Air Force							2,854.25				2,854.25
Moore, Ms. Alma B.	2/25	2/27	Honduras	384	192.00					384	192.00
Transportation, Department of the Air Force							2,854.25				2,854.25
Elrod, Ms. Marilyn A.	2/25	2/27	Honduras	384	192.00					384	192.00
Transportation, Department of the Air Force							2,854.25				2,854.25
VISIT TO GERMANY											
Cofer, Mr. Williston B. Jr.	2/26	3/1	Germany	780	300.00					780	300.00
Transportation, Department of State, Commercial							3,332.00				3,332.00
Committee total					14,380.91		98,036.39		2,655.18		115,072.48

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Paid by DOD.⁴ Paid by Department of State.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1984

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Mark Constantine	3/22	3/23	Brazil		81.00						81.00
Frank Record	3/22	3/28	Uruguay		348.00		^a 1,505.00				1,853.00
	3/23	3/23	Brazil		81.00						81.00
	3/23	3/28	Uruguay		348.00		1,505.00				1,853.00
Hon. Jerry M. Patterson	2/17	2/20	San Salvador		225.00		^a 630.22				855.22
Jan Shinpoch	2/15	2/20	San Salvador		375.00		^a 547.18				922.18
Committee total					1,458.00		4,187.40				5,645.40

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.^a Commercial air carrier.

FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN, Chairman, Apr. 26, 1984.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1984

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Harrison, Frank	1/3	1/5	Costa Rica		150.00				142.23		292.23
	1/5	1/9	Peru		300.00				100.85		400.85
Military transportation							1,509.42				1,509.42
Commercial transportation							697.49				697.49

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman, Apr. 25, 1984.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1984

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Berdes, G. R.	1/31	2/3	Poland		300.00						300.00
Commercial transportation							4,111.00				4,111.00
	3/19	3/22	Spain		324.00						324.00
	3/22	3/24	Italy		186.00						186.00
	3/24	3/26	Turkey		225.00						225.00
	3/26	3/28	Austria		182.00						182.00
	3/28	3/29	Germany		109.00						109.00
	3/29	4/1	Great Britain		330.00						330.00
Commercial transportation							4,247.00				4,247.00
Bonker, D.	2/20	2/22	Sweden		244.00						244.00
	2/22	2/22	Sweden		244.00						244.00
	2/22	2/25	Great Britain		297.00		49.50				346.50
Total					2,197.00		12,552.50				14,749.50
Boyer, R. K.	3/19	3/22	Spain		225.00						225.00
	3/22	3/24	Italy		186.00						186.00
	3/24	3/26	Turkey		225.00						225.00
	3/26	3/28	Austria		182.00						182.00
	3/28	3/29	Germany		109.00						109.00
	3/29	3/31	Great Britain		264.00						264.00
Commercial transportation							4,247.00				4,247.00
Bruce, T. W.	2/3	2/12	Switzerland		738.00		62.63				800.63
Commercial transportation					273.00						273.00
	2/12	2/15	France				3,709.00				3,709.00
Bush, R.	1/1	1/7	Brazil		600.00		162.62		55.00		817.62
	1/8	1/11	Peru		300.00						300.00
	1/11	1/14	Chile		285.00						285.00
	1/14	1/18	Argentina		340.00						340.00
	1/18	1/19	Colombia		172.00						172.00
Total					3,899.00		8,181.25		55.00		12,135.25
	1/20	1/23	El Salvador		^a 19.18						19.18
	1/24	1/25	Mexico		138.00		74.47				212.47
	1/25	1/27	Cuba		164.00		150.00				314.00
	1/23	1/24	Nicaragua								
	1/19	1/20	Costa Rica								
Commercial transportation							4,301.60				4,301.60
Chester, J. C.	1/8	1/11	Spain		225.00		84.73		66.96		376.69
	1/11	1/14	Morocco		225.00						225.00
	1/14	1/17	Turkey		324.00		16.60		35.00		375.60
	1/17	1/19	Italy		192.00		41.16		26.65		259.81
	1/19	1/21	France		168.00						168.00
	1/21	1/24	Great Britain		297.00		24.36		101.18		422.54
Military transportation							4,283.77				4,283.77
Total					1,752.18		8,976.69		229.79		10,958.66
Daoust, E. M.	1/8	1/11	Spain		225.00		84.73		66.96		376.69
	1/11	1/14	Morocco		225.00						225.00
	1/14	1/17	Turkey		324.00		16.60		35.00		375.60

