

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, November 18, 1987

The House met at 11 a.m.

The Most Reverend John J. Myers, S.T.L., J.C.D., D.D., coadjutor bishop of Peoria, Peoria, IL, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray. God, Father and Lord, we thank You and praise You for the beauty of the vast universe which You have created, for this small planet, our home, but even more for the gift of human persons and of the human family which You have fashioned in Your own image. Human genius and human love are but reflections of Your wisdom and love. In our day they have brought about a genuine transformation in the history of humankind and yet our history is distorted by selfishness, shortsightedness, and even ill will.

We pray with genuine awareness of our solidarity with men and women all over the world. May all of Your children know peace. May they all find respect for their personal dignity and be provided by their own efforts and by society with whatever is required for proper living. We ask that the creative potential of the human spirit be directed to beauty, truth, and goodness and not be overcome by the darker forces within ourselves or within our history.

We pray, too, Father, for the Members of this House. May their common endeavor always serve the broader human good. May both objectivity and excellence mark their labors. May they always be faithful to what is noblest in the human heart and always be true servants of their constituents and of this Nation, but Your good servants first.

Your kindness, Father, has granted each of us the privilege of living in the United States of America. May our bounty lead us to share. May our liberty lead us to love. May our strength prompt us to attend to others with care.

Great God, we ask that You hear our humble voices and those of all Your children the world round, You who live and reign forever and forever. 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.

GUEST CHAPLAIN, MOST REVEREND JOHN J. MYERS, COADJUTOR BISHOP OF PEORIA, PEORIA, IL

(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, it is a very great honor for me to welcome to the House the Most Reverend John J. Myers, coadjutor bishop of Peoria, who opened our session in prayer.

On September 3 of this year, I had the good fortune to be present when Bishop Myers was consecrated and installed as coadjutor bishop. The beauty of the ceremony with its sacred music and ancient rituals, combined with the knowledge that we were witnessing the consecration of someone born and raised in central Illinois, made that event memorable for all who attended.

Bishop Myers was born in Ottawa, IL, on July 20, 1941. He attended Loras College, Dubuque, IA, 1959-63. He went on to theological studies at the prestigious North American College, Georgian University in Rome, 1963-67.

He was ordained on December 17, 1966, in St. Peter's Basilica in Rome.

He attended Catholic University in Washington, DC, from 1974 to 1977, and received his degree as doctor of church law.

It is not only as a scholar that Bishop Myers has served God and his neighbors. He has also served his fellow Catholics—and the larger community of central Illinois—as assistant pastor, Holy Family Parish, in Peoria and associate pastor, St. Matthew's Parish in Champaign.

From 1977 to the present he has held important positions in the Diocese of Peoria including administrator, St. Mary's Cathedral, chancellor of the diocese, vicar general of the diocese and now, coadjutor bishop.

When Pope John Paul II named Bishop Myers to his current post, the announcement was greeted with great joy throughout our community. Bishop Edward W. O'Rourke, bishop of Peoria since 1971, said:

I am especially grateful to Pope John Paul II for choosing Bishop Myers for this important position. I know from many years of working with Bishop Myers that he is a prayerful and holy priest and has demonstrated many talents. . . .

I join with Bishop O'Rourke and all those in our area, of many faiths, in congratulating Bishop Myers and thanking him for being with us today.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 278. An act to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to provide Alaska Natives with certain options for the continued ownership of lands and corporate shares received pursuant to the Act, and for other purposes.

RESIGNATION OF MEMBER AND APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 17, 1987.
Hon. JIM WRIGHT,
*The Speaker, House of Representatives, The
Capitol, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby submit my resignation as a member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, effective at your pleasure.

Sincerely,

GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 1 of rule 48, the Chair appoints to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. GLICKMAN, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

COMMENDING SPEAKER WRIGHT FOR HIS EFFORTS IN CENTRAL AMERICA

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

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend you on your efforts to encourage a negotiated settlement to the Central American crisis. Your support of the Guatemalan accords has sent an important message of respect and dignity to the region. By standing up and being counted, you have demonstrated a willingness to open new avenues for peace. Everyone knows that the Arias peace plan cannot survive without a commitment from the United States that we will not disrupt the process. Your active

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

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

support gives the Central American leaders great hope that the United States will honor the provisions of the agreement and allow the people of Central America to determine their own destiny. Mr. Speaker, I applaud your courage and initiative.

□ 1110

OPPOSING GORBACHEV ADDRESS TO JOINT SESSION

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, in order to convene a joint session of Congress, it is necessary to have unanimous consent. I have been informed that Secretary Gorbachev has been asked to address a joint session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Congress is the embodiment of democracy in the greatest democracy in the world. The honor of addressing this body is and should be reserved for democratic leaders of the world. On behalf of the 50 million people who have been killed by the Soviet regime, I object. On behalf of the 400,000 Jews who wish to leave the Soviet Union and the repressed religious leaders of all faiths, I object. On behalf of the 1 million Afghans who have died and 4 million Afghan refugees, I object. On behalf of the Angolan people, repressed by \$2 billion in Soviet weaponry and 40,000 Cuban mercenaries, I object. On behalf of the Nicaraguan people, repressed by 23,000 tons of Soviet war material, I object. On behalf of the State of Israel, whose existence is threatened by the Soviet-armed Syrian and PLO war machines, I object.

Mr. Speaker, Secretary Gorbachev will not address this Congress if I have anything to say about it.

WE NEED WELFARE REFORM NOW

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

Mrs. KENNELL. Mr. Speaker, I keep hearing that now is not the time to address welfare reform. I cannot understand this line of reasoning.

What I do understand though is that we are spending billions of dollars on a welfare system that is fatally flawed. It is a system that locks women into dependency, it is a system that means one out of every four children in America are born into poverty.

Mr. Speaker, we have a bill ready to come before this body, a bill that is not perfect, but it is a new beginning for welfare reform. It is practical. It faces up to the fact that all people who can work should work, but it also

is practical in that it provides Medicaid for children and child care for children if their mothers are going to work.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but ask this body to consider recognizing the fact that before we adjourn for the holidays we should think of those in need, those who want to be independent, those who want to be contributing citizens, and do welfare reform.

OPPOSING GORBACHEV'S ADDRESS TO A JOINT SESSION

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, what? Gorbachev has been invited to address a special session of Congress?

My grandparents, as did your parents or grandparents or ancestors, fled to these shores in search of freedom and liberty, the very liberties and freedoms denied to the people that Gorbachev rules. When our parents, grandparents, and ancestors fled to the American shores, they fled the Gorbachevs of the world.

Now we, their daughters and sons, are inviting the personification of tyranny into this House where the people of the United States rule. Our parents and grandparents and ancestors must be absolutely ashamed of us.

The President of the United States deals with all foreign leaders of every ilk and kind, but to allow Gorbachev to speak in the halls of freedom is a desecration to this House and the principles we hold dear.

Who invited Gorbachev to speak? They did not speak for me. Did they speak for you?

EXHIBITION OF GENERAL MOTORS SUN RACER SOLAR CAR

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

Mr. JONTZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to take just a minute to invite the Members of the House to view the General Motors Sun Racer vehicle which is now on display out in front of the Capitol Building. This vehicle has just returned from Australia where on November 6 the Sun Racer finished some 600 miles ahead of its nearest competitor to win the Inaugural Trans-continental World Solar Challenge. The Sun Racer performed flawlessly over its 6-day trek through the rugged Australian outback with tire changing representing the only delay in its winning effort.

The Sun Racer vehicle represents the triumph of team work and technology, the sort of technology that General Motors is developing to help

meet the needs of our country in transportation and be a leader in so many ways.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage Members of the House to see this very intriguing vehicle while the opportunity presents itself today.

CLEAN AIR ACT EXTENSION

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House an issue of grave concern to my constituents in the 22d Congressional District of New York and indeed to citizens throughout the Nation. I am referring to the problem of environmental degradation due to air toxics and airborne pollutants which taint the quality of our atmosphere.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday Mr. Lee Thomas, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, announced his intention to delay the imposition of sanctions under the Clean Air Act for at least 3 years. Under current law, these sanctions would normally be imposed upon those areas which do not meet the attainment standards contained in the Clean Air Act by December 31, 1987. Mr. Speaker, at a time when Congress is considering whether or not to extend the deadline for compliance with the Clean Air Act provisions, the procedure announced by Mr. Thomas is untimely and extremely unwise.

The time for Congress to take action on clean air legislation is now. Even today, Mr. Speaker, the House Rules Committee is considering whether or not to allow an amendment to the omnibus continuing resolution which would extend the deadline for compliance with the Clean Air Act attainment standards. While a short-term extension may be necessary in order to avoid the undesirable effect on economic development which sanctions would necessarily entail, it is clear that the time for paperwork studies has long since passed. Under no circumstances can we afford to continue dragging our feet beyond the 100th Congress. I urge my colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee to take prompt action which will lead to a workable compromise on clean air legislation and guarantee compliance with the attainment standards set out in the Clean Air Act. With all due respect for the committee's fine work, I urge my colleagues to take this action now, sooner rather than later, before it is too late for us and too late for our environment.

TORRICELLI AMENDMENT TO THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE BILL

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

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, this morning when the foreign assistance legislation comes before this House I will offer a simple amendment that requires that when cash assistance is given by our Government to developing lands and imports are ordered by that developing nation, they simply come from the United States. It will not prohibit countries from spending that money within their own countries. It will not require that goods be purchased in America where they are not competitive or not produced. But simply if a developing nation is going to use cash assistance from America and has made the decision to import, that it come from America.

I offer the amendment because of the simple realization that increasingly United States cash assistance is being used to fund the importation of Argentinian and French wheat and Japanese and German industrial goods.

Mr. Speaker, it is simply not fair that farmers and workers in America who struggle to pay their taxes are having this money go abroad to buy goods from their own competitors. In offering the amendment I want to thank the corn, rice, cotton, sunflower, and wheat growers of America who have all joined me in this effort, and I urge my colleagues simply in the name of what is fair to our taxpayers, to our farmers, to our industrial workers, to support this amendment today.

KC-10 TANKER/CARGO AIRCRAFT—GOOD NEWS ABOUT OUR MILITARY SYSTEMS

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

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, because I took part in a military delivery yesterday, I was unable to be present for several votes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

I would like the record to show that had I been here, I would have voted:

“No” on approval of the Journal.

“Yes” on approval of the conference report for H.R. 1451.

“Yes” on House Joint Resolution 376, that the Soviet Union should grant permission to emigrate to all those who wish to join spouses in the United States, which I cosponsored.

“Yes” on House Concurrent Resolution 186, urging the head of state of East Germany to repeal the order directing border guards to shoot to kill anyone who attempts to cross the Berlin Wall without authorization,

and to issue an order to tear down the Berlin Wall, which I cosponsored.

“Yes” on H.R. 3471, to make the Veterans’ Administration an executive department, which I cosponsored.

“No” on H.R. 3400, the Federal Employees Political Activities Act of 1987.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to describe my activities yesterday. We are constantly hearing the bad news about our military systems, but we never hear the good news. Here is some very good news.

In Long Beach, CA, yesterday, I met with the workers who build the KC-10 tanker/cargo aircraft at the ceremony to mark the delivery of the 58th KC-10 out of a series of 60 aircraft. After the ceremony, I flew with the crew back to Andrews Air Force Base.

Mr. Speaker, all of these aircraft have been delivered on or before schedule, at or below cost. The KC-10 is the only tanker/cargo aircraft that can both receive and deliver fuel while airborne. Its reliability is better than 90 percent.

The KC-10 allows us to deliver our forces anywhere in the world and it played a critical role in the recent Libyan action, was a key part of the Grenada operation, and it is involved in the Persian Gulf operation.

Without the ability to refuel our fighters and attack bombers in flight, our air power is severely compromised. The reliability of these aircraft depends upon the reliability of the KC-10, and, indeed, the KC-10 has proven one of the most reliable in the sky.

The KC-10 is also a vital part of our airlift capability. Together with the C-17 program, McDonnell Douglas has established itself as a leader in this important aspect of defense. If the C-17 progresses as well as the KC-10 has, it will be another outstanding success.

As Caspar Weinberger leaves office, we should all remember the most important thing he said during his tenure as Secretary of Defense: “If we are to preserve peace, we must meet the military threats that face us.” I am happy to report to Congress today that the KC-10 helps us do exactly that.

TRAFIGANT AMENDMENTS TO CUT THE FOREIGN AID BILL

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I have taken the floor to notify Members that I will be offering two amendments to the foreign aid bill, to cut military assistance programs by 20 percent and the economic support fund by 20 percent.

The reason I offer this to you is because I have been overwhelmed by lobbyists and Members’ staffs asking me

not to bring this amendment, they do not want to have to vote on cutting foreign aid. I will tell you this now, because I will bring it, and I will ask for votes because I am tired of lobbyists that never call me when the President wants to throw out education programs, economic development programs, revenue sharing thrown out, which are our economic support funds for our cities. The only calls I get from lobbyists are when I want to cut foreign aid money.

We must make some cuts down here, and I think we need to start with NATO defense, and with foreign aid, and we will still leave, after my cuts, an awful lot of money for those people overseas.

In closing, how can we justify paying our neighbor’s rent bill when the bank is foreclosing on our own home? I will bring those amendments, and I want you to remember that you are lobbyists for the American people today.

FRIENDLY WAGER

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

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. Speaker, it must be quite distressing for my esteemed colleague from Nebraska—the Honorable HAL DAUB—to have to stand here before you all today knowing full well that history is not on the side of his beloved Cornhuskers.

Since the college football teams first met in 1912, the Oklahoma Sooners have been winners more often than the Cornhuskers. The Sooners have won 31 of the last 41 games. Last year’s exciting game finished with the Sooners beating the Cornhuskers 20 to 17.

To the people living everywhere but in Nebraska it must seem silly to continue this yearly drubbing. But we’re hospitable folk in Oklahoma and we would rather humor the Cornhuskers than offend them.

I am so confident that the Sooners are predestined to beat the Cornhuskers again this Saturday in Lincoln that I am willing to put up an expensive quantity of one of Oklahoma’s finest homegrown products—Oklahoma select pecans.

Oklahoma is the third largest pecan producer in the country, harvesting more than 40 million pounds in a good year. Oklahoma pecan producers encourage all to stock up on pecans for snacking during the upcoming Saturday afternoon massacre.

OKLAHOMA-NEBRASKA RIVALRY

(Mr. DAUB asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, while Washington is abuzz with stock market crashes, budget battles, tanker wars, Presidential posturing, it's refreshing to know that the people back home in Nebraska have got their priorities straight: The No. 1 Nebraska priority this Saturday is to stay No. 1 in something that really matters, college football.

But this isn't just any old game. It's one of college football's preeminent rivalries, Nebraska against Oklahoma.

This year, like the 1971 game which has been called the game of the century, the teams are ranked one and two in national polls.

I've made a friendly little wager with the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. JAMES INHOFE. I've put up corn-fed Nebraska beef against what he promises is high-grade Oklahoma pecans.

I remember some years back when Barry Switzer told Nebraska fans that he hoped we liked Mexican food because we were going to eat a lot of tamales down at the Fiesta Bowl.

Well, I may let the Boomer-Sooners keep their pecans when I win my bet because I think they might spice up the tamales the Sooners will be eating at the Fiesta Bowl this year.

I invite all of my colleagues, especially the ones in the middle of the budget battles, to take a break and watch a real battle between two of our Nation's finest teams this Saturday.

□ 1125

SHARING THANKSGIVING DINNER WITH MEMBERS OF THE ARMED SERVICES

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

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services of the House, I have had the opportunity over the last 10 months to travel over many of our military installations in this country. Recently I had the occasion to visit the Philadelphia Navy Yard in a neighboring district of mine where I met with many of our young sailors. While I was there, I learned that many of these young people will not be able to join their families next Thursday for the traditional Thanksgiving meal.

At that point in time, Mr. Speaker, I came up with the idea that perhaps we should establish and adopt the Sailor Program. I went back to my district and announced to my constituents that I would set the tone by inviting two young sailors who cannot join their families into my home for Thanksgiving dinner, and I encouraged my constituents to do likewise.

We have had an absolutely overwhelming response, with hundreds of families calling to share their Thanksgiving meals with sailors who cannot join their families back home.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House and my colleagues in the other body, as well as Americans all over the country, to join me in sharing this year's Thanksgiving dinner with some of our young men and women who serve in our military services at domestic installations and will not be able to join their families for Thanksgiving dinner this year.

WILL THE SANDINISTAS RELEASE THE IMPRISONED?

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

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, according to an article in Monday's Washington Post, the Sandinista government is preparing to release nearly a thousand political prisoners. However, experience suggests that when dealing with the Sandinistas, we ought to count our change very carefully. Lino Hernandez, head of the Independent Permanent Commission on Human Rights, said that many of those being pardoned have already served their time, and in any case, releasing only one-tenth of the nearly 10,000 political prisoners "is not sufficient to create an atmosphere of national reconciliation.

Mr. Speaker, we ought to find out exactly who the released prisoners are before we suggest the Sandinistas are being forthcoming. The Sandinista government itself says that at least 27 of them were persons who had already been freed, and several others were common criminals. Further, at least 50 more were the Sandinistas' own army and interior ministry troops who had committed human rights abuses. Why should these people be counted among political prisoners of the Sandinistas? And of a list of 1,344 cases submitted to the Sandinistas by the Human Rights Commission, only 161 were named in Ortega's final amnesty proposal. The rest were turned down for political considerations. Mr. Speaker, is this how the Sandinistas act in good faith?

ELEMENTS OF HYPOCRISY IN CENTRAL AMERICAN PEACE

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, what happens when Members of Congress stick their noses in foreign policy? We get such travesties of justice as the release of cold-blooded terrorists who murdered U.S. marines assigned to guard our Embassy in El Salvador, all in the name of a phony peace.

Mr. Speaker, please tell us how releasing terrorists serves the pursuit of peace. Any peace that equates terrorists with the tens of thousands of political prisoners rotting in Sandinista jails is no peace at all, but an insult to the civilized world and a stain on American honor.

We're already beginning to see the hypocrisy behind this so-called peace. It's nothing more than a buzzword for abandoning the Nicaraguan resistance.

It's a peace based on lies, and no peace like that can endure? Mr. Speaker, what will you say a few short years from now, when a Communist beach-head is firmly established a stone's throw from Texas, when Soviet ships freely roam both oceans from their Nicaraguan ports, and when country after country in Central America fall under the Soviet shadow? How proud of your peace will you be then?

EXPRESSION OF RESISTANCE TO THE PROPOSED GORBACHEV VISIT

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

Mr. DORAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not think I have ever come to the well of this, the greatest deliberative body for freedom in the world, with a more important subject. I am going to do everything I possibly can within my power to prevent the world's most powerful Communist leader from standing at that lectern and addressing a joint session of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, our civic religion is democracy. It is liberty. Winston Churchill stood there 19 days after Pearl Harbor, on December 26, 1941. He knew then that democracy would be saved in Europe because the United States had been provoked into declaring war on Japan and Germany just a few days before, when President Roosevelt stood at that very lectern. General MacArthur stood there, and only people of democracies have stood there, more in the last few years than ever before in our history.

But to have Gorbachev stand there is just an insult to this Chamber. He murdered—or his government did—Larry McDonald, a fellow Congressman, and they have never apologized for that. He has never apologized or paid reparations to 68 Americans who died on that Korean 007. I cannot believe we fought this through in this House.

That Communist leader is going to have the KGB working with the Secret Service and the D.C. Police and our Capitol Hill Police to push around out there Jewish refusenik families, Cuban-Americans, Cambodian-Ameri-

cans, Vietnamese-Americans, Hungarian-Americans, and Czech-Americans.

I beg you, Mr. Speaker, do not let this Communist come in to this Chamber. We will meet with him out in the hall somewhere.