May 9, 1984

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

11663

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1984—
Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Eckert, S. E.	1/17	1/19	Italy		192.00		41.16		26.65		259.81
	1/19	1/21	France		168.00						168.00
	1/21	1/24	Great Britain		297.00						297.00
							24.36		101.18		422.54
							4,283.77				4,283.77
	1/8	1/11	Spain		225.00				66.96		376.69
	1/11	1/14	Morocco		225.00						225.00
	1/14	1/17	Turkey		324.00		16.60		35.00		375.60
	1/17	1/19	Italy		192.00		41.16		26.65		259.81
	1/19	1/21	France		168.00						168.00
Gale, M. E.	1/21	1/24	Great Britain		297.00		24.36		101.18		422.54
							4,283.77				4,283.77
Garon, R. J.	1/8	1/11	Spain		225.00		84.73		66.96		376.69
	1/11	1/14	Morocco		225.00						225.00
	1/14	1/17	Turkey		324.00		16.60		35.00		375.60
	1/17	1/19	Italy		192.00		41.16		26.65		259.81
	1/19	1/21	France		168.00						168.00
	1/21	1/24	Great Britain		297.00		24.36		101.18		422.54
							4,283.77				4,283.77
Garon, R. J.	2/11	2/15	France		455.00						455.00
	2/15	2/19	Switzerland		328.00		173.91				501.91
	2/19	2/22	Great Britain		297.00						297.00
							2,459.00				2,459.00
	1/7	1/10	Hong Kong		366.00		31.86		47.92		445.78
	1/10	1/14	Thailand		444.00		57.67		58.48		560.15
	1/14	1/17	Pakistan		324.00				32.45		356.45
Goodman, M.	1/7	1/10	Hong Kong		366.00		31.86		47.92		445.78
	1/10	1/14	Thailand		444.00		57.67		58.48		560.15
	1/14	1/17	Pakistan		324.00				32.45		356.45
Grunberg, C. A.	1/17	1/18	Turkey		108.00		7.50		34.44		149.94
	1/18	1/22	Italy		516.00		54.61		70.14		640.75
							7,887.56				7,887.56
	3/19	3/24	Spain		540.00						540.00
	3/24	3/26	Turkey		225.00						225.00
							4,509.00				4,509.00
	1/4	1/5	Great Britain		99.00		16.44				115.44
	1/6	1/13	Bangladesh		425.00		236.25				661.25
	1/13	1/22	India		386.37						386.37
	1/22	1/29	Pakistan		574.11						574.11
Ingram, G.	1/3	2/3	Italy		288.00						288.00
							5,269.50				5,269.50
Jackson, D. M.	2/12	2/15	France		273.00		30.66				303.66
	2/15	2/19	Belgium		300.00						300.00
							1,695.81				1,695.81
	2/12	2/19	Philippines		529.64		43.13				572.77
							2,226.04				2,226.04
	1/12	1/14	France		182.00						182.00
							1,921.00				1,921.00
	1/8	1/11	Spain		225.00		84.73		66.96		376.69
	1/11	1/14	Morocco		225.00						225.00
	1/14	1/17	Turkey		324.00		16.60		35.00		375.60
Kur, R. J.	1/17	1/19	Italy		192.00		41.16		26.65		259.81
	1/19	1/21	France		168.00						168.00
	1/21	1/24	Great Britain		297.00		24.36		101.18		422.54
							4,283.77				4,283.77
Lantos, T. P.	1/6	1/10	El Salvador		300.00		20.42				320.42
	1/10	1/12	Nicaragua		150.00						150.00
	1/12	1/13	Honduras		100.00						100.00
	1/13	1/16	Costa Rica		225.00						225.00
	1/16	1/17	Panama		75.00						75.00
							1,034.44				1,034.44
	1/8	1/11	Spain		225.00		84.73		66.96		376.69
	1/11	1/14	Morocco		225.00						225.00
	1/14	1/17	Turkey		324.00		16.60		35.00		375.60
	1/17	1/19	Italy		192.00		41.16		26.65		259.81
Majak, R. R.	1/19	1/21	France		168.00						168.00
	1/21	1/24	Great Britain		297.00		24.36		101.18		422.54
							3,296.28				3,296.28
							49.50				445.50
							2,513.00				2,513.00
Moss, K. B.	2/20	2/24	Great Britain		396.00						396.00
Paolo, Bernadette	1/8	1/11	Spain		225.00		84.73		66.96		376.69
	1/11	1/14	Morocco		225.00						225.00
	1/14	1/17	Turkey		324.00		16.60		35.00		375.60
	1/17	1/19	Italy		192.00		41.16		26.65		259.81
	1/19	1/21	France		168.00						168.00
	1/21	1/24	Great Britain		297.00		24.36		101.18		422.54
							4,283.77				4,283.77
Peckham, G. G.	2/11	2/15	France		364.00						364.00
	2/15	2/18	Switzerland		328.00		173.91				501.91
	2/19	2/21	Great Britain		168.00						168.00
							2,459.00				2,459.00
	2/12	2/19	Philippines		628.13		43.13				671.26
							2,226.04				2,226.04
Total					2,949.13		9,352.70		229.79		12,531.62

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1984—

Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Perugino, M. R.	1/8	1/11	Spain		225.00		84.73		66.96		376.69
	1/11	1/14	Morocco		225.00						225.00
	1/14	1/17	Turkey		324.00		16.60		35.00		375.60
	1/17	1/19	Italy		192.00		41.16		26.65		259.81
	1/19	1/21	France		168.00						168.00
	1/21	1/24	Great Britain		297.00		24.36		101.18		422.54
Military transportation							4,283.77				4,283.77
Pritchard, J.	1/5	1/7	Italy		192.00						192.00
	1/7	1/10	Jordan		270.00						270.00
	1/10	1/15	India		485.00		258.36				743.36
	1/15	1/18	Nepal		225.00						225.00
	1/18	1/20	Spain		150.00						150.00
Military transportation							5,314.00				5,314.00
Ramsay, C.G.	1/7	1/10	Hong Kong		366.00		31.86		47.92		445.78
	1/10	1/14	Thailand		444.00		57.67		58.48		560.15
Total					3,563.00		10,112.51		336.19		14,011.70
	1/14	1/17	Pakistan		324.00				32.45		356.45
	1/17	1/18	Turkey		108.00		7.50		34.44		149.94
	1/18	1/22	Italy		516.00		54.61		70.14		640.75
Military transportation							7,887.56				7,887.56
Roberts, A. W.	1/4	1/5	Great Britain		99.00		16.44				115.44
	1/6	1/13	Bangladesh		425.00		236.25				661.25
	1/13	1/22	India		888.00						888.00
	1/22	1/30	Pakistan		630.00						630.00
Commercial transportation							5,269.50				5,269.50
Roth, S.	2/12	2/19	Philippines		614.75		43.13				657.88
Commercial transportation							2,496.00				2,496.00
Rovner, C. P.	2/12	2/15	France		273.00		30.66				303.66
	2/15	2/19	Belgium		300.00						300.00
	2/19	2/22	Sweden		366.00						366.00
Total					4,543.75		16,041.65		137.03		20,722.43
Commercial transportation							2,296.00				2,296.00
Siljander, M. D.	1/8	1/11	Spain		225.00		84.73		66.96		376.69
	1/11	1/14	Morocco		225.00						225.00
	1/14	1/17	Turkey		324.00		16.60		35.00		375.60
	1/17	1/19	Italy		192.00		41.16		26.65		259.81
	1/19	1/21	France		168.00						168.00
	1/21	1/24	Great Britain		297.00		24.36		101.18		422.54
Military transportation							4,283.77				4,283.77
Solarz, S. J.	1/1	1/7	Brazil		525.00		162.62		55.00		742.62
	1/8	1/11	Peru		300.00						300.00
	1/11	1/14	Chile		285.00						285.00
	1/14	1/18	Argentina		595.00						595.00
	1/18	1/19	Colombia		172.00						172.00
	1/19	1/20	Costa Rica		37.50						37.50
Total					3,345.50		6,909.24		284.79		10,539.53
	1/20	1/23	El Salvador		112.50						112.50
	1/24	1/25	Mexico		138.00		74.47				212.47
	1/25	1/27	Cuba		164.00		150.00				314.00
	1/23	1/24	Nicaragua								
Commercial transportation							3,820.00				3,820.00
Military transportation							2,870.00				2,870.00
Sloan, L.	1/4	1/5	Great Britain		99.00		16.44				115.44
	1/6	1/13	Bangladesh		525.00		236.25				761.25
	1/13	1/22	India		940.00						940.00
	1/22	1/30	Pakistan		630.00						630.00
Commercial transportation							5,269.50				5,269.50
Sprunger, C. D.	2/11	2/15	France		364.00						364.00
	2/15	2/19	Switzerland		128.00						128.00
Commercial transportation							1,812.00				1,812.00
Total					3,325.50		14,248.66				17,574.16
Tavlarides, M. J.	2/11	2/15	France		364.00						364.00
	2/15	2/17	Switzerland		164.00		173.91				337.91
Commercial transportation							1,812.00				1,812.00
Torricelli, R. G.	1/9	1/11	Ireland		172.00						172.00
	1/11	1/13	Greece		150.00						150.00
	1/13	1/16	Turkey		225.00				46.10		196.10
Commercial transportation							1,175.00				1,175.00
Weiss, T.	1/6	1/10	El Salvador		300.00		120.42		171.53		591.95
	1/10	1/12	Nicaragua		150.00						150.00
	1/12	1/13	Honduras		40.00						40.00
	1/13	1/15	Costa Rica		150.00						150.00
Commercial Transportation							884.67				884.67
Total					1,715.00		4,166.00		217.63		6,098.63
Winn, L.	1/8	1/11	Spain		225.00		84.73		66.96		376.69
	1/11	1/14	Morocco		225.00						225.00
	1/14	1/17	Turkey		324.00		16.60		35.00		375.60
	1/17	1/19	Italy		192.00		41.16		26.65		259.81
	1/19	1/21	France		168.00						168.00
	1/21	1/24	Great Britain		297.00		24.36		101.18		422.54
Military transportation							4,283.77				4,283.77
Total					1,431.00		4,450.62		229.79		6,111.41
Grand total (1st quarter)											193,389.30