WORLD CONTRACT BRIDGE CHAMPIONSHIPS

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

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Speaker, for the third time in 50 years of World Contract Bridge Championships, the open team and women's team titles went to the same country. At the final ceremonies Saturday, October 24, 1987, in Ocho Rios, Jamaica, the United States was presented with the Bermuda Bowl and the Venice Trophy.

The only precedents for this are the world championships in Budapest, Hungary in 1937 when the Austrians were double winners, and an Italian double victory in the 1972 world championships in Miami, FL.

Five Americans—Chip Martel, Lew Stansby, and Hugh Ross, from California, Bobby Wolff and Bob Hamman from Texas—retained the open team championship this year that they won 2 years ago in Sao Paulo, Brazil. The sixth winner was Mike Lawrence from California. The team was captained by Dan Morse from Texas.

The Americans winners of the Venice Trophy for the women's title were Capt. Carol Sanders from Tennessee, Lynn Deas, Juanita Chambers, and Judi Radin from New York, Beth Palmer from Maryland, Cheri Bjerkan from Illinois, and Katherine Wei from Texas.

In addition, Mrs. Wei, chairman of the board of the Falcon Shipping Group, won the Goren Award sponsored by the International Bridge Press Association for Bridge Personality of the Year. Mrs. Wei is an Asian American and the second Asian to win the award. It was awarded to Deng Xiaoping, senior leader of the People's Republic of China in 1981.

Apart from having won the Venice Cup with her partner, Mrs. Radin, Mrs. Wei has won two other gold medals representing the United States. By winning their third gold medal, they have achieved the highest ranking status in bridge—that of world grand master.

CONSTITUENTS WANT NO TAX INCREASES, AN END TO DEFICIT SPENDING

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

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, we are on the border of an unprecedented agreement as to where we are going to

take the American economy in the next few months. I believe, very simply, that the people of Ohio and the people of America have been sending a message for a long time to the Congress, and that is that "We pay enough taxes already. Why don't you in Congress live within your means?"

I believe the answer to the deficit shortfall in the United States is not from lack of taxes. I believe it is from excessive spending here in the Congress. Therefore, the message that they have been giving us is to look at spending.

Revenues are up 11 percent for the last 6 years in succession. A 1-year, across-the-board freeze would give us \$130 billion in deficit reductions. We do not need to go that far, but, very simply, to get the \$28 billion that we are looking for, we have to do it and we must do it, not by putting more taxes on the American people, not by closing more businesses across the country by an excessive Government burden through taxation and regulation, but by cutting the growth in spending that has been the hallmark of the last 8 to 10 months especially.

So, Mr. Speaker, I call upon those who are making the agreement at the summit conference here on the budget to do what is right for America by controlling the growth of spending, and, please no further increases in taxes.

PERMISSION TO OFFER MODIFIED AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3100, INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AND DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION ACT OF 1987

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. Speaker, I had printed in the RECORD of November 10, 1987, on page H 9977, an amendment to title V of H.R. 3100, the bill that we will be considering this afternoon. At the suggestion of the staff of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I am making some technical changes in that amendment, so the one I offer this afternoon will not be identical to the one in numbers that I presented before.

So I have clearance, Mr. Speaker, with the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee to make this request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Without objection, the gentleman may offer his modified amendment.

There was no objection.

□ 1135

SANDINISTA HYPOCRISY

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

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, Sandinista Commandante Daniel Ortega continued to insist that cease-fire talks should be held outside of Central America, preferably in the United States. At a news conference in Mexico City, Ortega said that "no Central American country can be the site of these talks." So much for the idea that this is a Central American problem, to be solved by Central Americans within the region, as defined by the Arias plan which the Sandinistas themselves signed. It is clear the commandante wants to avoid dealing with the leaders of the Central American democracies.

Contrast Ortega's attitude with the views of Cardinal Obando y Bravo, who stresses the need for negotiations to be held in Central America. Costa Rican President Arias agrees with the Nicaraguan resistance that negotiations should be held in Nicaragua. Mr. Speaker, the Sandinista line on negotiations is a hypocritical rejection of the spirit of the Guatemala peace accords. It is becoming more and more clear that by taking this inflexible line, the Sandinistas are isolating themselves from the other Central American republics.

CONGRESS IS NO PLACE FOR DICTATORS TO SPEAK

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

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, if President Botha of South Africa were invited to address a joint session of Congress, every Member who loves freedom would be outraged; and I am confident the Black Caucus would lead a walkout in desperate reparation being so honored.

Gorbachev is the dictator of the Soviet empire. He has troops in Afghanistan, Angola, Nicaragua, and militarily occupies Eastern Europe, the Berlin Wall is still up, and recently promoted the general who presided over the killing of Larry McDonald, a Member of this Congress.

Yeltsin, a reformer, was fired in a purge reminiscent of Stalin; and we have no reason to believe Gorbachev is anything but a Communist dictator.

I hope every Member of Congress will give their gallery pass to a refusnik, to an Angolan to sit in the Gallery; and I hope every Member who loves freedom will walk out on Gorbachev as they would have walked out on Hitler or Botha.

The House of Representatives is not a place for dictatorships, and Gorbachev has to act in the nature of democracy, not just hire a good P.R. man before he should be allowed to speak in the temple of freedom.

OPPOSITION TO GORBACHEV
ADDRESSING JOINT SESSION
OF CONGRESS

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I too think it is important that this body make its views known about the potential of the General Secretary of the Communist Party, not the head of their government, the General Secretary of the Communist Party being invited to address this institution in a joint session.

I have prepared a letter to both the President and to Speaker WRIGHT asking them not to allow this to take place, expressing opposition in the strongest possible terms to that particular event taking place.

An address before a joint session of Congress is the highest honor our Nation can bestow on the head of a foreign state. It has been reserved for leaders such as Churchill, de Gaulle, and Adenauer, people who have led their nations through dark trials to secure and defend democratic freedoms for their people.

To permit the dictator of an oppressive tyranny to appear before the Congress would tarnish forever the rare honor of addressing the highest representative body of the American people. We ought not let it happen.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members responded to their names:

(Roll No. 435)

Ackerman	Boulter	Craig	Levin (MI)	Rose
Akaka	Boxer	Crane	Levine (CA)	Rostenkowski
Alexander	Brennan	Daniel	Lewis (CA)	Roth
Anderson	Brooks	Dannemeyer	Lewis (FL)	Roukema
Andrews	Broomfield	Darden	Lewis (GA)	Rowland (CT)
Annunzio	Brown (CA)	Daub	Lightfoot	Rowland (GA)
Anthony	Brown (CO)	Davis (IL)	Lipinski	Roybal
Applegate	Bruce	Davis (MI)	Livingston	Russo
Armey	Bryant	de la Garza	Lloyd	Sabo
Atkins	Buechner	DeFazio	Lott	Salki
AuCoin	Bunning	DeLay	Lowery (CA)	Savage
Badham	Burton	Dellums	Lowry (WA)	Sawyer
Baker	Bustamante	Derrick	Lujan	Saxton
Ballenger	Byron	DeWine	Lukens, Thomas	Schaefer
Barnard	Callahan	Dickinson	Lukens, Donald	Schneider
Bartlett	Campbell	Dicks	Lungren	Schroeder
Barton	Cardin	Dingell	Mack	Schuette
Bateman	Carper	DioGuardi	MacKay	Schulze
Bates	Carr	Dixon	Madigan	Schumer
Bellenson	Chandler	Donnelly	Manton	Sensenbrenner
Bennett	Chapman	Dorgan (ND)	Markey	Sharp
Bentley	Chappell	Dornan (CA)	Marlenee	Shaw
Bereuter	Cheney	Downey	Martin (IL)	Shays
Berman	Clarke	Dreier	Martin (NY)	Shumway
Bevill	Clay	Duncan	Matsui	Sikorski
Bilbray	Clinger	Durbin	Mavroules	Sisisky
Bilirakis	Coats	Dwyer	Mazzoli	Skaggs
Billey	Coble	Dymally	McCandless	Skeen
Boehlert	Coleman (MO)	Dyson	McCloskey	Skelton
Boggs	Coleman (TX)	Early	McCurdy	Slattery
Boland	Collins	Eckart	McDade	Slaughter (NY)
Bonior	Combest	Edwards (CA)	McEwen	Slaughter (VA)
Bonker	Conte	Edwards (OK)	McGrath	Smith (FL)
Borski	Cooper	Emerson	McHugh	Smith (IA)
Bosco	Courter	English	McMillan (NC)	Smith (NE)
Boucher	Coyne	Erdrich	McMillen (MD)	Smith (NJ)
			Miller (CA)	Smith (TX)
			Miller (OH)	Smith, Denny
			Miller (WA)	(OR)
			Mineta	Smith, Robert
			Moakley	(NH)
			Molinari	Smith, Robert
			Mollohan	(OR)
			Montgomery	(OR)
			Moody	Snowe
			Moorhead	Solarz
			Morella	Solomon
			Packard	Stenholm
			Panetta	Stratton
			Parris	Stump
			Passahyan	Sundquist
			Patterson	Staggers
			Pease	Stallings
			Pelosi	Stangeland
			Perry	Stenholm
			Pickett	Stratton
			Pickle	Stump
			Porter	Sundquist
			Kildree	Thomas (CA)
			Kleckza	Thomas (GA)
			Kolter	Torricelli
			Konnyu	Towns
			Kostmayer	Traficant
			Kyl	Torricelli
			LaFalce	Towns
			Lagomarsino	Traficant
			Lancaster	Torricelli
			Lantos	Towns
			Latta	Traficant
			Leach (IA)	Torricelli
			Leath (TX)	Towns
			Lehman (CA)	Traficant
			Lehman (FL)	Torricelli
			Leland	Towns
			Lent	Traficant

□ 1150

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). On this rollcall, 399 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

Under the rule, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES
ON H.R. 3051, AIRLINE PASSENGER PROTECTION ACT OF 1987

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3051) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to establish minimum standards relating to air carrier passenger services, and for other purposes with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees:

From the Committee on Public Works and Transportation on all provisions except section 4(c) of the Senate amendment: MESSRS. HOWARD, ANDERSON, MINETA, OBERSTAR, NOWAK, DEFazio, HAMMERSCHMIDT, SHUSTER, STANGELAND, and GINGRICH.

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce on section 4(a) (jointly) and section 4(c) (exclusively) of the Senate amendment to H.R. 3051: MESSRS. DINGELL, THOMAS A. LUKEN, FLORIO, TAUZIN, SLATTERY, SIKORSKI, LENT, WHITTAKER, BILIRAKIS, and SCHAEFER.

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AND DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION ACT OF 1987

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 293 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3100.

□ 1203

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3100) to authorize international security and development assistance programs and Peace Corps programs for fiscal years 1988 and 1989, and for other purposes, with Mr. AUCOIN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset with respect to the International Security and Development Assistance Act which is before us that this is a 2-year foreign assistance authorization bill and deserves the consideration of this body.

I have been asked, Mr. Chairman, to give my colleagues some indication of what our plan of operation is, and I think I better do that right at the outset.

□ 1205

We plan to proceed today not later than 6 o'clock, and earlier if possible. I do not know how many titles we can get through today. We have 1 hour of general debate, as my colleagues know, and we have 10 hours of debate on the amendments that are printed in the RECORD, and 1 hour of debate on the minority substitute if they choose to introduce it.

We had thought as a general proposition that we would try to use up half of the time today, but if that runs into too late an hour, I do not want to keep Members here beyond 6 o'clock, we would like to conclude earlier if possible, but we would definitely conclude earlier if possible if there is a requirement to go over until tomorrow. Otherwise we would not plan on going over until tomorrow, we would conclude the consideration of this bill after the recess.

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

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I wonder, it is your intention then to try to complete at least five or six titles today?

Mr. FASCELL. If we can get to that many today, I say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], that would be fine. Maybe that is too ambitious a schedule, but we would like to let this run enough time to see how far we can move along.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. If the gentleman will further yield, when does my colleague expect to finish the bill?

Mr. FASCELL. It would be the week of December 7.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3100, the International Security and Development Assistance Act of 1987, is a comprehensive 2-year foreign assistance authorization bill which deserves the approval of the House.

I choose my words carefully and I mean precisely what I say: This measure deserves support for three simple and important reasons; it is responsible, it is necessary, and it is practical.

First, it is fiscally responsible. It responds to the collective determination of the country and this House to spend less. H.R. 3100 is a freeze bill, below last year's appropriated level, and more than half a billion dollars below the executive branch request.

This bill is necessary in terms of programs it contains which protect vital U.S. interests abroad. These programs include:

Military aid to our friends and allies, which strengthens free world security and enhances our own defenses, including the use of military bases by U.S. forces around the world;

Special economic assistance to areas of strong strategic interest to the United States, particularly the Middle East; and

Development and humanitarian help to poor countries, which will enable them to improve their economies through self-help.

Finally, H.R. 3100 is practical, because it means jobs for Americans, further economic expansion, and opportunities to restore some balance to our serious trade deficit.

How does it do that? By responding to the fact that the economies of developing countries over the past few years have become the fastest growing markets for American products at the same time that they are the source of materials needed by U.S. industry. It is also practical since the great bulk of the funds in this bill are spent right here in the United States for services and goods produced by your constituents—American farmers and workers.

Let me emphasize two essential points:

First, that this bill is a freeze bill. It authorizes appropriations of \$11,446,900 for fiscal years 1988 and 1989, \$600 million less than the executive branch request, and \$47 million less than the appropriated level for foreign assistance for fiscal year 1987. Further action taken on the floor is expected to reduce the total by an additional at least \$500 million. I would also point out that although authorizing committees are not subject to 302(b) allocations under the Budget Act, we have managed to stay within the overall allocation for the 150 function. In fact, we have a letter from Chairman GRAY recognizing our efforts in this respect.

Second, it needs to be emphasized that this bill is the major vehicle for the Congress to exercise its influence and provide guidance in foreign policy. These functions will not be carried out through a continuing resolution. And if this bill does not pass that is the only opportunity the House will have—another continuing resolution and a further weakening of the committee system in the Congress. This is not in anyone's interest.

The Congress needs an authorizing bill. Therefore, a vote for this bill is a

vote for Congress' role in foreign policy and a vote to uphold the legislative process.

Title I of H.R. 3100 authorizes \$5,071,256,000 in fiscal years 1988 and 1989 for military assistance. The figure is \$5,471,256,000 when one includes special funding for base rights countries included in title VII of this bill. Even this combined figure is about \$380 million below the executive branch request. Military assistance funding is designated specifically for base rights countries and other key American allies to enable them to obtain necessary military equipment and training to support their own national defense requirements to strengthen mutual security goals.

Title II authorizes \$3.415 billion in fiscal years 1988 and 1989 for economic support fund assistance to areas where the United States has special political and strategic interests, \$171.7 million less than the President's request. It also restructures the terms under which ESF assistance is provided to improve accountability of ESF funds and to enhance the impact of these funds on the long-term development of recipient nations. In addition to funding directed toward countries which are politically, militarily, or economically important to the United States, this title also provides for assistance to the non-Communist resistance efforts in Cambodia and Afghanistan, and earmarks \$100 million for tied aid credit programs to counter foreign predatory financing practices which inhibit United States exports.

Title III authorizes \$1.174 billion for development assistance to poor countries for fiscal years 1988 and 1989, \$28 million more than the President's request. This level includes \$66 million for the child survival fund for fiscal year 1988 and an additional \$10 million for the fund for the next year, the only additional fiscal year 1989 funding provided in this bill. This title also mandates a new microenterprise program, earmarking at least \$50 million in fiscal year 1988 to facilitate the creation and expansion of micro and small enterprises among the poorest people in developing countries.

Title IV authorizes \$353 million for other foreign assistance programs each year in fiscal year 1988 and 1989, \$54.6 million less than requested by the President. By limiting the amount provided for operating expenses for the Agency for International Development, H.R. 3100 provides for increases in such programs as American Schools and Hospitals Abroad [ASHA] and for U.S. voluntary contributions to UNICEF and to the U.N. Development Program.

Title V authorizes \$95.7 million for the International Narcotics Control Assistance Program. The title is a bipartisan effort to improve the effec-

tiveness of the U.S. antinarcotics efforts and to demonstrate the continuing seriousness with which the committee views the lack of progress in antidrug efforts by narcotics-producing countries.

Title VI sets out policy with respect to foreign assistance for the vital countries in Europe and the Middle East. It includes earmarks of assistance at existing levels for Israel and Egypt. It also maintains assistance for Greece and Turkey in the same ratio as in previous years, while reducing funds earmarked for both countries in line with budget reductions.

Title VII provides a policy framework for U.S. assistance to the countries of Latin America. It establishes a new Caribbean-Central American scholarship program to encourage the establishment of partnerships among the Federal Government, State governments, colleges and universities, and business, to support scholarships for students from the Caribbean and Central American countries to study in the United States.

Title VIII establishes a new fund for assistance to Africa to streamline and facilitate economic assistance, through long-term commitments to development in sub-Saharan Africa, greater flexibility in aid programming, and greater emphasis on participation of local level groups in planning and implementation of development activities. It authorizes \$450 million for development assistance to sub-Saharan Africa, and \$50 million in development assistance for member countries of the Southern Africa Development Coordination Conference.

Title IX sets forth policy concerning U.S. foreign assistance to Asian countries. It extends for 2 years the waiver in section 669 of the Foreign Assistance Act in order to continue to provide assistance to Pakistan and adds a number of conditions and requirements with regard to nuclear developments and human rights in Pakistan. This title also earmarks \$100 million in grant military assistance and \$124 million in ESF assistance for the Philippines for fiscal year 1988 and provides that sufficient military and ESF assistance be available in fiscal year 1989 to fulfill the 1983 pledge to provide \$900 million to the Philippines by the end of fiscal year 1989.

Title X authorizes \$142 million for the Peace Corps, \$11.6 million more than the President's request, in order to move toward the goal mandated by the Congress in 1985 of 10,000 Peace Corps volunteers by 1992.

Title XI includes a number of miscellaneous provisions, including congressional policy statements on various foreign affairs issues. It includes a provision to specify the duration of any waivers of assistance to Communist countries, and makes them ineligible for assistance, and adds to the list

of countries designated as Communist countries the following: the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, the People's Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, the People's Republic of Angola, and the People's Republic of Kampuchea.

Title XII includes the provision already referred to authorizing an additional \$400 million to meet U.S. security assistance requirements arising from agreements providing for U.S. access to military facilities in foreign countries. Presidential flexibility is provided as to which countries and assistance accounts would be increased.

In sum, Mr. Chairman, this bill carries out programs requested by the President necessary to support U.S. interests abroad.

It helps our own defenses by helping those of our friends and allies abroad. It enhances our export sales and the potential growth of U.S. markets in developing countries. It provides for humanitarian and development assistance to poor countries on an enlightened, self-help basis. It serves the cause of peace in areas of interest to the United States, particularly in the Middle East.

It is the best legislative vehicle we have, the principal vehicle for providing for congressional initiatives in foreign policy to carry out the congressional role in the foreign affairs field.

I urge passage of the bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, first I would like to compliment the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee. I can appreciate his concerns very deeply. I want to assure him, however, at the outset that we have had a great deal of problems in getting an indication of where the State Department and the administration come down on the foreign aid bill. They are clearly very much opposed to H.R. 3100 in its present form. In fact, I have a statement of administration policy which states:

The bill intrudes substantially upon the President's ability to carry out his foreign assistance program and, particularly in the context of a 2-year authorization, to respond to new circumstances, and therefore leaves the administration with no choice but to oppose its passage.

I have also learned, and I want to correct the chairman because he probably has not heard this yet, that the administration has indicated that they do support the substitute that I will offer as printed in the RECORD.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman be kind enough to yield on that point?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I am always happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman really has surprised me. Are you serious? I mean, the administration finally designed to get you a commitment on your substitute? I want to congratulate you. I am not being ridiculous or funny here, I am serious.