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Represents refunds made of unused per diem.

DANTE B. FASCELL, Apr. 30, 1984.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1984

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Brown, Darrell	2/18	2/26	England	558.60	792.00		1,485.00				2,384.19
Breaux, John B., M.C.	1/11	1/14	Mexico	91,772.80	544.00		362.59				906.59
DeLaney, Glenn	1/11	1/14	Mexico	91,772.80	544.00		489.60				1,033.60
Drago, C. Grady	1/15	1/19	Panama		300.00		507.00				807.00
Kenyon, Ronald	1/15	1/18	Panama		300.00		533.00				833.00
MacKenzie, William H.	1/11	1/14	Mexico	91,722.80	544.00		423.00				967.00
Shumway, Norman D., M.C.	1/15	1/19	Panama		300.00		1,383.00				1,683.00
Storey, Deborah A.	1/11	1/15	Mexico	108,800	680.00		423.00				1,103.00
Smith, Timothy E.	1/11	1/14	Mexico	91,722.80	544.00		480.18				1,024.18
Welch, Edmund B.	1/10	1/15	Mexico								(*)
Committee total					4,548.00		6,193.56				10,741.56

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Local transportation submitted to State Department upon return for reimbursement.⁴ All expenses paid by Center for Oceans Law and Policy. Traveler guest speaker.