Have you got something in writing from them?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I had a little voice come up and say it is on its way.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. No one has worked harder on this bill than the gentleman from Florida, Mr. FASCELL. And I also want to congratulate the staff and the Members of both parties in attempting to produce a bill promoting a sound and balanced foreign policy. I want to indicate that title I of the committee bill is indicative of the chairman's success in producing a bipartisan consensus, and no one, Mr. Chairman, has worked harder than the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] in this regard.

The Republican members of the Foreign Affairs Committee have not printed one single amendment in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the recommendations of the chairman's own subcommittee, which are contained in title I. Oddly enough, the first five amendments that we may be considering to H.R. 3100 will be offered by majority members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

As I indicated earlier, I have received a statement of administration policy regarding H.R. 3100, and I want to cite further the administration's statement that if this bill were presented to the President in its present form, his senior advisers will recommend a veto. As the statement further indicates, the reasons are many.

One criticism both of the majority bill, H.R. 3100, and the minority substitute is that both bills would authorize appropriation levels well below the administration's request. The chairman made that very clear in his statement. However, beyond that, the administration has indicated that it strongly prefers the minority substitute which, as I indicated, has been printed in the RECORD.

The administration further criticizes the committee bill for its numerous earmarkings. I think this is the area that really troubles them most, the ceilings and limitations and other constraints on implementation of the administration's foreign assistance program. The majority bill intrudes substantially upon the President's ability to carry out his foreign assistance program and pursue foreign policy goals.

The committee bill earmarks assistance for particular countries and programs in excess of the administration's request, while at the same time au-

thorizing some programs far less than that requested. The result will mean greater difficulties in maintaining our relations and continue support for those countries which are vital to the national security interests of our country.

If I may for a moment turn to what we call the Broomfield substitute, I ask my colleagues to carefully consider the substitute and its provisions. I want to indicate also that it is my intent to wait until we have completed the consideration of the entire committee bill, with all of its amendments, before I consider offering the substitute. I think I would be remiss if I did not thank the chairman of our committee and the Rules Committee for the consideration of the rule that we are operating under which gives the broadest flexibility to consider the committee bill and all the amendments thereto, and also permits the minority to offer a substitute and include in it the key amendments that have been adopted during the debate on this bill before we consider whether to adopt the substitute in the Committee of the Whole.

I certainly want to thank the chairman on his help in securing this rule. I think a lot of his own members questioned his judgment in giving the minority this kind of consideration, but it is indicative again of Chairman FASCELL's fairness in trying to work out a bipartisan bill.

My substitute to H.R. 3100 is within budget. It is \$117 million less than H.R. 3100 in fiscal year 1988.

We increase funding for the war against illicit drugs and we've reduced funding levels for voluntary contributions to the U.N. and other international organizations.

In a truly bipartisan effort the substitute retains many positive provisions of H.R. 3100.

As I stated, title I is virtually a mirror image of the chairman's bill.

Title V, as I indicated, increases the funds authorized to carry out the war on illicit drugs and retains many key provisions.

The Europe and Middle East title, title VI, is virtually identical with a few modifications which the administration insisted upon and supports.

Title IX, Asia and Pacific, is substantially the same product which the committee produced.

Title X, the title on Peace Corps, is identical to the committee bill.

The committee's title XII provisions on additional assistance for base rights countries is identical to our title XI in the substitute bill.

Throughout the other titles of the bill we have adopted other substantive provisions of the majority's bill. But there are major differences of the magnitude which will enable a Presidential veto.

If I may quickly highlight some of the significant differences between the substitute and H.R. 3100.

The economic support fund title:

Provides the same funding level as H.R. 3100, but eliminates several Hamilton provisions in the bill that would seriously restrict the President's ability to use this flexible foreign policy tool to protect U.S. interests abroad.

Strikes the Torricelli cargo preference provision which subsidizes one industry while potentially causing great harm to others, particularly agriculture.

Strikes the Bonker tied aid provision which earmarks scarce ESF funds and requires governmental trade subsidization, the merits of which should be addressed in a different legislative vehicle.

In the Western Hemisphere title:

Section 711 establishes a clearly defined and bipartisan set of criteria on what constitutes genuine democratization in Nicaragua. Based upon legislation developed by Congressman TALLON and Congressman CHANDLER.

Section 712 urges the Government of Nicaragua to enter into direct negotiations with the Directorate of the Nicaraguan resistance in order to bring about a mutual and verifiable cease-fire and to reach a political settlement with the Nicaraguan resistance.

Section 713 creates a new program administered by the State Department which would make special assistance available to civilian, democratic groups in Nicaragua such as political parties, labor unions, and private sector organizations which are committed to democratic values and to the democratization of Nicaragua. Funding for this program would be \$10 million in fiscal year 1988 and \$12 million in fiscal year 1989.

These three sections are not included in H.R. 3100.

The Africa title:

Establishes the aid fund for Africa at the same \$450 million level in H.R. 3100, but strikes highly restrictive language and unnecessary political rhetoric in the committee bill.

Emphasizes sectoral priorities of agriculture and natural resources, health, and population programs, and requires an overall aggregate of 30 percent of authorized funds be used in these important pursuits.

Includes language emphasizing the critical and positive role that linkages between U.S. universities and African higher education institutions can play in developing the African Continent.

Strikes all country-specific language, certifications, and restrictions that undermine U.S. interests in Africa and constrain administration flexibility.

Strikes earmark of an additional \$50 million in development assistance funding for the SADCC—so-called front-line states—countries of south-

ern Africa. These countries include Angola, Mozambique, Tanzania, and Zimbabwe.

In the Asia and Pacific title:

Pakistan waiver extended for 2 years; additional modification includes reporting requirement in appropriations bill relating to Arshad Pervez case.

Strikes language encouraging "a wide range of nonofficial contacts between U.S. and Vietnam."

Strikes Philippines \$50 million ESF agrarian reform earmark, but authorizes such a program from existing funds.

The Hyde amendment:

Contains a new Hyde provision requiring administration reporting on the effectiveness of U.S. foreign economic assistance, listing the most and least successful country programs. The Washington Post today highlights this important provision on its editorial page.

I encourage every Member of the House to support the balanced and rational foreign policy goals outlined in my substitute.

□ 1230

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON], chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. YATRON. I thank the chairman very much for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3100, the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1987. I first want to commend the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. FASCELL, and the ranking minority member, Mr. BROOMFIELD, for bringing this legislation to the floor and for their tireless efforts to forge a consensus to advance U.S. interests worldwide.

Mr. Chairman, it is frequently argued that the absence of a bipartisan approach to foreign affairs undermines the credibility and effectiveness of U.S. foreign policy. H.R. 3100 offers the Congress and the administration the opportunity to restore consensus, continuity, and unity to policymaking.

The authorization process is a constitutional responsibility which we owe to the American people. It is an absolute requisite for a sound, consistent foreign policy which preserves our military and economic security and projects the fundamental values of our democratic society.

H.R. 3100 contains policy directives and funding authorizations which are vital to the conduct of American foreign policy. The bill enables the United States to fulfill its security commitments to critically important

base rights countries such as the Philippines, Turkey, and Spain.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is also completely compatible with our humanitarian objectives and responsibilities. H.R. 3100 contains some important human rights provisions. It also supports continued U.S. assistance to two American-administered international organizations: UNDP and UNICEF. UNICEF's success in reducing the tens of thousands of childhood deaths from preventable disease has been widely acclaimed, and UNDP has been instrumental in addressing the development needs of the world's poorest citizens. Strong American leadership has been, and will continue to be, critical to the continued success of these agencies.

Many of our colleagues are justifiably concerned about the domestic implications of supporting foreign assistance. In this respect, I would note that, in addition to developing a sound policy, the bill promotes the purchase of American goods and services including industrial and agricultural commodities. Further, the funding levels of the bill are within budgetary guidelines and are significantly below the fiscal year 1988 request.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that there are over 200 proposed amendments to H.R. 3100. Some of these will improve the effectiveness of the bill, while others may undo the delicate and carefully crafted balance of interests that the measure attempts to address. I urge our colleagues to vote for H.R. 3100 and to follow Chairman FASCELL's guidance in the upcoming debate.

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

Mr. Chairman, I value this opportunity to discuss our foreign assistance authorization legislation for fiscal years 1988 and 1989.

Foreign assistance consumes only a small fraction of the Federal budget, let alone the GNP. Our Development Assistance Program consumes far less per capita than many developed nations in the world.

Yet our foreign assistance programs are effective ways of helping secure important national interests—helping our national security in the military sense, our interest in economic growth around the world, and, with increasing importance these days, our interest in keeping narcotics away from our shores. Moreover, our foreign aid program helps Americans respond in an organized way to a humanitarian impulse that is in the best American tradition of sharing with others, and helping them make their way in the world. While it is true that charity begins at home, no one can fail to be moved by the incredible poverty and famine that still grips so much of the world today. And where there is poverty, we frequently find an emerging hostility.

Unfortunately, the Foreign Affairs Committee was unable to come up with a unified approach to this foreign aid legislation. Moreover, the administration adamantly opposes this legislation at this time. Regrettably, we simply cannot adopt a bill in this House without the acquiescence of the administration.

In an attempt to bridge the differences between the administration and the committee, our ranking minority member has crafted a substitute which addresses the administration's concerns while including the best aspects of our committee bill.

The Broomfield substitute contains additional funding for narcotics control programs overseas; contains Middle East funding and policy language that is identical to our committee bill's provisions, contains urgently needed funds for "base rights" countries, and continues initiatives encouraging private voluntary organizations' involvement in foreign assistance, encourages further assistance to "micro-enterprises," and provides full funding for the Fund for Africa.

While the Broomfield substitute will not fully please everyone, including myself, it is a good bill which reasonably and responsibly continues the legislative process in foreign aid.

Mr. Chairman, I know that our colleagues, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], and our distinguished ranking minority member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], and their staffs worked long and hard to produce a bill which we could all accept. While they were unable to fully reach that goal, but they did come close. We owe them both a debt of gratitude for bringing us to this point. I am certain that the balance of this debate will be constructive, although contentious from time to time. I urge my colleagues to give careful consideration to the arguments to be raised, but always to keep in mind the benefits to our own Nation from our foreign assistance program. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to give due consideration and support for the Broomfield substitute measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to state that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] has 13 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO], a senior member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my strong opposition to H.R. 3100 in its present form and urge my colleagues to consider seriously the need to amend the committee's foreign aid bill in order to make

it acceptable to a majority of the Members of this body and to the administration.

As I stated, along with the vice chairman of the committee, Mr. BROOMFIELD, in our additional views to the committee report, if there is recognition that minority support and support by the administration is essential to the passage of a foreign aid bill—and I believe that is true—then one must recognize that Republican support will only be forthcoming if there are Republican priorities and initiatives incorporated in the body of the foreign aid bill as we consider it on the floor. I know many on our side will be making an effort to gain approval for a number of amendments that are necessary to make the bill acceptable. This piecemeal effort, however, does not make for a truly comprehensive, thoughtful approach to implementing U.S. foreign policy.

The Broomfield substitute, which will be offered later, represents, in my opinion, the best alternative for a foreign assistance program that is fair and representative of U.S. security interests balanced by severe budget restraints. What took place in the Foreign Affairs Committee and its subcommittees was not in many cases the type of consultation, cooperation, and compromising necessary to produce a foreign aid authorization bill supportive of American foreign policy and capable of securing support from minority members and the administration.

It may be technically correct to refer to H.R. 3100 as a bipartisan bill, but in more cases than not it gives mere lip service to the minority's concerns while encumbering the statutes governing foreign aid with conditions and restrictions that virtually hamstring the Executive as it tries to administer foreign aid.

On major issues involving our relations with close allies in Europe, Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and the Western Hemisphere, all too often it appears that the Congress is trying to punish our friends and reward our enemies. In almost every title of the bill, I can point to problems that, unless they are resolved, will cause the defeat of this bill, or that if it were passed somehow, would ensure a certain veto by the President. Undoubtedly many will make an effort to amend H.R. 3100 during the 10 hours permitted. Some of those amendments would result in improvements, others would only make the bill worse. I urge my colleagues to be realistic in their approach to legislating U.S. foreign policy. We must leave some room for the administration to adapt to changing circumstances in the world. We cannot foresee every eventuality, so we must permit flexibility. I believe the Broomfield substitute provides the most responsible approach to allow

flexibility in our foreign aid program while preserving and protecting U.S. national security interests.

I urge my colleagues to work on fashioning a foreign aid bill that will command the greatest possible bipartisan support.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE].

Mr. WOLPE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of H.R. 3100, the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1987.

I want to take these couple of minutes to discuss that part of the bill that falls within the jurisdiction of my subcommittee.

I want to draw the attention of my colleagues particularly to title VIII of this bill which contains a very innovative and far-reaching reform of our economic assistance program to sub-Saharan Africa. It is a major step, I believe, toward a more cost effective and a more efficient foreign aid program in Africa, one which supports the efforts of Africans themselves to achieve equitable, environmentally stable, participatory and self-reliant economic growth.

□ 1245

American political, economic, and humanitarian interests on the continent require a sound and a long-term aid policy as an alternative to the tragically expensive Band-Aid of famine relief. This new approach, which I introduced in the House following several years of intense consideration by the Subcommittee on Africa, has gained broad bipartisan support in the Congress and in the country. The original cosponsors of this approach in the House include my Republican colleagues, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentlewoman from Rhode Island [Miss SCHNEIDER], and also the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LELAND], the chairman of the Select Committee on Hunger. A similar bill has been adopted by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on a bipartisan basis.

This portion of H.R. 3100 is strongly supported by a broad range of citizens groups, including Interaction, which encompasses some 114 American private and voluntary organizations, the major environmentalist groups such as the Sierra Club, the National Wildlife Federation, and the National Audubon Society, and a number of other organizations that have been long concerned with American policy toward the African continent most notably the U.S. Catholic Conference, the National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council, Bread for the World, and Transafrica.

Mr. Chairman, no region in the world finds itself in such a steep and steady economic decline as does Africa. Yet too often, American aid projects have been poorly planned and ineffective.

Too often, they have ignored the thousands of private and voluntary organizations—church groups, women's groups, local savings clubs, credit unions, cooperatives—that keep Africa going and that mobilize citizen pressure to make African governments more responsive to development needs. Top-down, bureaucratic Western aid projects simply do not work, and the landscape of Africa is littered with costly and wasteful "white elephants."

Too often our assistance programs have ignored African women, who produce 80 percent of the continent's food.

Too often we have not really insisted that African countries undertake policy reforms to improve incentives for agricultural production. Too often our aid programs have given short shrift to the need to protect the natural resources base for Africa so that environmental degradation does not undermine African productivity. Nor have our efforts in the areas of health and population planning been adequate to sustain the human resource base for development.

Among the most important features of our reform are provisions that call for much closer consultation with the poor majority, through African and other private and voluntary organizations, that incorporate the active participation of women in development activities, that establish criteria for economic policy reforms, and that define critical sectoral priorities for assistance with minimum earmarks of 10 percent each for natural resources, for health, and for voluntary population programs. The 70-percent remainder could be spent flexibly by AID within broad legislative authorities.

A 5-year commitment of funds provided in this legislation to support the long-term economic policy reform programs on the African Continent, to improve the cost effectiveness of our own assistance through better planning, and to help make up for Africa's declining proportion of total foreign aid, a fall of approximately 30 percent in the last 4 years.

Let me say, finally, Mr. Chairman, that we know that this reform will not work if the AID professionals feel they cannot work with it. Therefore, we have had extensive negotiations with AID and have agreed to make a number of changes to ensure that this will not only be a thoughtful reform but also a workable one.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, since 1980, the United States has provided billions of dollars in aid to El Salvador. Without that aid, El Salvador would fall victim to its Communist insurgency.

What troubles me, however, is that this aid has made it easy to block or delay crucial economic reforms needed for El Salvador's long-term success. El Salvador needs to adopt economic policies and programs similar to other countries who have followed the path of greater privatization and reduced Government control. The war and recent earthquakes have harmed El Salvador's economy. Unfortunately, so have the current policies of the government.

Recently, I met with representatives of El Salvador's private sector. They strongly endorse the democratic process now underway in their country. But it is plain to most observers that El Salvador's economy is in a tailspin and the government's central planning and control of the economy is simply not working.

If we are going to continue to supply aid, as I think we should, we should also insist that the Duarte government make reforms in its economic programs and policies. The private business sector must be allowed to compete without the heavy interference and, in some cases competitions of the government.

Mr. Chairman, without policies that stimulate growth and productivity through the private sector, the future of El Salvador's long-term economic and political security will be bleak indeed.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to a senior member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

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

Mr. Chairman, what is this world coming to? To listen to some of the complaints that have been circulating around the cloakrooms the last day or two, one would think that the House of Representatives is suffering from an excess of democracy. Specifically, one might gain the impression that the 40 percent minority is ganging up on the 60 percent majority.

I am referring, of course, to all of the whining about 233 amendments having been filed on H.R. 3100. The more perceptive students on this subject will come readily to the conclusion that the preparation of so many amendments reveals a lot more about the bill than it does about the legislative procedures here in the full House. But the more perceptive among us will also see that the process which produced this bill was seriously deficient.

The membership of the Foreign Affairs Committee is divided precisely 60 percent Democratic to 40 percent Republican, and thus reflects the composition of the House as a whole. The subcommittees are similarly so divided. This division is necessarily neither good nor bad; in the past, such party-

line divisions have not prevented the development of a genuine, bipartisan consensus on a foreign aid bill.

This year, however, the majority members saw fit to abandon the consensus approach in favor of producing a partisan bill. Throughout the process, at subcommittee level and in the full committee, as one majority amendment after another was steamrolled through on party-line votes, we on the Republican side made repeated warnings that the committee was producing a bill that could not command the kind of bipartisan support it would need in the full House to have any chance of passage. Indeed, we asked just how many Republicans in the full House could be expected to vote for a bill that is little more than a preview of the foreign policy plank in the 1988 Democratic Party platform. So those of us here on the minority side of the aisle have come to view the full House of Representatives as the court of last appeal. We approach the proceedings today with the hope that the issues which were trampled to death in the committee process will receive a more open hearing in this larger venue and that is why there are so many amendments being offered here today by the minority.

But the surprising thing is that the Democrats are offering over 80 amendments themselves. In other words, they did not do it to us enough in committee. Today they will finish us off for good, and in so doing you will have this bill dearer than a doornail.

So lets get this waste of time over with.

MR. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LELAND].

MR. LELAND. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee for yielding time to me. I also thank him for his leadership, and I rise in strong support of his efforts to make this bill a fair and just bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my strong endorsement of the enhancements and improvements contained in the foreign assistance authorization legislation which provide a framework for a return to the basics of humanitarian development aid to people in need overseas.

The bill as it stands and as amended by measures being offered by the distinguished chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. FASCELL, represents a long-overdue revision of the Foreign Aid Program in a direction I command and support. The drafters of the bill deserve much credit for their efforts which result, for the first time in this decade, in a program providing more, not less, for efforts to feed the hungry, fight disease, protect the environment, and assist the chronic poor.

Mr. Chairman, over the past 7 years the U.S. Foreign Assistance Program has gone through a radical and, I believe, a dangerous transformation. Funding for our food and development assistance program has decreased

16 percent in 7 years, while the Military Assistance Program has more than doubled. The implications are obvious. Funding for projects to address basic health needs, to provide primary education, to protect the environment, to expand food production, to construct essential infrastructure, and to meet a host of needs in developing countries has evaporated.

In its place there has been first an ever-increasing amount of funding for military equipment and training to countries that still cannot feed their own populations. The shift in funding levels sends a signal to developing countries that the United States is becoming less interested in the strength of their development programs, the health and livelihoods of their people, and more interested in the strength of their armed forces.

The American people do not want such a shift away from humanitarian concerns, and I believe that it is time that we in Congress bring our Foreign Aid Program back into balance. H.R. 3100 is a first and major step in that direction.