WALTER B. JONES, Chairman, Apr. 24, 1984.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1984

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Michael J. O'Neill, staff	1/3	1/18	Europe		1,265.00		2,088.70				3,353.70
James O. Bush, staff	1/3	1/18	Europe		1,265.00		2,068.80				3,333.80
Steven K. Berry, staff	1/4	1/14	Europe		960.00		2,461.00				3,421.00
Bernard Raimo, Jr., staff	1/4	1/14	Europe		960.00		2,461.00				3,421.00
Hon. Wyche Fowler, Jr.	2/9	2/16	Asia		692.00		846.98				1,538.98
	2/16	2/20	Africa		336.00						336.00
Richard H. Giza, Staff	2/19	2/16	Asia		692.00		2,900.98				3,592.98
	2/16	2/20	Africa		336.00						336.00
Committee total					6,506.00		12,827.46				19,333.46

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

EDWARD P. BOLAND, Chairman, Apr. 30, 1984.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1984

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
de Lugo, Ron, Cong.	1/5	1/7	Italy		192.00						192.00
	1/7	1/10	Jordan		270.00						270.00
	1/10	1/15	India		485.00						485.00
	1/15	1/18	Nepal		225.00						225.00
	1/18	1/20	Spain		150.00						150.00
Military air transportation							5,457.00				5,457.00
Committee total					1,322.00		5,457.00				6,779.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JAMES J. HOWARD, Chairman, Apr. 30, 1984.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1984

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
R. Nicholas	1/15	1/14	United States								
	1/22	1/22	Taiwan ³								
	1/22	1/26	Japan								
	1/27		United States	82,720	468.00	5,740	24.43	13,300	60.40	101,760	552.83
W. Lowery		1/7	United States				4,283.77				4,283.77
	1/8	1/11	Spain	35,460	225.00					35,460	225.00
	1/11	1/14	Morocco	1,842.62	225.00					1,842.62	225.00
	1/14	1/17	Turkey		324.00						324.00
	1/17	1/19	Italy	326,016	192.00					326,016	192.00
	1/19	1/21	France	1,446.48	168.00					1,446.48	168.00
	1/21	1/24	England	209.55	297.00					209.55	297.00
	1/25		United States								
Committee total					1,899.00		4,308.20		60.40		6,267.60

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Lead official delegation; expenses paid by Tunghai University.

DON FUQUA, Chairman, Apr. 27, 1984.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1984

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Don Edwards	12/26	12/29	Hong Kong	2,838.30	366.00						366.00
	12/19	12/30	Thailand	2,542	111.00						274.83
	12/30	1/5	Vietnam		504.00		1,915.00				2,419.00
	1/5	1/7	Thailand	7,625.75	333.00						333.00
Mr. Francis Stover	12/27	12/29	Hong Kong	1,892	244.00						244.00
	12/29	12/30	Thailand	2,542	111.00		159.86		163.83		434.69
	12/30	1/5	Vietnam		504.00		1,925.25				2,429.25
	1/5	1/7	Thailand	7,625.75	333.00						333.00
	1/7	1/9	Hong Kong	946	122.00						122.00
Commercial transportation							4,023.50				4,023.50
Committee total					2,628.00		8,023.61		327.66		10,979.27

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

G. V. MONTGOMERY, Chairman, Apr. 27, 1984.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3302. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Logistics and Communications), transmitting notification of the Air Force's plans to study conversion of various functions at different installations, from inhouse operation to commercial contract over the next 3 fiscal years, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304 nt (Public Law 96-342, section 502(a) (96 Stat. 747)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3303. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the fiscal year 1983 report of the Director, National Institute of Arthritis, Diabetes, and Digestive and Kidney Diseases, pursuant to PHSA, section 434(e) (94 Stat. 3185); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3304. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the fiscal year 1982 report on health consequences and extent of drug abuse in the United States, and drug abuse prevention activities of the Department, pursuant to Public Law 92-255, sections 405(b) (92 Stat. 1268) and 501(d) (93 Stat. 1314); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3305. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation, transmitting a report on

the Corporation's activities under the Freedom of Information Act during 1983, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3306. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to make uniform the penalties for violation of regulations applicable to the national park system, and for other purposes, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

3307. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to make it a Federal offense to assault or kill an employee of the Environmental Protection Agency assigned to perform investigative, inspections, or law enforcement functions, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3308. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the Commission's 97th annual report for fiscal year 1983, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 10311, 10386, 10706(h), and 10731(b)(3); Public Law 96-448, section 217(c)(1); jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Public Works and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the