As the bill currently stands, Military Assistance programs would be reduced \$19 million from last year's levels, while development assistance would be increased by \$153 million. I strongly support these funding levels as the beginning of a process to reestablish the emphasis on development assistance in the Foreign Aid Program which I believe is proper and which the people of this country support.

Over the past 7 years, Africa has been progressively and continuously allocated a declining share of the development assistance funding. Africa received 12.5 percent of the funding in 1980, and only 7.2 percent in 1987. This decline in funding—a decline in real terms, not just percentages—has occurred at a time when many African countries have committed themselves to difficult economic reforms requiring outside assistance, when several face severe famine due to drought or insurgency, and when all are struggling to become more self-sufficient.

The United States cannot and must not turn its back on the people of Africa during this critical hour of development. We who played such a crucial role in responding to the urgent crisis of 1984-85, cannot now risk a sharp slide into recurring famine and endless tragedy. Sub-Saharan Africa has a higher proportion of people at risk of starvation than any region in the world. Africa must, therefore, receive a reasonable share of the Foreign Assistance Program.

H.R. 3100 currently includes \$450 million in development assistance for the fund for Africa and \$50 million for the Southern Africa Development Coordinating Conference. These levels are significant—but not adequate. Africa needs more assistance and we can afford to provide more. I strongly urge my colleagues to support Mr. FASCELL's amendment to earmark \$85 million in the economic support fund [ESF] for Africa. By doing so, we demonstrate our commitment to Africa's development and to its people. By doing so, we provide African nations with a greater opportunity for progress, for reform, and perhaps for survival.

MR. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

MR. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to start out by saying this: Let there be no misconstruing of what I say. The integrity or the purpose of my amendments is not to question the gentleman's leadership or his concerns to help preserve the freedom of our Nation. I think that in the beginning the gentleman was quite concerned about that.

I would like to offer an amendment that says: "Strike all after the enacting clause: Charity starts at home." But I realize there are grave needs throughout the world, and America must help preserve those opportunities for freedom.

I am bringing two amendments to the floor today. Those amendments would not affect the hot box in the world which we must be concerned with, that is, title VII, but it will affect Military Assistance programs and economic support funds.

Let me tell the Members why. I recall coming to the floor last year and trying a last-ditch effort in the 99th Congress to save an economic support fund for America known as revenue sharing. I was not successful. I was told this: "Traficant, we must make cuts. We must take the scalpel and get at the budget. We must make cuts to preserve freedom in America."

Here is what I am saying on the floor today: I am ready to make those cuts, but before I cut one more dollar in American aid, I want to start with NATO money, I want to start with foreign aid, and I want to start with that military budget that has a lot of dead turkeys flying around that cannot even fly straight.

So today I am offering two amendments. The first would cut 20 percent from military assistance, a total of \$207 million. It would leave \$827 million in there for military assistance.

The second one would cut approximately \$600 million from economic support funds. It would still leave in there over \$2 billion for economic support funds for each year. The total cuts, if taken against the whole, would reduce the foreign aid expenditures by 13 percent in each year.

The total cuts, Mr. Chairman, I would say to those Members of Congress who get up and talk about being fiscally conservative, would be about \$1.7 billion in real cuts that we would not have to cut off the backs of the American people.

□ 1255

They are right now studying cuts, COLA's for senior citizens and Federal workers.

This President threw out vocational education, or tried to; and he wanted to throw out the Economic Development Administration and cut Pell grants in education.

He does not want training money for laid-off and unemployed workers. That is about where we are at.

The President said that he will veto this if there is not more money. Let us make him get out his pencil and veto a foreign-aid bill with not enough money in it, a President that wants to cut domestic programs.

You want Traficant to help you cut, I am ready to help you, with unnecessary expenditures of the American Government, not those on the backs of the American people.

I want the Members' help on my amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] spoke for some time and at some length about our national security interests and how they are tied to the foreign aid bill.

I agree with the gentleman, and I think we should be directing our attention toward those countries that work with us in the area of national security, human rights, and who support democratic principles; but in the African portion of the bill we have \$50 million for the SADCC countries, Southern African Development Coordination Conference.

These countries for most part oppose the United States, vote against us in the United Nations, and many of them support Communist governments and work with countries such as the Soviet Union.

Instead of earmarking these funds for SADCC, these funds should be used to help those African countries that work with us. Some of the countries, if we are going to earmark those funds, Kenya, Liberia, Somalia, Cameroon, Djibouti, Sudan, Niger, and Botswana; and, Mr. Chairman, I do not understand how we can appropriate \$50 million for countries that oppose us consistently.

For instance, Angola, a Communist government, is going to get earmarked funds in this bill. They vote with us at the United Nations 6.8 percent of the time. Mozambique votes with us 7.2 percent of the time. That means over 90 percent of the time they support the Soviet Union and the Communist-bloc countries, and yet we are earmarking up to \$50 million to help these countries.

Tanzania, Zimbabwe, Tunisia, all of these countries oppose us consistently, and yet this legislation will appropriate \$50 million for these countries.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the entire African section of this bill should be rewritten. It is a step in the wrong direction.

The majority in this House is supporting the wrong approach in the

area of foreign policy and foreign aid. When my colleagues and I on the Subcommittee on Africa discussed these issues with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE], the chairman, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], the chairman of the full committee, we were met with a stone wall.

That is why we have so many amendments pending before this body on the African section of this bill. I believe if we are really concerned about a realistic foreign policy approach, and a foreign policy bill, then we need to come together and reconcile our differences.

There was no spirit of cooperation on the Subcommittee on Africa in this area, so I would say, as far as the African section of this bill is concerned, it should be structurally changed, and toward that end, I am going to offer about 17 or 18 amendments.

I hope the Members will look with favor upon them.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KOSTMAYER].

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

Mr. Chairman, let me begin by thanking Chairman FASCELL for his perseverance and the long hours of work he has devoted to drafting this bill and bringing it to the floor of the House. The process has been extremely difficult, and the chairman has done his best to satisfy the major concerns of both the majority and the minority in an effort to report a bill acceptable to the House as a whole. Chairman FASCELL deserves both our thanks and our respect.

Unfortunately, all the chairman's work could not undo the most blatant and troubling problem with the foreign aid bill: the overall funding levels. Despite modest increases in the foreign aid budget over the last several years, the budget is woefully inadequate. It is simply criminal that both the House and Senate can approve \$289 billion for the Pentagon, and yet we are now struggling to win approval for \$11 billion in foreign aid. Budget constraints are forcing us to shrink from many of our commitments and obligations throughout the world, and our short-term need to reduce the deficit could well allow long-term trends which are already developing to be exacerbated and to directly threaten American interests.

These funding constraints necessitate that we use our foreign aid dollars more carefully and prudently than ever. Several disturbing trends in foreign aid spending are reflected in this foreign aid bill, trends which I believe result from misdirected spending priorities.

In 1980, 50 percent of our foreign assistance was development assistance—money the United States provided to

struggling nations in order to meet basic human needs and to promote economic growth and development. It was the consensus view then that such economic development served as the foundation for democracy and stability and thus coalesced with U.S. regional and international interests. Today, less than 25 percent of the funds in the foreign aid bill are development assistance funds, and America's commitment to pursuing democracy's expansion through bilateral development is in steady decline.

The United States declining support for economic development assistance has been accompanied by a dramatic new emphasis on security assistance. H.R. 3100, for example, provides just \$1.6 billion in development assistance but \$8.9 billion in security aid.

A few real dollar comparisons of the foreign aid budget under the Carter administration and the foreign aid budget under the Reagan administration underscore the point. From 1980 to 1987 bilateral development project aid to the Third World declined by 8 percent from \$1.9 billion to \$1.7 billion in 1987. U.S. contributions to multilateral development banks over the same period fell from \$2.4 billion to \$1.5 billion, a drop of 63 percent.

In sharp contrast, U.S. security assistance to the Third World under the Reagan administration has increased an astonishing 514 percent in real dollars, from \$300 million in 1980 to \$1.6 billion 1987.

The growth and expansion of the International Military Education and Training account [IMET] reflects the sweeping change in the security assistance portion of our foreign aid program. In 1980, the IMET budget was \$25 million and the program affected 52 countries. Today, the IMET budget is \$56 million and 99 countries are involved. Included in the list of recipients of security aid are Finland, Luxembourg, Austria, Yugoslavia, Chile, and Trinidad/Tobago. Indeed, it seems there is hardly a country with whom we have relations which doesn't receive IMET funding. There are 17 countries whose only aid relationship with the United States is through International Military Education and Training, including the poor nations of Nigeria and Zimbabwe.

To cite just one more example of the incredible emphasis this administration places on security assistance, the Military Assistance Program funding has increased nearly tenfold. In 1980, MAP funding was \$110 million. In 1987, MAP funding is \$1.03 billion.

Under the Reagan administration security and military assistance has soared while bilateral and multilateral development assistance has plummeted. I believe that a limited foreign aid budget divided so unequally in favor of military aid shortchanges vital U.S.

economic, political, and humanitarian interests. We know that major influxes of military aid benefit, predictably, the recipient country's armed forces. The unfortunate result is that in many cases we institutionally strengthen the military relative to the civilian government we are trying to help.

U.S. security interests throughout the world are real and compelling. But our current allocation of scarce foreign assistance resources ignores the growing importance of the developing world in the global economy, the changed position of the United States in the global trading system, the internationalization of the commercial banking system, and a host of other factors.

Too much emphasis on the East-West conflict clouds our perception of the real problems and aspiration in the developing world, and can easily put the United States on the losing side of change.

According to a recent poll, and contrary to popular wisdom, a majority of Americans favor providing foreign economic aid. Those Americans would no doubt be shocked to learn that only 10 percent of the economic support funds budget is targeted to low-income nations. Less than one-quarter of total U.S. bilateral development assistance, economic support funds, and food aid is programmed for the world's low-income countries. Low-income countries receive about \$0.54 per capita compared to \$4 per capita for lower middle-income countries, and \$1.84 per capita for upper middle-income countries.

The shrinking foreign aid pie demands that we reevaluate how American foreign assistance is utilized. It is high time we rediscover the vital role bilateral and multilateral development assistance can and does play in our efforts to protect U.S. interest not just in the immediate future but in the long run. We are on the path to establishing relationships based solely on America's military might and not on our historic commitment to the view that economic growth, development, and opportunity sustain and nurture democratic systems. We should lessen our reliance on military responses and favor instead civilian governments committed to the welfare of their own citizens.

The foreign aid program can be far more than the Defense Department supplemental it is fast becoming. It is time we returned our foreign assistance program to its original development objectives and realized the true potential of American foreign aid.

In an effort to counter the growing trend away from development aid, I will today offer an amendment to the economic support fund title of the foreign aid bill.

Under the current foreign aid program, the preponderance of economic support funds are distributed as cash supplements to countries which already receive some type of U.S. security assistance. Although the cash may not be used for military purposes, it is extended primarily to support our military objectives.

Unfortunately, there is very little oversight of ESF cash transfers. But we do know that it is used by recipients as consumption aid, primarily for balance of payments and imports.

In committee, Representative LEE HAMILTON offered an amendment—now section 204 of H.R. 3100—to restructure these ESF cash transfers from consumption aid to investment aid on the well-founded belief that the long-term economic development of nations throughout the world is the greatest protector of U.S. global interests—economic, humanitarian, and security interests. The amendment mandates that 40 percent of all ESF provided in fiscal year 1988, and 50 percent of the ESF provided in fiscal year 1989 be used specifically for long-term economic development projects and programs.

The Hamilton amendment is a vast improvement over current law, but too many automatic exemptions have been added to it. Countries which receive \$5 million or less in ESF per year, countries with an annual per capita income over \$2,500, countries which provide the United States with base rights, and countries which provide the United States access to military facilities on their soil are all automatically exempted from the Hamilton requirements. Collectively, these provisions could automatically exempt all but two of the countries that receive ESF from the United States.

The Hamilton amendment is good policy, and it should apply to as many countries as possible, not as few as possible.

I hope to strengthen section 204 by eliminating the automatic exemption for countries providing the United States with access to military facilities. Providing blanket exemptions to all countries that provide the United States any access to military facilities could add 14 ESF recipients to the list of nations not covered by the Hamilton provision. That would make 30 of the 32 U.S. ESF recipients exempt—and render section 204 meaningless.

We have the opportunity to help set U.S. foreign aid back on the right track, to reassert our commitment to development and economic growth, to broaden our relations with developing countries that are becoming increasingly important players in the world market, and to promote democracy by helping to lay the groundwork for economic stability.

U.S. interests cannot be protected in the long term simply by providing ever

increasing amounts of security aid. We must return to using our foreign aid budget to provide real economic and development assistance. Strengthening the Hamilton amendment is a good place to start.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORAN].

Mr. DORAN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong support of the substitute of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], and point out to the Members on the majority side that 10 years ago, the language in the Broomfield substitute would have been the language of the majority, and some conservatives might be assaulting it in a sense of misguided frugality; and it would be a bipartisan effort.

I hope that we will see some bipartisan voting on the Broomfield substitute.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3100, the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1987. I want to commend my chairman, Mr. FASCELL, for his leadership throughout this process—in committee and bringing the bill to the floor. He has continually struggled to forge a foreign policy consensus on tough issues and he has done so in a fair and tough-minded way. The result is a committee bill that advances our interests. In terms of security, in terms of our own economy, and in terms of our ability to lead the free world.

Foreign aid is typically a lightning rod for criticism and is often billed as a giveaway of taxpayers' money. Well, if this were true, we wouldn't find that a majority of Americans actually support foreign aid. They support it for a number of reasons. Primarily, they support it because it makes sense: It is our insurance policy and our best investment in securing our foreign policy goals.

To assure security in Europe, this bill contains money for key base rights countries—Spain, Portugal, Greece, and Turkey. These bases guarantee access and ensure NATO security. The European bases have taken on new significance in light of the pending INF agreement. Our ability to maintain adequate funding to host countries will show our resolve in maintaining our commitment to the NATO alliance.

In the Middle East, our aid goes to bolster our allies and advance the peace process. The United States has vital security interests in this area. We continue to outmaneuver the Soviets by maintaining strong ties to the Arabs and the Israelis. This bill maintains our commitments to Israel and Egypt and promotes economic development in the region.

In the developing world, our aid goes to promote self-help programs that meet basic human needs and opens new markets for U.S. exporters. We have a trade deficit of \$170 billion and we need new markets if we want to turn it around. This bill will assist these countries in becoming integrated in the world economy.

I support this bill because it makes sense from a security standpoint. But it also makes sense from an economic standpoint. To those who point to foreign aid as a giveaway, let me point out that: 80 percent of foreign aid dollars are spent in the United States purchasing U.S. products and services; between 1982 and 1984, developing countries purchased a total of 235 billion dollars' worth of U.S. manufactured goods, about 36 percent of total American exports; and 80 percent of all new manufacturing jobs are now linked to international markets.

Simply put, the world is a lot smaller than it used to be. The United States can make a big difference by making a small investment—less than 2 cents on the Federal dollar—to advance our own economic and security interests. As the richest country in the world, as the leader of the free world, we can and should make this investment. I urge my colleagues to support the committee bill.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to commend my friends and colleagues for their fine work on this legislation. As usual, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] has done an incredible job in pulling together this bill. Foreign aid is not a vote-getting issue but after having spent 4 years as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I have come to understand the importance of having an effective foreign aid program.

I believe, however, that foreign aid is a two-way street. That is, while we may be willing to give aid to the extent that we are able, our friends and allies that are the recipients of that aid must also do their part to try and develop their economies so that eventually they can stand on their own. El Salvador is a case in point.

There is no nation that has suffered more during this decade from political strife than El Salvador. This strife has naturally caused a great deal of economic hardship for the people of El Salvador. That is why a ceasefire and real effort toward bringing peace to that nation is so important. I believe President Duarte is making an effort, but he must do more.

He must work with the unions, and he must work with the private sector. He and his government must attempt to rebuild the Salvadoran economy as they try to build democracy. I believe the two go hand in hand. Peace and democratic institutions cannot take hold if there is economic chaos, and economic stability cannot exist unless there is a partnership between the Government, the unions, and private enterprise.

Since taking over as chairman of the Banking Committee's Subcommittee on International Finance, Trade, and Monetary Policy, I have come to appreciate just how important the economic side of international relations is for determining the political fate of a nation. So it is throughout Central America. Nations as diverse as Nicaragua and El Salvador cannot function properly if they are choking off the right of workers and businessmen.

I do not mean to exaggerate the case of El Salvador, or for that matter compare President Duarte with Daniel Ortega. There is no comparison. President Duarte is trying to build a democracy and has been for several years. My point is this: Labor and business are the

backbone of any democracy, perhaps they should be listened to a little more not only in El Salvador but throughout the region if political stability, that is democracy, is to thrive. That way we can be sure that the foreign aid dollars we give are well spent.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, last year our Government spent hundreds of millions of dollars to help wealthy developers build luxury hotels and upscale shopping malls. For a small fraction of this cost, we can promote microenterprises to help the world's poorest people climb out of the soul-numbing poverty that marks their existence. A loan of only \$100, for example, can help a lace maker in Bangladesh become a self-sufficient business woman.

Fourteen million children under the age of five die each year in developing countries. The U.N. International Children's Education Fund [UNICEF], estimates that up to half of these children could be saved if simple, inexpensive measures were widely available. For example, a child can be immunized against six childhood diseases for \$5. And a child dehydrated by severe diarrhea—a common cause of death in the developing world—can be saved by a salt/sugar solution at a cost of about 10 cents a dose.

Our Government does help support these types of low-cost, effective programs. This is American foreign economic aid at its best. Unfortunately, most American taxpayers believe the worst about foreign aid programs. As a result, these programs are a very low priority for most Members of Congress. For many Members, foreign economic aid ranks below our military aid programs, whose strategic value is often more readily apparent.

Yet, for reasons of economic self-interest, strategic importance and moral leadership, U.S. foreign economic aid, which now accounts for only four-fifths of 1 percent of the Federal budget, can be one of the most effective uses of our tax dollars.

In underdeveloped countries, U.S. economic aid can play a crucial role in strengthening fragile economies, fostering self-sufficiency, and encouraging the shift away from inefficient centralized economies and toward free enterprise. As these economies develop so do their consumer markets. In the long run, appropriate U.S. aid programs can help those nations that are economic basket cases, wholly dependent on Western donors, become instead, our trading partners, providing

important markets for American goods and services.

We also enhance our own security by using foreign aid programs to encourage the emergence of stable, entrepreneurial, economies. Nations with stable free market economies are far more likely to share our democratic political values.

As we have seen recently in South Korea, the more broadly prosperous a nation becomes, the more adamant will be the demands of its people for genuine democratic institutions—a free press, freedom to associate, to organize and dissent. And the proliferation of free market democratic societies in the world is our greatest defense against the expansionist totalitarianism of Marxist-Leninist nations.

Finally, foreign aid like the child survival programs and famine relief efforts are more than simple charity. By supporting these programs we as a nation say to the world, there is one standard of decency, one standard of compassion for all members of the human community. And no accident of birth should condemn a child to death.

Unfortunately, our foreign economic aid programs have, too often, done little more than line the pockets of friendly despots. Or these programs have funded grandiose, inappropriate development projects which did little to benefit the world's poorest people. A blanket indictment of all foreign aid, however, throws the baby out with the bath water; precluding thoughtful analysis of the problem and preventing the implementation of effective, cost-efficient programs.

Most Members of Congress have heard questions like the one I heard recently back home. "What I don't understand," said the Bothell resident at one of my town meetings, "is why we're so concerned about giving to Third World countries, and not to our own?" The answer is, of course, that the health and well-being of our own citizens has always, and will always, have the first claim on Federal resources.

But this Nation cannot be an island of prosperity in a sea of poverty, for we will inevitably be swept away with the tide. And to enjoy the blessings of liberty, we must exercise the responsibilities of freedom. We neglect these responsibilities at our own peril.

That's what foreign aid is about.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE].