Clerk for printing and references to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 4785. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 98-737). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOLAND: Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. Implementation of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (Rept. No. 98-738). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND
RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MOLINARI (for himself, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WEISS, Mr. ADDABBO, and Mr. ACKERMAN):

H.R. 5627. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to promote a stable economic mix of families residing in public housing by authorizing public housing agencies to establish maximum monthly rents for such housing based on unsubsidized monthly rents, debt service, and operating expenses, or other relevant factors; to

the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 5628. A bill to reform the residential conservation service and the commercial and apartment conservation service; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 5629. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to assist homeowners in taking corrective measures with respect to urea formaldehyde foam insulation, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 5630. A bill to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to permit the notification and repair, replacement, or refund of toys that create a substantial risk of injury to children; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON:

H.R. 5631. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a visitor contact and administrative site for the Big Thicket National Preserve in the State of Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WEISS (for himself and Mr. LEVINE of California):

H.R. 5632. A bill to prohibit the introduction of U.S. Armed Forces into or over El Salvador or Nicaragua for combat, and to prohibit U.S. support for military and paramilitary operations against Nicaragua; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Rules, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 5633. A bill to expand the definition of migratory fisherman for purposes of chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NEAL:

H. Con. Res. 302. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Reagan administration and succeeding administrations stress to the People's Republic of China, as a continuing concern, the importance the American people attach to religious freedom, and to strongly urge that government to release from prison the five elderly Roman Catholic priests, a number of Protestant pastors and layworkers, and others of various faiths, reportedly being held on charges related to religious activities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 259: Mr. SOLOMON.
H.R. 898: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 1376: Mr. CONTE, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. WORTLEY, and Mr. GEDJENSON.
H.R. 1405: Mr. LOTT.
H.R. 2584: Mr. ORTIZ and Mr. ANNUNZIO.
H.R. 2977: Mr. STAGGERS.
H.R. 3028: Ms. FIEDLER.
H.R. 3642: Mr. MARTIN of New York.
H.R. 4098: Mr. MOODY, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. SIMON, Mr. OBEY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. HARRISON, Mr. LEVITAS, Mr. STARK, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. WHITLEY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. ROBINO, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. RUDD, Mr. DYSON, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. BONKER, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. TORRES, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. SHUMWAY, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.
H.R. 4522: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 4571: Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. ERLÉNBOURN, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. IRELAND, and Mr. OXLEY.

H.R. 4635: Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. SHELBY, and Mr. BILEY.

H.R. 4805: Mr. FAZIO, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. OTTINGER, and Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 4865: Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 4884: Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 4965: Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. ECKART.

H.R. 4966: Mr. McEWEN.

H.R. 5107: Mr. STUDDS, Mr. MOODY, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 5158: Mr. DEWINE, Mr. COURTER, Mr. TAUKE, and Mr. BADHAM.

H.R. 5173: Mr. EDGAR, Mr. MINISH, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. FRANK, and Mr. FAZIO.

H.R. 5180: Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. COLLINS, and Mr. BONIOR of Michigan.

H.R. 5457: Mrs. LLOYD.

H.R. 5486: Mr. RINALDO, Mr. FISH, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. LLOYD, and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 5503: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut and Mr. ST GERMAIN.

H.R. 5580: Mr. HUGHES, Mr. LEVINE of California, and Mr. WOLF.

H.J. Res. 435: Mrs. JOHNSON.

H.J. Res. 452: Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. PATTERSON, and Mr. PASHAYAN.

H.J. Res. 543: Mr. BONER of Tennessee and Mr. BROOMFIELD.

H.J. Res. 547: Mr. HEFNER, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. PORTER, Mr. DASCHLE, and Mr. WHITLEY.

H. Con. Res. 226: Mr. BADHAM, Mr. COELHO, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, and Mr. ECKART.

H. Con. Res. 283: Mr. JEFFORDS.

H. Res. 395: Mr. BRYANT.

H. Res. 457: Mr. VANDERGRIF.

H. Res. 441: Mr. SOLOMON.