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

As the general debate winds to a close, it is appropriate to commend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], the chairman of our committee, for the enormous effort that he has put

into this legislation, and for the extraordinary leadership that he has shown on this subject in general, and on this bill in particular.

There is no greater internationalist in this Congress, and no finer leader in this Congress on issues pertaining to foreign affairs, than the chairman of our committee. I think that both sides of the aisle owe him a real debt of thanks for his perseverance and his leadership on these issues.

Mr. Chairman, this is a difficult bill to have crafted under the circumstances in which we find ourselves as a nation. We are faced with very severe budget difficulties, as evidenced by the budget negotiations and the difficulties presented in bringing this legislation to the floor on the very day we are trying to achieve a historic budget compromise between the other body, this body, and the executive branch. In essence, what we have is a coincidence of post-World War II reality in the context of our foreign aid responsibilities with 1980's budget realities.

I am cognizant of the difficulties that the budget presents us. At the same time in weighing our foreign and international responsibilities and obligations, I consider that the legislation we have before the Members deserves to be supported, I would hope on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. Chairman, people decry government by continuing resolution. If we are to avoid that type of governance, we need to pass authorizing legislation this represents.

This bill strikes the appropriate balance, and I urge that it be supported.

The CHAIRMAN. All time under general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered under the 5-minute rule by titles and each title shall be considered as having been read.

No amendments are in order except those amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on or before November 10, 1987. Subject to clause 6 of rule XXIII, debate on all amendments shall not exceed 10 hours.

It is in order for the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, or his designee, to offer en bloc amendments at any time, including germane modifications in the text of any amendment. Amendments offered en bloc are considered as having been read, are not subject to amendment or to a demand for a division of the question, and are debatable for 20 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the "International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1987".

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.

TITLE I—MILITARY ASSISTANCE AND SALES AND RELATED PROGRAMS

Sec. 101. Foreign military sales credits.

Sec. 102. Military assistance program.

Sec. 103. International military education and training.

Sec. 104. Peacekeeping operations.

Sec. 105. Cooperative training agreements with major non-NATO allies.

Sec. 106. Sales from stocks.

Sec. 107. Financing for commercial leasing arrangements.

Sec. 108. Terms of foreign military sales credits.

Sec. 109. Waiver of penalty interest on FMS arrearages.

Sec. 110. Enforcement and processing of arms export licensing requirements.

Sec. 111. Biennial review of the International Traffic in Arms Regulations.

Sec. 112. Reciprocal leasing.

Sec. 113. Sales of antitank shells containing a depleted uranium penetrator component.

Sec. 114. Exclusion of salaries from prices of certain FMS sales.

Sec. 115. FMS Guaranty Reserve Fund.

TITLE II—ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND

Sec. 201. Authorizations of appropriations.

Sec. 202. Authority to use funds for emergency assistance.

Sec. 203. Segregated accounts for cash transfers.

Sec. 204. Use of ESF assistance to promote long-term development.

Sec. 205. Prohibition on use of ESF assistance for port or terminal construction projects detrimental to United States farmers.

Sec. 206. Purchase of United States goods and services with ESF assistance.

Sec. 207. Tied aid credit program.

Sec. 208. Restriction on use of funds for nuclear facilities.

TITLE III—DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

Sec. 301. Agriculture, rural development, and nutrition.

Sec. 302. Child survival fund.

Sec. 303. Population and health.

Sec. 304. Education and human resources development.

Sec. 305. Cooperative development program.

Sec. 306. Energy, private and voluntary organizations, and private sector and selected development activities.

Sec. 307. Sustainable development.

Sec. 308. Private sector revolving fund.

Sec. 309. Protecting biological diversity.

Sec. 310. Private sector assistance.

Sec. 311. Limitation relating to development assistance.

Sec. 312. Enhancing the private-public partnership for foreign assistance.

Sec. 313. Use of foreign assistance loan repayments for development assistance activities.

Sec. 314. Providing credit for the poor in developing countries.

Sec. 315. Assistance for the prevention and control of AIDS in developing countries.

Sec. 316. Minority set-aside.

TITLE IV—OTHER ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

PART A—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT PROGRAMS

Sec. 401. American schools and hospitals.

Sec. 402. Housing guaranty program.

Sec. 403. Agricultural and productive credit and self-help community development programs.

Sec. 404. Trade credit insurance program.

Sec. 405. Voluntary contributions to international organizations and programs.

Sec. 406. International disaster assistance.

Sec. 407. Antiterrorism assistance program.

Sec. 408. Trade and development program.

Sec. 409. Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development.

PART B—PUBLIC LAW 480 AND SECTION 416 PROGRAMS

Sec. 421. Promoting biological diversity.

Sec. 422. Period of agency response; period for comments on agency guidelines.

Sec. 423. Farmer-to-farmer program under Public Law 480.

Sec. 424. Multiyear agreements under section 416(b).

Sec. 425. Minimum level of food assistance.

TITLE V—INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL

Sec. 501. Authorizations of appropriations.

Sec. 502. Development of herbicides for aerial coca eradication.

Sec. 503. Procurement of weapons to defend aircraft involved in narcotics control efforts.

Sec. 504. Pilot and aircraft maintenance training for narcotics control activities.

Sec. 505. Reallocation of funds withheld from countries which fail to take adequate steps to halt illicit drug production or trafficking.

Sec. 506. Waiver of restrictions on United States assistance for certain major drug-transit countries.

Sec. 507. Reports and restrictions concerning certain countries.

Sec. 508. United States reliance on licit opium gum from foreign sources.

Sec. 509. Assistance for Bolivia.

Sec. 510. Assistance for Peru.

Sec. 511. Assistance for Mexico.

Sec. 512. Cooperative nonmajor drug-transit countries.

Sec. 513. Increased funding for AID drug education programs.

TITLE VI—EUROPE AND THE MIDDLE EAST

Sec. 601. Assistance for Israel.

Sec. 602. Assistance for Egypt.

Sec. 603. Cooperative scientific and technological projects.

Sec. 604. Use of certain deobligated funds for projects in the Middle East and for additional assistance for American hospitals abroad.

Sec. 605. West Bank and Gaza development initiative.

Sec. 606. Foreign military sales for Jordan.

Sec. 607. Use of chemical weapons in the Near East.

Sec. 608. Assistance for Greece.

Sec. 609. Assistance for Turkey.

Sec. 610. Cyprus.

Sec. 611. Turkish occupation troops and Greek military forces on Cyprus.

Sec. 612. Excess defense articles for NATO southern flank countries and major non-NATO allies on the southern and southeastern flank of NATO.

Sec. 613. Assistance for Poland.

Sec. 614. United States contributions to the Anglo-Irish International Fund.

Sec. 615. Annual reports on economic conditions in Egypt, Israel, Turkey, and Portugal.

Sec. 616. Reporting requirements.

TITLE VII—WESTERN HEMISPHERE

PART A—CENTRAL AMERICA

Sec. 701. Central America democracy, peace, and development initiative.

Sec. 702. Military aircraft transfers.

Sec. 703. Economic assistance for Central America.

Sec. 704. Suspension of assistance if a military coup occurs.

Sec. 705. Assistance for El Salvador.

Sec. 706. Assistance for Guatemala.

Sec. 707. Refugees in Honduras.

Sec. 708. Assistance for Costa Rica.

Sec. 709. Assistance for implementation of regional peace agreement.

Sec. 710. Policy regarding Panama.

Sec. 711. Nicaragua.

Sec. 712. Restrictions on assistance to police.

PART B—SOUTH AMERICA

Sec. 721. Military assistance for Paraguay.

Sec. 722. Economic Assistance for Uruguay.

Sec. 723. Suspension of OPIC programs for Chile.

Sec. 724. Restriction on training assistance for Argentina and Brazil.

PART C—THE CARIBBEAN

Sec. 741. Assistance for Haiti.

Sec. 742. Caribbean development plan.

Sec. 743. Assistance for the Eastern Caribbean.

Sec. 744. Annual report on Soviet military assistance to Cuba.

PART D—PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE REGION GENERALLY

Sec. 761. Condition on military assistance for Latin America and the Caribbean.

Sec. 762. Allocations of economic support fund assistance.

Sec. 763. Inter-American Foundation.

Sec. 764. Administration of justice program.

Sec. 765. Caribbean-Central American scholarship partnership.

TITLE VIII—AFRICA

PART A—AFRICA FAMINE RECOVERY AND DEVELOPMENT

Sec. 801. Short title.

Sec. 802. Africa famine recovery and development.

Sec. 803. Reports to Congress.

Sec. 804. Conforming amendments.

Sec. 805. African famine assistance.

Sec. 806. African Development Foundation.

Sec. 807. United States trade restrictions on products from sub-Saharan Africa.

Sec. 808. Effective date.

PART B—OTHER PROVISIONS RELATING TO SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Sec. 821. Balance-of-payments support for countries in Africa.

Sec. 822. Support for the Southern Africa Development Coordination Conference.

Sec. 823. Assistance for Zaire.

Sec. 824. Assistance for Liberia.

Sec. 825. Policy regarding Kenya.

Sec. 826. Policy regarding Sudan.

Sec. 827. Policy regarding Mozambique.

Sec. 828. Restriction on military assistance to countries exporting oil to South Africa.

Sec. 829. Study and report on attempts to undermine import sanctions against South Africa.

PART C—NORTHERN AFRICA

Sec. 841. Policy regarding Tunisia.

Sec. 842. Western Sahara.

TITLE IX—ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

PART A—EAST ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

Sec. 901. Support for the right of self-determination for the Cambodian people.

Sec. 902. Assistance for the Cambodian people.

Sec. 903. Policies regarding Vietnam.

Sec. 904. Japan and the Arab economic boycott of Israel.

Sec. 905. Annual report regarding Korea.

Sec. 906. Assistance for the Philippines.

Sec. 907. South Pacific regional programs; scholarships.

Sec. 908. Authority to stockpile defense articles in Thailand and Korea.

Sec. 909. Refugees from Southeast Asia.

Sec. 910. Cooperation on POW/MIA issue.

PART B—SOUTH ASIA

Sec. 921. Assistance for the Afghan people.

Sec. 922. Democracy in Bangladesh.

Sec. 923. Israel-India relations.

Sec. 924. Waiver for Pakistan of section 669 prohibition on assistance.

Sec. 925. Sales of military equipment to Pakistan.

Sec. 926. Democracy and human rights in Pakistan.

Sec. 927. Illicit drug production and trafficking in Pakistan.

Sec. 928. Settlement of the conflict in Sri Lanka.

Sec. 929. Limitation on development assistance for India.

TITLE X—PEACE CORPS

Sec. 1001. Authorizations of appropriations.

Sec. 1002. Passenger automobiles.

Sec. 1003. Technical publications.

TITLE XI—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 1101. Effective date.

Sec. 1102. Use of foreign currencies.

Sec. 1103. Comprehensive annual reports on foreign assistance.

Sec. 1104. Reprogrammings of assistance.

Sec. 1105. Foreign assistance allocation reports.

Sec. 1106. Foreign debt repayment.

Sec. 1107. Annual foreign assistance report.

Sec. 1108. Foreign assistance accountability.

Sec. 1109. Coordination of all United States assistance for foreign law enforcement agencies.

Sec. 1110. Technical corrections.

Sec. 1111. Countries which import sugar from Cuba.

Sec. 1112. Early warning system regarding multilateral development bank loans.

Sec. 1113. Independent labor unions.

Sec. 1114. Countries listed as Communist countries.

Sec. 1115. Requirement to specify duration for period of waiver of Communist country prohibition.

TITLE XII—ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR BASE RIGHTS COUNTRIES

Sec. 1201. Additional authorizations of appropriations.

Sec. 1202. Foreign military sales program ceiling.

Sec. 1203. Maintenance of military balance in the Eastern Mediterranean.

□ 1310

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 ASSISTANCE AND SALES AND RELATED PROGRAMS

SEC. 101. FOREIGN MILITARY SALES CREDITS.

(a) AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.—The first sentence of section 31(a) of the Arms Export Control Act is amended to read as follows: "There are authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out this Act \$3,950,000,000 for fiscal year 1988 and \$3,950,000,000 for fiscal year 1989."

(b) AGGREGATE PROGRAM CEILING.—Section 31(b)(1) of that Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b)(1) The total amount of credits extended under section 23 of this Act may not exceed \$3,950,000,000 for fiscal year 1988 and \$3,950,000,000 for fiscal year 1989."

SEC. 102. MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

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 \$1,033,716,000 for fiscal year 1988 and \$1,033,716,000 for fiscal year 1989."

SEC. 103. INTERNATIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING.

(a) AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 542 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 542. AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out the purposes of this chapter \$55,851,000 for fiscal year 1988 and \$55,851,000 for fiscal year 1989."

(b) HUMAN RIGHTS TRAINING IN IMET PROGRAMS.—Chapter 5 of part II of that Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 546. HUMAN RIGHTS TRAINING.

"Respect for internationally recognized human rights shall be an important component of the assistance provided to any country under this chapter for any fiscal year."

(c) SCHOOL OF THE AMERICAS.—Chapter 5 of part II of that Act (as amended by subsection (b) of this section) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 547. SCHOOL OF THE AMERICAS.

"Of the funds made available to carry out this chapter, up to \$3,000,000 each fiscal year may be used for the fixed base operating costs of the United States Army School of the Americas."

SEC. 104. PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS.

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, \$31,689,000 for fiscal year 1988 and \$31,689,000 for fiscal year 1989."

SEC. 105. COOPERATIVE TRAINING AGREEMENTS WITH MAJOR NON-NATO ALLIES.

Section 21(g) of the Arms Export Control Act is amended—

(1) by inserting “and with other countries which are major non-NATO allies,” after “New Zealand;” and

(2) by adding at the end the following: “As used in this subsection, the term ‘major non-NATO allies’ means those countries designated as major non-NATO allies for purposes of section 1105 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1987.”

SEC. 106. SALES FROM STOCKS.

Section 21 of the Arms Export Control Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(j) In the case of a sale under subsection (a)(1)(B) of this section, the President may contract for the procurement of replacement major defense equipment if the eligible country or international organization provides the United States Government with a dependable undertaking as described in section 22(a) of this Act. The authority of this subsection may be exercised only to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in advance in appropriation Acts.”.

SEC. 107. FINANCING FOR COMMERCIAL LEASING ARRANGEMENTS.

Section 23(a) of the Arms Export Control Act is amended by adding at the end the following: “The authority of this section may be used to provide financing to Israel for the procurement by leasing (including leasing with an option to purchase) of defense articles from United States commercial suppliers if the President determines that there are compelling foreign policy or national security reasons for those defense articles being provided by commercial lease rather than by government-to-government sale under this Act.”

SEC. 108. TERMS OF FOREIGN MILITARY SALES CREDITS.

(a) WHEN INTEREST RATES DETERMINED.—Section 23(c)(2) of the Arms Export Control Act is amended by striking out the parenthetical phrase in subparagraph (B).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 23(c) of that Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) Loan agreements made on market rate terms pursuant to this section after September 30, 1984, may be amended to fix the interest rates applicable to undisbursed funds as of the time each disbursement is made. The authority of this paragraph may be exercised only to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in advance in appropriation Acts.”.

SEC. 109. WAIVER OF PENALTY INTEREST ON FMS ARREARAGES.

Section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) The President may waive the collection of penalty charges that have accrued or may accrue on loans made pursuant to this section or section 24. The authority of this subsection may be exercised only to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in advance in appropriation Acts.”.

SEC. 110. ENFORCEMENT AND PROCESSING OF ARMS EXPORT LICENSING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) REGISTRATION FEES FOR MUNITIONS CONTROL LICENSES.—Section 38(b) of the Arms Export Control Act is amended by inserting at the end the following:

“(3)(A) For each of the fiscal years 1988 and 1989, \$250,000 of registration fees collected pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be

credited to a Department of State account, to be available without fiscal year limitation. Fees credited to that account shall be available only for the payment of expenses incurred for—

“(i) contract personnel to assist in the evaluation of munitions control license applications, reduce processing time for license applications, and improve monitoring of compliance with the terms of licenses; and

“(ii) the automation of munitions control functions and the processing of munitions control license applications, including the development, procurement, and utilization of computer equipment and related software.

“(B) Funds made available under subparagraph (A) may not be used for any purpose other than those specified in subparagraph (A), and this limitation may not be waived under the authority of any other provision of law.

“(C) The authority of this paragraph may be exercised only to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in advance in appropriation Acts.”.

(b) DISQUALIFICATION AND FORFEITURE FOR VIOLATIONS OF INTERNATIONAL TRAFFIC IN ARMS REGULATIONS.—Section 38 of that Act is amended by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d)(1) No contract between a foreign government and a person convicted or debarred for a violation of this section or section 39, or any rule or regulation issued under either section, may be approved for financing under this Act during the twelve months following the date of such conviction or debarment.

“(2)(A) Any person who is convicted for a violation of this section or section 39, or any rule or regulation issued under either section, shall (in addition to any other penalty) forfeit to the United States—

“(i) any of that person's interest in, security of, claim against, or property or contractual rights of any kind in any defense article or other tangible item that was the subject of the violation;

“(ii) any of that person's interest in, security of, claim against, or property or contractual rights of any kind in any defense article or other tangible item that was used in—

“(I) the export or attempt to export, or

“(II) the contribution, gift, commission, or

fee that was paid or offered or agreed to be paid,

that was the subject of the violation; and

“(iii) any of that person's property constituting, or derived from, any proceeds obtained directly or indirectly as a result of the violation.

“(B) The procedures in any forfeiture under this paragraph, and the duties and authorities of the courts of the United States and the Attorney General with respect to any forfeiture action under this paragraph or with respect to any property that may be subject to forfeiture under this paragraph, shall be governed by section 1963 of title 18, United States Code. Any new budget authority provided by this subparagraph may be exercised only to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in advance in appropriation Acts.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (d) of section 38 of that Act, as enacted by subsection (b) of this section, shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act or October 1, 1987 (whichever is later), and applies—

(1) in the case of paragraph (1) of subsection (d), with respect to convictions or de-

barments occurring on or after the effective date of that subsection; and

(2) in the case of paragraph (2) of subsection (d), with respect to convictions based on conduct occurring on or after the effective date of that subsection.

SEC. 111. BIENNIAL REVIEW OF THE INTERNATIONAL TRAFFIC IN ARMS REGULATIONS.

Section 38(f) of the Arms Export Control Act is amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: “At least once every 2 years, the President shall review the regulations issued to carry out this section, including the items listed on the United States Munitions List, in order to determine what changes in those regulations are appropriate, including determining what items, if any, no longer warrant export controls under this section. Based on each such review, the President shall revise those regulations as necessary and shall publish a revised compilation of those regulations.”.

SEC. 112. RECIPROCAL LEASING.

Section 61(a) of the Arms Export Control Act is amended in subparagraph (B) by striking out “fiscal year 1987 and only with respect to one country” and inserting in lieu thereof “fiscal years 1987, 1988, and 1989 and only with respect to one country each such year”.

SEC. 113. SALES OF ANTITANK SHELLS CONTAINING A DEPLETED URANIUM PENETRATOR COMPONENT.

The President may not sell any M833 antitank shells, or any comparable antitank shells containing a depleted uranium penetrator component, to any country other than—

(1) a country which is a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, or

(2) a country which has been designated as a major non-NATO ally for purposes of section 1105 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1987.

SEC. 114. EXCLUSION OF SALARIES FROM PRICES OF CERTAIN FMS SALES.

The last sentence of section 503(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended—

(1) by inserting “, or from funds made available on a nonrepayable basis under section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act,” after “under paragraph (3)”; and

(2) by inserting “(other than the Coast Guard)” after “Armed Forces of the United States”.

SEC. 115. FMS GUARANTY RESERVE FUND.

During fiscal years 1988 and 1989—

(1) the authority contained in the third sentence of section 24(c) of the Arms Export Control Act may not be exercised; and

(2) funds made available to carry out section 23 of that Act or section 503 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 may not be used to pay claims under guarantees issued under section 24 of the Arms Export Control Act, notwithstanding any other provision of law (specifically including any law providing appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs).

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ECKART].

Mr. ECKART. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman, my good friend, the gentleman from Florida, for yielding this time.

Our colleague, the gentleman from North Dakota, will be offering an

amendment shortly that focuses on a critical imbalance that exists in our foreign aid programs. It is a fundamental change that took place in the change of the Carter to Reagan Presidencies. At that time our foreign aid initiatives roughly were balanced 50-50 between military and economic development programs. Since then we have witnessed an increase of several hundreds of millions of dollars of increase in military aid alone.

The amendment of my colleague, the gentleman from North Dakota, seeks to cut \$83 million from the Military Assistance Program, to restore some sanity to foreign policy, to remove the military as the course of first resort in the conduct of foreign policy and to underscore our commitment to diplomacy first and military action second.

The amendment of my colleague, the gentleman from North Dakota, in which I join in cosponsorship, will restore some semblance of balance to the image of this Nation and the conduct of our foreign policy. It will place on a greater par the economic development needs of countries and less dependence on the military application of our foreign aid.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. FASCELL

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to the rule, I offer en bloc amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the en bloc amendments.

The text of the en bloc amendments is as follows:

Amendments offered en bloc by Mr. FASCELL: On page 15, strike lines 22 through 25 and on page 16 strike lines 1 through 7 and insert the following:

The authority contained in the third sentence of section 24(c) of the Arms Export Control Act shall be exercised to the extent necessary in order for the Defense Security Assistance Agency and the Department of Defense to honor their loan guarantee contracts and to make all payments to the Federal Financing Bank required by those contracts according to their original payment schedules.

Page 16, after line 7, insert the following:

SEC. 116. CONDITIONS ON SALES OF F-15's TO SAUDI ARABIA.

Any sale or other transfer to Saudi Arabia by the United States of F-15 aircraft shall be subject to the following conditions:

(1) Any F-15 aircraft sold or otherwise transferred to Saudi Arabia shall be limited to models A, B, C, and D.

(2) The United States shall not sell or otherwise transfer to Saudi Arabia the F-15-E or other advanced aircraft with a ground attack capability and shall not upgrade existing Saudi Arabia aircraft to that capability.

(3) Saudi Arabia shall not possess more than 60 F-15 aircraft at any one time, except that additional replacement F-15 aircraft may be held in the United States, at the expense of Saudi Arabia, for shipment to Saudi Arabia only after the President notifies the Congress that the existing inventory of F-15 aircraft held by Saudi Arabia is less than 60 and, then, only on a one-for-one replacement basis as each F-15 aircraft is

totally removed from the inventory of Saudi Arabia.

Page 16, after line 7, insert the following:

SEC. 117. RESTRICTIONS ON FMS SALES OF STINGER MISSILES.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the United States Government may not sell any STINGER air defense guided missile (or any other man-portable ground-to-air missile with comparable advanced technology) to any foreign military or paramilitary force under the Arms Export Control Act.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The prohibition contained in subsection (a) does not apply with respect to—

(1) a transfer to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or the armed forces of a member nation of that organization;

(2) a transfer to the armed forces of a country designated as major non-NATO ally for purposes of section 1105 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1987;

(3) a transfer otherwise specifically authorized by the Congress by an Act or joint resolution enacted after the date of enactment of this Act; or

(4) a transfer if the President certifies to the Congress that—

(A) an unforeseen emergency exists which requires the immediate transfer of the missiles; and

(B) no other air defense system can meet the air defense needs of the recipient.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the Congress a report which assesses the global threat caused by the proliferation of man-portable ground-to-air missiles with advanced technology comparable to that of the STINGER missile, without regard to the country of origin of those missiles. This report shall give special emphasis to the danger of such missiles being used in acts of terrorism.

SEC. 118. NOTICE TO CONGRESS REGARDING POSSIBLE MISSILES SALES.

(a) PRICE AND AVAILABILITY REPORTS.—Section 28 of the Arms Export Control Act is amended—

(1) in the first sentence of subsection (a)—

(A) by striking out “or” after “\$7,000,000 or more” and inserting in lieu thereof a comma, and

(B) by inserting “, or of any missiles, rockets, or associated launchers or any artillery projectiles (without regard to the amount of the possible sale),” after “\$25,000,000 or more”; and

(2) in the clause (2) of subsection (b)—

(A) by striking out “or” after “\$7,000,000 or more” and inserting in lieu thereof a comma, and

(B) by inserting “, or of any missiles, rockets, or associated launchers or any artillery projectiles (without regard to the amount of the proposed sale),” after “\$25,000,000 or more”.

(b) NOTIFICATIONS IN THE ABSENCE OF RECENT PRICE AND AVAILABILITY REPORT LISTING.—

(1) SALES SUBJECT TO NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—Paragraph (2) of this subsection applies with respect to any letter of offer to sell any missiles, rockets, or associated launchers or any artillery projectiles (without regard to the amount of the sale) if, within the preceding 6 months, a listing has not been transmitted to the Congress pursuant to section 28 of the Arms Export Control Act with respect to that sale and if section 36(b) of that Act does not apply.

(2) REQUIREMENT FOR NOTIFICATION.—Before issuing any letter of offer described in paragraph (1), the President shall notify the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate. Any such notification shall contain the information required in a certification under section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act.

(3) TIME FOR NOTIFICATION.—The notification required by paragraph (2) shall be submitted not less than 30 days before the letter of offer is issued, unless the President states in the notification that an emergency exists which requires the proposed sale in the national security interests of the United States. If the President states that such an emergency exists, he shall include a detailed justification for his determination, including a description of the emergency circumstances which necessitate the immediate issuance of the letter of offer and a discussion of the national security issues involved.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] will be recognized for 10 minutes and a Member opposed to the amendments will be recognized for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Let me explain what we have done here, if my colleagues will follow me.

Mr. Chairman, the en bloc amendment contains the amendment of Mr. SMITH of Florida—all of these were printed in the RECORD, of course—which essentially codifies the existing agreement between the executive branch and the Congress on the sale of F-15's to Saudi Arabia and places a ceiling of no more than 60 F-15's in Saudi Arabia at any one time.

The amendment also contains the amendment offered by Mr. OBEY, which allows FMS funds to be used to replenish the guaranty reserve fund and represents a compromise concerning the restrictions on the transfer of Stinger missiles and congressional notification regarding the sale of such missiles. This compromise of the two amendments of Mr. LEVINE and the amendment of Mr. SMITH of Florida would apply a prohibition on the sale through FMS of man-portable ground-to-air missile defense systems unless specifically authorized by Congress but exempts nations other than NATO or major non-NATO allies of the United States.

At the same time, the compromise provides the executive branch with waiver authority to sell such systems in situations in which these missile systems represent the only air defense system which can meet the air defense requirements of the proposed recipients.

The compromise requires a report within 6 months of the date of enactment on the global threats that are posed to U.S. national security interests through the continued proliferation of these weapons systems and

strengthens congressional review of all missile and rocket launcher sales regardless of dollar value by requiring the executive branch to include such sales in its quarterly price and acquisition reports.

Finally, the compromise stipulates that any proposed sale of such items which have not been included in a price and acquisition report must be submitted 30 days in advance of any sale.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendments en bloc.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time.

I want to take this opportunity to commend the chairman for having crafted a very, very finely tuned bill, that had to sail through some very difficult waters. There was a very significant amount of compromise that was made necessary by the kinds of exigencies which exist in our budgetary process today.

I might add for those who do not know it, this is another in a series of years where foreign aid has been reduced.

Now, there are those who would like to have increased foreign aid, but right now the mode is for decreased foreign aid; so hopefully the amounts that are going to be authorized in this bill will be left as is on this very important subject.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment prohibits the sale of the manned portable Stinger antiaircraft missiles to all countries except NATO and major non-NATO allies for sales explicitly approved by Congress.

This legislation authorizes the President to waive the prohibition under certain provisions.

In addition, there are certain certification requirements that he is required to make.

This amendment I bring before the body as part of the en bloc amendments, and there are others I will discuss in a minute, is one of tantamount importance, because it raises the question of how Congress balances the interests of arming foreign nationals in the name of our own national security, while unavoidably flooding the international arms market with state-of-the-art weapons whose transfer is almost impossible to monitor. As with many aspects of foreign policy, this question presents a clear dichotomy of interests and will only be resolved when there is a consensus on what is the most effective method of protecting the lives of American citizens and the security interests of the United States.

For years there has been a great concern over the proliferation of the manned portable Stinger antiaircraft

missile. This concern stems primarily from the difficulty of applying adequate controls over such a maneuverable weapon. It is a very effective defense weapon.

On the other hand, the exact features which make it desirable to the international military establishment also make it a potent weapon for enemies of the United States.

The amendment that is offered here would dramatically decrease the risk that an American manufactured weapon, such as the Stinger, in the end will be used to kill or maim American citizens, albeit detrimental to our security interests.

I might add that the revelation that 30 of these Stinger missiles are now in the hands of the Iranians, most likely through the problem of getting them from the Afghan rebels, is one of the major reasons for this amendment. We cannot allow that proliferation.

Second, in this en bloc amendment is a revision which has been agreed to by both sides, I believe, in the Senate and this body, on conditioning the sale recently approved of F-15's to Saudi Arabia to 60 maximum in their inventory at any time, and any aircraft sold to replace one of those 60 has to be made with notice to the Congress and limiting the weapons of the F-15's to A's, B's, C's, or D's. That is something, as I said, that has been in fact agreed to by all parties.

Finally, there is a provision on which my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE] will speak subsequent to me with reference to Stinger missiles and other weapons in the Persian Gulf region, which I wholeheartedly endorse, which is a very good idea, along the same lines as what I am speaking about, and that is the Stingers all over the world, and that is the proliferation of these very dangerous American weapons, to make sure that they are not used ultimately against American citizens by terrorists.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge all my colleagues to adopt this en bloc amendment.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might consume of the 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Obey amendment of this en bloc amendment would in my opinion gut the U.S. Security Assistance Program. Basically, it is a back door effort to cut security assistance, while leaving economic aid untouched.

It is unnecessary, because the administration has stated that the GRF funding question can be resolved without statutory language.

I would point out again that this is just another case where a bad bill is going to be made badder, if there is such a word, which means that its chances of ever being enacted into law are growing dimmer by the minute.

Second, the first Smith amendment that would limit transfer of F-15's to Saudi Arabia, I think all the gentlemen on that side of the aisle already know, since they are in the majority in the Senate, that this has already been worked out with the Senate and we should not be putting this into statute. We all know that it has already been done.

Third, on the last Smith amendment en bloc, again I think we have serious problems here, because of congressional micromanagement.

There is a serious question whether Stinger transfers to Chad, to Afghanistan and Pakistan and many other countries, such as France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and Great Britain could go on. I just think this is a bad time for us to be legislating this kind of restriction and it is just really going to hurt this bill; so I regret that these amendments are being offered at this time.

Mr. Chairman I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE].

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding this time. I also thank him for his assistance and for his staff's assistance in crafting a compromise amendment combining three different amendments that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI], and I have been working on for a period of time.

Mr. Chairman, in sum, the net result of this en bloc amendment is to make it more difficult to transfer overseas one of the most dangerous and potentially lethal weapons in the U.S. arsenal, a weapon that could easily get into the hands of terrorists. This is the Stinger missile.

Mr. Chairman, last year, the most controversial component of the proposed missile sale to Saudi Arabia was the Stinger missile. Its potential for mischief, its potential for terror, and its potential for use against innocent civilians was the cause, more than anything else, of a lopsided vote on the floor of this House opposing this arms package; the vote was 356 to 62.

On a bipartisan basis, Mr. Chairman, people on both sides of the aisle in both bodies of this legislature have attempted to get at the inappropriate and unnecessary proliferation of Stinger missiles. Regrettably, despite the intense concern that has been

demonstrated by Members of Congress over the security issues at stake in global proliferation of Stingers, this administration persists—to use the language of a Member of the other body—in passing out these missiles much the way many people pass out cigars. In short, this administration seeks all too often to transfer Stingers to one nation or another.

Under this en bloc amendment, we still have allowed an exemption to this ban, which uses the language of current law. In other words, if the President certifies that "an unforeseen emergency which requires the immediate transfer of the missiles," and if no other air defense system can meet the air defense needs of the recipient, then the Stinger sale can proceed.

I should emphasize that these exemptions are broader than I would like to see. In fact, I oppose these exemptions, but they are in the en bloc language.

Mr. Chairman, I introduced a bill of my own which would have totally banned the transfer of Stinger missiles to any Persian Gulf nation in the next fiscal year. I introduced another bill which would have totally banned the transfer of Stinger missiles to any country other than a NATO country or major non-NATO ally on this globe without congressional authorization.

□ 1325

However, in an effort to compromise and in an effort to at least begin to stem the flow of proliferation, I agreed to this en bloc amendment. It calls for additional notice requirements so that the Congress will be provided with adequate notice on all sales of missiles and rockets regardless of the dollar amount. While this notice is not as broad as I would like to see, it does inform us of the administration's intent when it wishes to proceed with a transfer of Stingers or any other missile. In addition, and as I noted earlier, it allows Congress to block that transfer on a government-to-government basis. While this does not cover covert transfers, which I would like to see included in the bill, it still would block government-to-government transfers unless the exemptions apply.

It is a modest amendment, Mr. Chairman. And while it does not go far enough, it is an important step in the direction of controlling the global proliferation of our most lethal and sophisticated weaponry, particularly the Stinger missile. Such proliferation is inappropriate and highly dangerous to U.S. interests.

I urge my colleagues to support this en bloc amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am really surprised because what this amendment is doing

as far as the Stinger missiles are concerned is that it is driving the administration or any future administration to deal covertly with these countries as opposed to overtly. We have sold Stinger missiles under foreign military sales to NATO and to a number of non-NATO countries including Australia, South Korea, which we are now going to ban, New Zealand, Pakistan, which we will now ban, Saudi Arabia, Chad, where we won a war against the madman Qadhafi. I just do not understand the reasoning behind this and I regret that the House cannot vote on this issue separately instead of en bloc.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO], who will speak on a very cogent point.

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

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak to several parts of this en bloc amendment with regard to foreign military sales, and the foreign military sales guarantee reserve fund amendment.

I think it can be maintained and properly so that the effect of this amendment if it is adopted would be to eliminate military assistance programs outside of earmarked countries. Its effect on our bilateral security relationships would be devastating. It would send a signal to our allies that we are not to be relied upon, that we are more concerned with procedure than with the substance of our relationship.

Sufficient authority already exists to manage arrearages due to the Federal Financing Bank which is handling overdue loans in much the same way that rescheduled debt is handled.

This amendment would commit scarce resources, security assistance resources to resolve what is essentially an accounting problem. I would hope for that reason alone that this would be turned down.

With regard to the amendment relating to the sale of F-15's to Saudi Arabia, the amendment is exactly what has been worked out with Members of the Congress and the administration on such a sale to Saudi Arabia. I do not know what the purpose of including it is other than perhaps to embarrass the administration and say that we do not trust you, we have to have this in writing.

Although I do not object to what it provides, I certainly do not think it should be included in this bill.

With regard to the Levine amendment which is included in an amended form in this legislation, I think as the author of the amendment pointed out a moment ago, it does not cover where probably the problem is or could be, namely, covert sales. I do not think we have that same kind of problem here.

Also, the amendment does not just refer to Stinger missiles. It refers to any missile, rocket, or associated launchers or any artillery projectiles, which I read as one artillery shell. I think that this would result in excessive reporting requirements, would overburden both the administration and congressional staffs, and would draw our attention away from more suitable areas.

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

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

Mr. LEVINE of California. I would refer the gentleman to the language concerning the area that you refer to, and that is on notification of missiles or other projectiles. In terms of the prohibition, it only covers Stingers. I would refer the gentleman to that specific language.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. But what I said was it would result in undue paperwork for both of us.

Mr. LEVINE of California. If the gentleman would continue to yield, I make this point just in the context of the accuracy of the description of the amendment.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. The gentleman is correct. So the provisions would flood the committees with notifications on transfers raising no significant policy issues and I think would impede rather than enhance effective congressional oversight.

Again, I think the resulting delays would necessarily also erode U.S. credibility as a reliable supplier in a period when there are an increasing number of alternative sources for the weapons in question and when the relative U.S. position as a supplier of defense goods and services to free world countries is declining. We are not the only supplier of such weapons in the world today.

I would also say that although the amendment as presented to us today is an improvement in some regards compared to the original amendment, it still does have a number of shortcomings. For example, one of the exceptions is that the President may transfer and then certify to Congress if there is an unforeseen emergency.

What is that? I can just see that no matter what the emergency is, Members of this Congress are going to stand up and say that the administration should have foreseen that, and therefore it does not fall within the exception.

I would hope that my colleagues would turn down this en bloc amendment.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ].

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Chairman, if I might say, I am working on an amendment now which should be ready in a

minute or so which would be an amendment to this en bloc amendment. When it arrives, I will ask unanimous consent to offer it. The amendment in effect would permit an exception to the prohibition on sale of Stingers to countries where we have support apparatus or military facilities. I have in mind in particular Bahrain, a country in the Persian Gulf which is the headquarters for our Mid-east force and whose cooperation is really essential in terms of our capacity to maintain our fleet in that part of the world.

There is clearly a threat to important Bahraini facilities and I discovered much to my chagrin and regret that this en bloc amendment which I had understood the impression would have permitted the sale in limited amounts of Stingers to Bahrain is worded in such a way right now that it would preclude such a sale. So I plan to offer this amendment if no one objects which would make that exception possible.

I would hope, given the importance of this issue, that no one would object so the House can have a chance to address this vitally important issue.

MODIFICATIONS OFFERED BY MR. SOLARZ TO THE AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. FASCELL

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments offered en bloc by Mr. FASCELL be modified as follows:

"On page 3, after paragraph (2) insert the following new paragraph (3) and redesignate existing paragraphs (3) and (4) accordingly:

"(3) a transfer to a country which has either support units or military facilities staffed by members of the United States Armed Forces;".

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification offered by Mr. SOLARZ to the amendments offered by Mr. FASCELL: On page 3, after paragraph (2) insert the following new paragraph (3) and redesignate existing paragraphs (3) and (4) accordingly:

(3) a transfer to a country which has either support units or military facilities staffed by members of the U.S. Armed Forces;

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, as I see the proceedings here, we have debated this en bloc amendment for about 10 minutes and, if I gather what the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] is doing, he is modifying this amendment because we have already found one major flaw in it.

Do we have any assurance that there are not a number of other major flaws in this en bloc amendment since we are making very substantive foreign policy decisions here? Is my understanding correct?

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SOLARZ. I think this is a major flaw. I think it needs to be corrected and other people may find other problems with the en bloc amendment. In my view this is by far the most important and serious, and in view of the fact that the chances for the amendment's passing appear to be reasonably good, I think it is in our interest to try to modify the en bloc amendments in this fashion in order to avoid what could be a very serious problem for our forces in the Persian Gulf.

□ 1335

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, let me ask the gentleman is his amendment going to apply to any other countries other than Bahrain?

Mr. SOLARZ. It certainly applies to Bahrain. Whether or not it applies to any other countries, I have to say to the gentleman I am honestly not in a position to say because I have not examined literally every country in the world. But to the extent that there are countries which have either support units or military facilities staffed by members of the U.S. Armed Forces, it would apply. And what it would mean is that in those circumstances such countries would not be by law ineligible to buy Stingers from the United States.

Whether it was wise for us to sell Stingers to those other countries is a matter that would have to be determined on a case-by-case basis. But just as the en bloc amendments exempt NATO countries and non-NATO major allies like Israel from the restrictions in the amendment, my amendment would also exempt countries that have support units or military facilities staffed by members of the United States Armed Forces. And if I can have a chance to explain the amendment, I think that the gentleman and I hope most of the other Members will find it acceptable.

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, it is my understanding this amendment would include any military facilities staffed by military personnel no matter how small those facilities are, is that correct?

Mr. SOLARZ. There is no size criteria in the amendment.

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

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say the gentleman from New York is offering a very good amendment. It makes a very bad en bloc amendment better. But the gen-

tleman, I think, really brought out the crux of what is happening here today with our micromanagement of foreign policy on the floor of this House.

The gentleman said, and I quote him: "I cannot honestly say that it affects any other areas."

Let me just give an example. The Philippines, where we have already had American military servicemen assassinated on the streets, if this were not in here we would not be able to sell the Philippine Government, allies of ours, Stinger missiles to protect those bases that are there.

Not only that, but let me give another example. We have access agreements with countries all over this world where the gentleman, flying all over the country during the break that is coming up, are going to be flying into these countries. Those countries ought to have access to these Stinger missiles to protect those planes flying in.

This whole thing never should have been brought on this floor. It is making a bad bill worse, and the whole amendment should be defeated. But I commend the gentleman because he is a statesman in offering an amendment from that side of the aisle to make it a better bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] insist on his reservation?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I just want to say that the gentleman from New York is being offered an opportunity to do what frankly as one of the people who had two of his amendments of the four that are rolled into this en bloc amendment did not wish done. But I do not wish to hold him back from offering this kind of choice to this body.

But I would just hope that we could stop making this out to be something that it is not, a panacea, because this amendment en bloc can stand on its own without any problem. It certainly does not have any flaws.

The gentleman from New York is being afforded an opportunity to do what he wants, and we will debate the issue on the floor as to whether Stinger missiles should or should not be sent over to Bahrain or any other country in the world. And I will not object, but I would hope that we could keep the context of this debate in at least some logical order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman and to all Members that pending is a unanimous-consent request to modify the pending en bloc amendments. There will not be a separate vote on the unanimous-con-

sent request. This is not an amendment to an amendment.

What is pending is a unanimous-consent request to modify the pending en bloc amendments.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ]?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Chairman, will there not be a vote in the event the unanimous consent is granted to the gentleman from New York for offering his modifying amendment to the en bloc amendment? Will there not be a vote on the modifying amendment offered by the gentleman from New York?

The CHAIRMAN. No. The Chair will state that what is pending is a unanimous-consent request to modify the pending en bloc amendments. That is by unanimous consent. If granted, a vote then could come on the en bloc amendments as modified.

Does the gentleman from California have a further parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Chairman, this gentleman does have another parliamentary inquiry.

Is the Chair ruling that the only manner in which the en bloc amendment can be modified is by unanimous consent? In the absence of unanimous consent, there cannot be a vote on the proposal to modify the en bloc amendment.

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

Mr. LEVINE of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state that the gentleman from California was stating a parliamentary inquiry, and if the gentleman wishes, the Chair will answer that parliamentary inquiry, and then he will be pleased to answer the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Chairman, mine has been answered to my satisfaction.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California have a further parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Chairman, my parliamentary inquiry has been answered by the Chair, and I thank the Chair.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the Chair has just indicated it is currently entertaining a unanimous-consent request from the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] to

modify the existing en bloc amendment, which means that if there is no objection, it would be modified?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Rather than having the gentleman from New York, having made a unanimous-consent request, allowed to offer an amendment to modify, is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state the gentleman is accurate. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Therefore, if no objection is heard, it will automatically be modified?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SOLARZ. My parliamentary inquiry is, would it be in order to ask unanimous consent to modify the en bloc amendment, to offer an amendment to modify the en bloc amendment which, if it did receive unanimous consent, would then have to be adopted by a vote of the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would ask all Members to listen to the language which he will state from the rule which is governing debate on this bill. The language is: "Such amendments en bloc shall be considered as having been read and shall not be subject to amendment or to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole."

So the answer to the gentleman is no.

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Chairman, I have another parliamentary inquiry because there seems to be some confusion in the ranks over here.

Is it the understanding of the Chair that because of the rule, even a unanimous-consent request, if granted, to permit an amendment to modify the en bloc amendment would be out of order? In other words, that unanimous-consent request could not in effect overrule the rule?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state that a unanimous consent request made in the Committee of the Whole cannot change the structure of the rule adopted by the House under which the Committee of the Whole is proceeding. So the answer, the Chair will state, is no, that would not be possible.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Chairman, would it be permissible at a subsequent time in the course of this

debate to allow the gentleman from New York to offer his amendment to the en bloc amendment by going from the Committee to the full House, asking for unanimous consent in the full House, making his offer at that time, and then going back into the Committee? I raise this question not because I like his amendment, but because I think he ought to be entitled to an opportunity to have it debated and offer it, and it would seem that this might satisfy procedurally the concerns that have been expressed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman is accurate, that such a request could be made in the full House, but only in the full House and not in the Committee of the Whole.

In the alternative, the Chair could entertain a request to withdraw the en bloc amendments. It then could be modified by Representative FASCELL and it could be offered in the Committee of the Whole. Either would be permissible.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Chairman, I have a further point of parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his further point of parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Chairman, would it not then be permissible for the Committee of the Whole House to take action on the en bloc amendment and if that action is positive, at a subsequent time, to allow the gentleman from New York, in the full House, to offer his amendment to the en bloc amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that he has already stated to the gentleman that would be possible in the full House.

Mr. LEVINE of California. After passage of the en bloc amendment in the Committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. LEVINE of California. I thank the Chair.

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the last word.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say I think we find ourselves in a very unfortunate position here. There had been some discussion of this question yesterday by a number of us before the bill was taken up, and at that time I expressed some very serious concerns about what struck me as the overly broad reach of this amendment or of a similar amendment.

I want to make it clear that I share the concerns of the authors of the amendment about the gratuitous sale of Stingers and other hand-held missiles all over the world. But I pointed out that the way the amendment they then envisioned was drawn it would preclude the sale of Stingers to Bahrain, and the reason that concerned me, and the reason I think it ought to concern every Member of this House is that we now have 20,000 men in the Persian Gulf. Their lives are at stake. And our capacity to maintain our fleet there and to provide these men with the support they need is contingent on our capacity to continue operating the headquarters of our Mideast force, which happens to be located in Bahrain.

Bahrain has had a request before us for some time now for Stinger missiles, not because they want Stingers for the sake of Stingers but because over the course of the last few years there have been a number of Iranian attacks against Bahraini oil rigs in the Persian Gulf. Bahrain depends on the production and export of oil for its income. Right now it has no way of defending those oil rigs; yet, at the same time it is under tremendous pressure in Bahrain because it has permitted the United States to maintain a support facility in its country which is directly related to the operation of our fleet in the gulf.

Now over and over again I heard Members on both sides of the aisle saying whenever the question of arms sales to Gulf States comes up, when are these countries going to give us bases, when are they going to help us help them in the gulf. Here we have a country, Bahrain, which has been helping us very quietly for years and years. To a certain extent their security is jeopardized as a result of what they are doing for the United States. They are under tremendous pressure, and yet when they ask us for some limited help through the sale of Stingers to help them defend their installations, we now appear to be coming forward with an amendment which would preclude it.

I had been under the impression earlier today that a compromise version of this amendment had been worked out which included language which would have made it possible for the sale of Stingers to Bahrain to go forward. After the amendment was introduced, however, and it was on the floor, I subsequently discovered that the language differed from the language that had been shown to my staff earlier in the day, and that it was now drawn in a fashion that would preclude the sale of Stingers to Bahrain.

□ 1350

I now find out that I am precluded from offering an amendment to the en

bloc amendments to correct this unfortunate omission. I want to serve notice that later on when we go into the full House or at any other appropriate moment if some parliamentary means can be devised to bring this issue before the House, I will do so, because I think that it is very important for us to avoid acting in ways that could put in jeopardy our men in the Persian Gulf.

The notion that the sale of Stingers to Bahrain is going to result in any significant increase in the threat of terrorism is sheer hogwash. The Mideast is already awash in hand-held missiles. There are plenty of Arab countries that have Soviet hand-held missiles. We have provided Stingers to plenty of other countries around the world. But to prevent the sale of Stingers now going forward to Bahrain when they have agreed in principle to all sorts of arrangements designed to prevent terrorists from getting hold of those Stingers and when by not selling those weapons to Bahrain in limited amounts for the purpose not of attacking Israel or any other country, but simply of defending their oil facilities we may be jeopardizing the security of our forces in the gulf it seems to me to be a serious mistake.

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

Mr. SOLARZ. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have served with the gentleman in the well in various legislative bodies for 15 or 20 years. He has never made such great sense. I wish this was a special order that we were carrying on here this afternoon so that we could continue it not at the expense of the 10-hour rule. But I would just say to the gentleman, it is a shame that Mr. SMITH of Florida will not withdraw his objection because we need to vote on this now and so we do not have a rollcall vote on the en bloc amendments.

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

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

Mr. SOLARZ. I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH].

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

Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman realizes that, "A," he and I have had a long-standing dispute about whether or not there should be Stingers proliferating and certainly I have not agreed prior to this to the fact that Bahrain or any other country should be exempted. I never made such an agreement with the gentleman. I want the record to be clear on that.

Mr. SOLOMON. If the gentleman will permit me to say so, I was informed by staff earlier in the day that

the staff of the gentleman from Florida and the staff of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE] had agreed to a formulation for this amendment which would have permitted an exemption not just for NATO countries and non-NATO countries, which he has already agreed to in the bill, but Bahrain as well. It turned out that that understanding is incorrect.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Unfortunately, that understanding is incorrect for whatever reasons. I apologize to the gentleman. I want the gentleman to be aware.

Second, and more importantly, the only reason I wish the gentleman would understand—and I think he does—

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

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] be allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I am not going to object to this one extension, but we are using up the 10 hours. It is not fair to the 160 amendments that we have to offer. We have to use some reasonableness here.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

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

Mr. SOLARZ. I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH].

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

Mr. Chairman, I tell the gentleman that more importantly the only reason I objected to the gentleman's unanimous-consent request, which I said I would not object to, was the fact that there was not going to be a vote allowed on the amendment to modify. I certainly would want the gentleman to have the ability to present his argument.

Mr. SOLARZ. I understand that. And it was my impression when I asked unanimous consent that it would require a vote.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. I understand that and so we have no misunderstanding. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has 1 minute remaining in the debate on the pending en bloc amendments.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I would just say that it is a shame that Mr. SMITH had to object to the Solarz

modification because this side of the aisle was not going to ask for a vote on the en bloc amendments if the House had accepted the SOLARZ amendment. Mr. SOLARZ has brought out so vividly what is wrong with this legislation and that is why we wanted the opportunity to vote individually on these individual amendments which have now been placed en bloc and it is a shame that things have broken down to this point.

Now we will have to ask for a vote on the en bloc amendments which we hate to do.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I would be pleased to yield to the chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman can do what he likes, of course, but let me say that I did not find this amendment in the RECORD anywhere. This bill has been no secret since January. This issue has been no secret all year.

And to leave the impression that all of a sudden some issue just simply kind of jumped up and we overlooked it is really not fair on the record. The issue has been here all the time. I think it is legitimate to debate it and to vote on it but to do something on this amendment because the other amendment was not in the RECORD or there is some complication about it is really not very fair. I hope the gentleman would reconsider.

Mr. SOLOMON. I have the greatest respect for the chairman, but when one of the most knowledgeable Members of this House, Mr. SOLARZ, was unaware of it, there is great reason to believe that many of the others on the floor did not.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the en bloc amendments offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 322, noes 93, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 436]

AYES—322

Ackerman	Ballenger	Boggs	Hayes (IL)	Panetta	Williams
Akaka	Bartlett	Boland	Hayes (LA)	Pashayian	Wise
Alexander	Bates	Bonior	Hefley	Patterson	Wolf
Anderson	Beilenson	Bonker	Hefner	Pease	Wolpe
Andrews	Bennett	Borski	Henry	Pelosi	Wortley
Annunzio	Bentley	Bosco	Hertel	Penny	Wyden
Anthony	Bereuter	Boucher	Hochbrueckner	Pepper	Wylie
Applegate	Berman	Boxer	Holloway	Perkins	Yates
Archer	Bilbray	Brennan	Horton	Petri	Yatron
Aspin	Bilirakis	Brown (CA)	Howard	Pickett	Young (AK)
Atkins	Bliley	Brown (CO)	Hoyer	Pickle	Young (FL)
AuCoin	Boehlert	Bruce	Hubbard	Porter	

Bryant	Huckaby	Price (IL)	Armey	Hansen	Packard
Buechner	Hunter	Price (NC)	Badham	Herger	Parris
Bustamante	Hutto	Pursell	Baker	Hiler	Quillen
Campbell	Inhofe	Rangel	Barnard	Hopkins	Rahall
Cardin	Jacobs	Ray	Barton	Houghton	Ravanel
Carper	Jeffords	Regula	Bateman	Ireland	Rhodes
Carr	Johnson (SD)	Richardson	Bevill	Jenkins	Rogers
Chapman	Jones (NC)	Ridge	Boulder	Johnson (CT)	Schaefers
Chappell	Jones (TN)	Rinaldo	Bunning	Koibe	Schulze
Clarke	Jontz	Ritter	Burton	Konnyu	Shumway
Clay	Kanjorski	Roberts	Byron	Kyl	Shuster
Coats	Kaptur	Robinson	Callahan	Lagomarsino	Skeen
Coble	Kasich	Rodino	Chandler	Latta	Slaughter (VA)
Coleman (MO)	Kastenmeier	Rose	Clinger	Leath (TX)	Smith (NE)
Coleman (TX)	Kennedy	Rostenkowski	Combest	Lightfoot	Smith (TX)
Collins	Kennelly	Roth	Craig	Livingston	Smith, Robert
Conte	Kildee	Roukema	Daniel	Lott	(NH)
Conyers	Kleczka	Rowland (CT)	Dannemeyer	Lujan	Smith, Robert
Cooper	Kolter	Rowland (GA)	Daub	Lukens, Donald	(OR)
Coughlin	Kostmayer	Royal	Davis (IL)	Lungren	Solomon
Crane	LaFalce	Russo	Dickinson	Madigan	Spence
Crockett	Lancaster	Sabo	Dornan (CA)	Marlenee	Stangeland
Darden	Lantos	Salki	Dreier	Martin (NY)	Stenholm
Davis (MI)	Leach (IA)	Savage	Duncan	McCandless	Stump
de la Garza	Lehman (CA)	Sawyer	Emerson	McMillan (NC)	Sweeney
DeFazio	Lehman (FL)	Saxton	Fawell	Michel	Swindall
DeLay	Lehman (FL)	Scheuer	Gekas	Miller (OH)	Taylor
Dellums	Leland	Schneider	Gingrich	Montgomery	Thomas (CA)
Derrick	Lent	Schroeder	Goodling	Myers	Vucanovich
Dicks	Levin (MI)	Schuette	Gregg	Nichols	Walker
Dingell	Levine (CA)	Schumer	Gunderson	Nelson	Wilson
DioGuardi	Lewis (CA)	Sensenbrenner	Hammerschmidt	Oxley	
Dixon	Lewis (FL)	Sharp			
Donnelly	Lewis (GA)	Shaw			
Dorgan (ND)	Lipinski	Shays			
Downey	Lloyd	Sikorski			
Durbin	Lowery (CA)	Sisisky			
Dwyer	Lowry (WA)	Skaggs			
Dymally	Lukens, Thomas	Skelton			
Dyson	Mack	Slattery			
Early	MacKay	Slaughter (NY)			
Eckart	Manton	Smith (FL)			
Edwards (CA)	Markey	Smith (IA)			
Edwards (OK)	Martin (IL)	Smith (NJ)			
English	Martinez	Smith, Denny			
Erdreich	Matsui	(OR)			
Espy	Mavroules	Snowe			
Evans	Mazzoli	Solarz			
Fascell	McCloskey	Spratt			
Fazio	McCurdy	St Germain			
Feighan	McDade	Staggers			
Fields	McEwen	Stallings			
Fish	McGrath	Stark			
Flake	McHugh	Stokes			
Flippo	McMillen (MD)	Stratton			
Florio	Meyers	Studds			
Foglietta	Mfume	Sundquist			
Foley	Mica	Swift			
Ford (MI)	Miller (CA)	Synar			
Ford (TN)	Miller (WA)	Tallan			
Frenzel	Mineta	Tauke			
Frost	Moakley	Tauzin			
Gallagly	Molinari	Thomas (GA)			
Gallo	Mollohan	Torres			
Garcia	Moody	Torricelli			
Gaydos	Moorhead	Towns			
Gejdenson	Morella	Traficant			
Gibbons	Morrison (CT)	Traxler			
Gilman	Morrison (WA)	Udall			
Glickman	Mrazek	Upton			
Gonzalez	Murphy	Valentine			
Gordon	Murtha	Vander Jagt			
Gradison	Nagle	Vento			
Grandy	Natcher	Viscosky			
Grant	Neal	Volkmer			
Gray (PA)	Nelson	Walgren			
Green	Nowak	Watkins			
Guarini	Oakar	Waxman			
Hall (TX)	Oberstar	Weber			
Hamilton	Obey	Weiss			
Harris	Olin	Weldon			
Hastert	Ortiz	Wheat			
Hatcher	Owens (NY)	Whittaker			
Hawkins	Owens (UT)	Whitten			
Hayes (IL)	Panetta	Williams			
Hayes (LA)	Pashayian	Wise			
Hefley	Patterson	Wolf			
Hefner	Pease	Wolpe			
Henry	Pelosi	Wortley			
Hertel	Penny	Wyden			
Hochbrueckner	Pepper	Wylie			
Holloway	Perkins	Yates			
Horton	Petri	Yatron			
Howard	Pickett	Young (AK)			
Hoyer	Pickle	Young (FL)			
Hubbard	Porter				

NOES—93

Armeny	Hansen	Packard
Badham	Herger	Parris
Baker	Hiler	Quillen
Barnard	Hopkins	Rahall
Barton	Houghton	Ravanel
Bateman	Ireland	Rhodes
Bevill	Jenkins	Rogers
Boulder	Johnson (CT)	Schaefers
Bunning	Koibe	Schulze
Burton	Konnyu	Shumway
Bateman	Kyl	Stuster
Callahan	Lagomarsino	Skeen
Chandler	Latta	Slaughter (VA)
Clinger	Leath (TX)	Smith (NE)
Combest	Lightfoot	Smith (TX)
Craig	Livingston	Smith, Robert
Daniel	Lott	(NH)
Dannemeyer	Lujan	Smith, Robert
Daub	Lukens, Donald	(OR)
Davis (IL)	Lungren	Solomon
Dickinson	Madigan	Spence
Dornan (CA)	Marlenee	Stangeland
Dreier	Martin (NY)	Stenholm
Duncan	McCandless	Stump
Emerson	McMillan (NC)	Sweeney
Fawell	Michel	Swindall
Gekas	Miller (OH)	Taylor
Gingrich	Montgomery	Thomas (CA)
Goodling	Myers	Vucanovich
Gregg	Nichols	Walker
Gunderson	Nelson	Wilson
Hammerschmidt	Oxley	

NOT VOTING—18

Biaggi	Coyne	Hall (OH)
Brooks	DeWine	Hyde
Broomfield	Dowdy	Kemp
Cheney	Frank	McCullum
Coelho	Gephart	Roe
Courter	Gray (IL)	Roemer

□ 1405

Mr. CALLAHAN changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. MOLINARI, INHOFE, BALLENGER, GALLEGLY, VALENTINE, and McEWEN changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the en bloc amendments were agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mr. Chairman, very briefly, it is my intention to ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment, with the understanding that the \$5 million in question, rather than being transferred from IMET to Development Assistance, will not be transferred but simply added to the final amount for development assistance in the bill.

With that understanding, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman has stated he chooses not to offer his amendment. He has not at this point offered an amendment, so no unanimous consent at this point is required.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

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

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

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KOSTMAYER] that we appreciate very much the fact

that he did not offer his amendment. I think his understanding, as he stated it a moment ago, is correct.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SWINDALL

MR. SWINDALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SWINDALL: Page 16, after line 7, insert the following:

SEC. 116. LIMITATIONS ON MILITARY ASSISTANCE.

(a) GENERAL ASSEMBLY VOTES—Funds authorized to be appropriated by this title may not be allocated to any country whose votes in the United Nations General Assembly Plenary differed from the United States position by more than 90 percent, as recorded in the most recent Department of State report entitled "Report to the Congress on Voting Practices in the United Nations".

(b) MOST RECENT REPORT DEFINED.—For purposes of applying subsection (a)—

(1) with respect to fiscal year 1988 assistance, the most recent such report shall be deemed to be the report dated April 23, 1987; and

(2) with respect to fiscal year 1989 assistance, the most recent such report shall be deemed to be the next annual report submitted after that date.

MR. SWINDALL (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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

□ 1415

MR. SWINDALL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment in terms of its effect is fairly simple.

It would simply state that we will not allow any military assistance to be afforded to countries that oppose us in the United Nations General Assembly Plenary more than 90 percent of the time.

Potentially that is 16 countries that would be affected—8 in Asia-Pacific, 5 in Africa, 2 in America, and 1 in Eastern Europe.

Under the current law there would only be three countries affected. Those countries would be Benin in Africa, Algeria in the Near East, and the Yemen Arab Republic in the Near East and Asia.

Clearly, the purpose of this bill is more symbolic than anything else. I would hope that the purpose of our foreign aid, whether it be military or otherwise, is to allow those countries that are supportive of our policies to understand our joint commitment to one another.

If I have a criticism about my own amendment, it is the fact that 90 percent hardly sends that message; but I also recognize the clear political reality that if we were to place 50 percent as a cutoff line, we would lose the requisite amount of support to pass this type of amendment, so my purpose in

offering this is to send a message to those countries that are recipients of military and foreign aid, that we do intend to require at least minimal support in the United Nations.

I must state that also we will have a similar amendment under title XI that states the same requirement will apply with respect to any foreign assistance; and of course, that will affect a good number more countries than we have under this.

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

MR. SWINDALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

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

I want to commend the gentleman for his amendment. Four years ago I offered an amendment which became law which required the State Department to record and to keep track of the voting record of these countries, and to report to the Congress on an annual basis.

Now that they are doing so, we can see just how badly some of these countries are that receive some of the largesse from the American taxpayers.

I commend the gentleman for offering the amendment, and I support it.

MR. SWINDALL. That report is referenced in section B, subparagraph 1, as well as next year's report.

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

MR. SWINDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

MR. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I, too, rise in support of this amendment, not just because of the message it sends or because of the three countries that it covers right now, but because a couple of years ago, and last year the State Department tried to get not only economic but military assistance for Mozambique, and I looked at the list on their support of the United States. They voted with us only 7.2 percent of the time, so if our State Department is successful in the future in getting military assistance for the Communist Government of Mozambique, maybe this legislation will help stop it once again.

I congratulate the gentleman on his amendment, and I urge every Member to vote for it.

MR. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

MR. SWINDALL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

MR. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There should be a price to pay for being opposed to the United States all the time. Ninety percent is virtually all the time.

You cannot accidentally vote with us more than 10 percent, so I think that not only does this prohibit the sale of

arms to countries that do not vote with us, even 10 percent of the time, but it sends a message to the rest of the world that we are watching, and we take these things seriously.

MR. SWINDALL. I would state to those Members who may be critical of this bill, because it does not go far enough, that it is important to at least set a standard.

I can assure the Members that in the future we will move to increase that standard, but first we need to place a standard, a minimal, and certainly 90 percent ought to be a minimal level; and it would potentially reach 16 countries.

COMPARISON OF THE 1986 VOTING RECORD OF THOSE COUNTRIES WHICH VOTED IN AGREEMENT WITH THE UNITED STATES ON LESS THAN 15 PERCENT OF THE PLENARY SESSION VOTES AND PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 1988 U.S. ECONOMIC AND MILITARY ASSISTANCE

[Dollars in thousands]

Country	1986 plenary votes, percent agreeing with United States ¹	Proposed fiscal year 1988		
		Total assistance	Military assistance ²	Develop- ment assistance ³
<i>Africa:</i>				
Angola	6.8	0	0	0
Benin	9.8	\$2,978	\$75	\$2,903
Burkina Faso	11.8	7,432	50	7,382
Burundi	14.2	2,140	140	2,000
Congo	12.3	680	40	640
Ethiopia	11.8	3,389	0	3,389
Gambia	11.1	6,408	40	6,348
Guinea	14.9	13,331	3,150	10,181
Madagascar	10.0	11,449	1,075	10,374
Mali	13.1	16,441	150	16,291
Mozambique	7.2	11,618	0	11,618
Nigeria	14.1	100	100	0
Seychelles	10.6	3,436	3,035	401
Tanzania	12.4	6,576	35	6,541
Uganda	13.6	7,669	100	7,569
Zambia	13.8	25,089	0	25,089
Zimbabwe	13.0	175	175	0
<i>American republics:</i>				
Cuba	6.8	0	0	0
Guyana	13.1	4,050	50	4,000
Nicaragua	9.3	0	0	0
<i>Near East and Asia:</i>				
Afghanistan	8.9	0	0	0
Algeria	7.4	100	100	0
Bahrain	13.6	0	0	0
Bhutan	14.4	0	0	0
Democratic Yemen	8.0	0	0	0
India	10.1	50,000	500	50,000
Indonesia	13.2	67,000	22,000	45,000
Iran	9.5	0	0	0
Iraq	8.8	0	0	0
Jordan	13.3	89,800	71,800	18,000
Kuwait	12.9	0	0	0
Laos	6.4	0	0	0
Lybia	6.2	0	0	0
Maldives	11.3	30	30	0
Qatar	12.3	0	0	0
Sri Lanka	14.5	16,950	160	16,790
Syria	7.9	0	0	0
United Arab Emirates	14.5	0	0	0
Vanuatu	14.2	0	0	0
Vietnam	6.4	0	0	0
Yemen Arab Republic	7.5	32,065	4,100	27,965
<i>Europe:</i>				
Albania	6.3	0	0	0
Cyprus	13.8	10,000	0	10,000
Hungary	12.8	0	0	0
Poland	12.0	0	0	0
Yugoslavia	13.1	100	100	0

¹ Data taken from the United States Department of State, "Report to the Congress on Voting Practices in the United Nations," Apr. 23, 1987.

² Data taken from the "Congressional Presentation for Security Assistance Programs: Fiscal Year 1988." Military aid includes IMET, FMS Credits and MAP.

³ Data taken from the Agency for International Development, "Congressional Presentation: Fiscal Year 1988." Development assistance includes Economic Support Fund, Education and Human Resources Development, Child Survival, Health, Population Planning, Agriculture, Rural Development and Nutrition, and Selected Development Activities. These figures do not include Public Law 480.

FOREIGN AID RECIPIENTS BITE U.S. HAND IN U.N.

(By Jeane Kirkpatrick)

We Americans like to think of ourselves as "world leaders," but from time to time we discover that almost no one chooses to follow us. The refusal of allies to join or support economic or military sanctions against Libya came as a shock to many. Even more graphic evidence of the limits of U.S. influence could be found in the recently released State Department report of votes in the last U.N. General Assembly.

Only 19 of the United Nations' 159 members voted on the same side as the United States even half the time. Most of the time most countries voted against the position we supported.

The State Department, legislatively required to prepare the report, has traditionally paid little attention to U.N. votes—believing that what happens there has little or no relation to the world outside. But, in fact, the U.N. is a microcosm of global politics and U.N. votes reflect the real decisions of real governments about whom to stand with and against.

Diplomats do not like such forced, public choices. They prefer to deal in ambiguous declarations. "It is not impossible," they say, "at some future time."

Sometimes, however, governments must make clear decisions in public view. Italy could not avoid responding—yes or no—to a U.S. request to land a plane carrying the *Achille Lauro* hijackers, nor to our request that they hold terrorist Abu Abbas for extradition.

NATO allies could not avoid responding to the U.S. request that they join in economic sanctions against Libya. Prime Minister Thatcher could not avoid granting or refusing the U.S. request to use British-stationed planes to attack Libya.

The French and Spanish governments could not avoid answering the U.S. request to overfly their countries. And so forth. But in relations among governments, such clear questions and unequivocal answers are relatively rare—except in the United Nations.

There, governments must vote on virtually all the subjects in the world. The need to make public choices in a global context forces them to decide month after month, year after year, where they stand and with whom they stand, whom they dare to offend and whom they must accommodate. U.N. votes register these decisions and priorities.

Reading the report, one readily understands why many in the State Department (especially the Africa Bureau) have resisted compiling votes and have urged a methodology that would obscure, rather than illuminate, how nations vote.

In fact, patterns of U.N. voting closely resemble what we already know—but would rather not think about—concerning relations among nations.

The United States most often votes with the other industrial democracies. Israel most often votes alongside the United States (some 91.5% of the time) and is closely followed by other Western allies: Britain (86.6), West Germany (84.4), France (82.7), Belgium (82.3), Italy (81.9) and so forth.

It is hardly a surprise that among NATO allies Greece least often votes with the United States (33.3%). Greece is also the only ally whose president publicly de-

nounces U.S. policy in Libya and Central America as similar to the continuing Soviet invasion, occupation and devastation of Afghanistan.

As agreement with the United States is greatest among the other industrial democracies, it is lowest among the Third World countries in the Soviet orbit.

In Africa, for example, the countries with sizable numbers of Soviet and Soviet-bloc military personnel are also those who least often agree with the United States—Ethiopia (9.3%), Benin (8.8), Libya (6.9), Mozambique (5.9), Algeria (5.1) and Angola (3.5).

Angola, which voted least often with the U.S., announced at about the same time as the release of the report that it would henceforth no longer even discuss problems with U.S. representatives. On the other hand, African countries who are generally closest to the U.S. and the West also register relatively high levels of agreement in U.N. votes: Ivory Coast (27.3%), Malawi (26.9), Liberia (23.7) and Zaire (23.1).

For the Americas and Asia, voting patterns also conform generally to what we know about the world. Canada and Grenada vote most often alongside the United States; Cuba and Nicaragua, least often. In Asia, Japan, Australia and New Zealand vote most often as we vote; South Yemen, Laos, Afghanistan, Vietnam and other Soviet client states, least often.

The most surprising aspect of the voting report is not what it tells us about the patterns of relations among nations, but what it reveals about the extent to which our views and values have become minority positions in the contemporary world, and the extent to which our government is willing to accept and support as "friends" countries who differ with us on virtually everything.

On more than 90 per cent of the votes, for example, India and Mozambique took a different position than the United States. Moreover, they disagreed with us on every "key" issue. Yet both receive substantial American economic assistance (Mozambique \$19.6 million last year, India \$155.7 million). And the heads of state of both were received at the White House by Ronald Reagan last year. Indeed, many countries that receive substantial amounts of U.S. aid voted opposite us on more than three-fourths of all votes, including issues of the greatest moral and political concern to Americans.

Sen. Robert Kasten (R. Wis.), author of the legislation requiring this report, commented that "we must therefore find ways" of securing greater support for our values and our interests from "nations that either depend on our defense umbrella, enjoy special trade advantage with the U.S. or successfully lobby for our aid dollars."

I agree. Progress toward this goal can be achieved. The recently concluded conference on African aid held under U.N. auspices indicates that some African countries are already turning away from the pro-Marxist, anti-U.S. "Third World" ideology, to more realistic and self-reliance strategies of development.

With the careful, clear-headed use of American resources, we can restore rather than dissipate U.S. influence and promote freedom and development in the process.

FOREIGN AID AND U.N. VOTING PATTERNS

[Dollars in thousands]

Country	U.S. economic/ military assistance, fiscal year 1985	U.N. Voting Record, 40th General Assembly. Percent coincidence with U.S. votes (Yes/ No)
African Bureau:		
Sudan	\$253,220	15.5
Somalia	104,869	16.3
Liberia	81,153	23.7
Kenya	78,449	16.7
Zaire	67,734	23.1
Zambia	50,000	14.9
Senegal	47,196	19.3
Zimbabwe	36,214	14.6
Niger	32,793	17.6
Mali	32,096	11.1
Mozambique	30,000	5.9
Cameroon	27,406	18.0
Malawi	26,579	26.9
Rwanda	21,667	17.4
Botswana	21,227	17.4
Chad	20,717	18.0
Madagascar	19,680	10.6
Ghana	17,041	13.2
Lesotho	16,204	16.0
Mauritania	15,463	16.1
Guinea	11,722	12.1
Burkina Faso	10,855	13.1
Swaziland	9,856	22.0
Sierra Leone	8,715	18.3
Uganda	7,946	13.2
Djibouti	7,576	14.3
Togo	7,307	19.0
Mauritius	7,000	22.1
Gambia	6,354	14.9
Burundi	6,035	15.9
Central African Republic	4,136	20.9
Ethiopia	3,909	9.3
Tanzania	3,278	11.3
Guinea-Bissau	3,004	12.2
Cap Verde	2,795	11.9
Seychelles	2,472	11.9
Benin	2,124	8.8
Gabon	1,931	19.7
Equatorial Guinea	1,071	21.2
Congo	1,000	11.3
Comoros	400	12.1
Ivory Coast	161	27.3
Additional regional funds	110,792	
Total	1,220,547	
Latin America/Caribbean:		
El Salvador	\$561,076	30.2
Honduras	282,571	29.8
Costa Rica	216,049	29.1
Dominican Republic	178,699	25.0
Jamaica	164,624	22.7
Guatemala	98,124	25.2
Panama	79,411	19.7
Peru	70,035	17.8
Ecuador	58,604	24.6
Haiti	55,021	23.8
Bolivia	44,135	18.5
Belize	24,730	37.8
Colombia	11,476	27.9
Grenada	11,191	71.7
Mexico	9,896	14.5
Paraguay	2,078	35.4
Brazil	750	16.0
Uruguay	100	18.1
Venezuela	96	19.0
Guyana	80	13.9
Barbados	69	20.3
St. Vincent	56	32.7
St. Lucia	48	26.2
Antigua	45	25.0
Bahamas	44	18.6
Suriname	42	16.2
Dominica	41	24.2
Trinidad and Tobago	39	17.9
St. Kitts-Nevis	26	50.0
Additional Regional Funds	253,410	
Total	2,122,566	
Asia/Near East/Europe:		
Israel	\$3,350,000	91.5
Egypt	2,479,883	15.3
Turkey	879,490	38.1
Pakistan	638,013	16.1
Greece	501,366	33.3
Spain	414,926	55.6
Philippines	269,676	22.3
Korea	231,943	—
Portugal	207,959	75.0
Bangladesh	198,874	16.1
Jordan	191,877	14.2
India	176,049	8.9
Morocco	150,096	5.9
Indonesia	147,020	14.3

FOREIGN AID AND U.N. VOTING PATTERNS—Continued

[Dollars in thousands]

Country	U.S. economic/ military assistance, fiscal year 1985	U.N. Voting Record, 40th General Assembly. Percent coincidence with U.S. votes (Yes/ No)
Thailand	140,310	22.4
Tunisia	96,577	13.9
Sri Lanka	65,121	16.8
Oman	60,155	13.6
Yemen	46,955	9.0
Nepal	21,791	18.0
Burma	20,669	17.1
Lebanon	19,480	13.1
Cyprus	15,000	11.6
Malaysia	4,981	16.3
Fiji	2,484	26.0
Micronesia	2,361	—
Maldives	1,522	12.5
Western Samoa	1,166	27.4
West Bank	1,373	—
Solomon Islands	982	48.1
Papua New Guinea	971	23.1
Gaza	679	—
Tonga	648	—
Afghanistan	543	6.2
Kiribati	227	—
Yugoslavia	96	11.9
Algeria	64	5.1
Singapore	50	23.6
Austria	49	40.0
Tuvalu	34	—
Fiji (Inland)	32	26.0
Iceland	22	—
Additional Regional Funds	49,334	62.4
Total	10,390,848	

Source: Agency for International Development.

CONGRESS SHOULD REVIEW ANTI-U.S. VOTES
(By Senator Bob Kasten)

This is the Year of Liberty, the year during which we rededicated the Statue in New York Harbor that for the past century has welcomed to our shores and to a new life the oppressed, impoverished citizens of the world.

In rededicating ourselves to the principles of liberty that make this nation great, we are also renewing our commitment as a nation blessed by prosperity to help those countries less fortunate than ourselves.

American largess is historic. It also is taken for granted. And while we should never as a nation turn our backs on those in need, we must seriously consider our priorities in giving aid to the world.

Consider this disturbing fact: the 159 member states of the United Nations voted against American interests in the General Assembly last year on average 80 per cent of the time.

That is the conclusion of the third annual "Kastan Report," the study of U.N. voting patterns done by the U.S. State Department in accordance with legislation I sponsored requiring these annual reports.

The report shows that once again Israel is our staunchest ally, siding with us on 91.5% of the votes before the General Assembly. A number of NATO allies—the United Kingdom, 86.6%; West Germany, 84.4%; France, 82.7%, up from 72% in 1984; Belgium, 82.3%; and Italy, 81.9%; all increased their support for the United States.

But, unfortunately, they were the exceptions to what is becoming a disturbing rule.

Most of the time, on most of the critical issues facing our nation, we stand almost alone in the United Nations.

According to the State Department analysis, the key issues before the General Assembly included positions taken by the United Nations on terrorism, the Soviet invasion and continued occupation of Cambo-

dia, the Arab-Israeli conflict, apartheid, human rights abuses in several countries, and efforts to delete instances of name-calling against various U.S. foreign policy positions.

It is a sad reality that we cannot even count on other NATO allies to support our positions with any consistency. Turkey and Greece, particularly, two countries which receive hundreds of millions of dollars in United States aid each year, voted consistently against us—Turkey 60% of the time and Greece 66% of the time.

Turkey refused to criticize human rights abuses in Iran and supported name-calling attacks against United States policy in the Middle East—both considered key votes by the State Department.

It should not be surprising that the strongest opposition to our position, in addition to Communist bloc nations in Eastern Europe, comes from the 21-member Arab group. It supported America on only 12.2% of the votes.

African nations, many of which look to America for the very survival of their people, gave us their support on only 15.1% of the votes.

There is a bright spot in the most recent "Kasten Report." Since our liberation of Grenada, that country has become an increasingly dependable friend in America at the United Nations. In 1983, Grenada opposed our position in the General Assembly more than 80% of the time. But in 1984, it supported us in 60% of the votes, and it has since raised its level of support to over 70%.

We are not attempting to buy votes with the aid we send to the needy nations of the world. But we do have the right to expect that if these nations aggressively seek our assistance, our money, and our protection, they in turn will support the positions that continue to keep our nation strong enough and vital enough to continue sending such assistance.

Yet, many of these nations are nowhere in sight when we need their support in the United Nations.

According to the most recent U.N. vote analysis, Egypt, a major recipient of United States foreign aid, opposed our positions a shocking 85% of the time. Even the Philippines supported us on only 22% of the General Assembly votes.

I urge all of my colleagues to carefully consider the pattern of voting by those nations who seek and receive our aid. In these times of cutting back we must place priorities not only on how our dollars are spent, but where.

The American people expect no less of the elected representatives.

U.N. VOTING RECORD
**1985 U.N. General Assembly Fortieth
Session)**

**SUPPORT OF U.S. POLICY NOT MATCHED BY
FOREIGN AID DOLLARS**

The Selous Foundation's first annual United Nations Voting Record is an examination of the votes and patterns of the U.N.'s 159 member-nations. This record is based upon data from the fortieth session of the United Nations General Assembly in 1985.

The purpose of this record is to graphically illustrate the enormity of U.S. foreign aid granted to nations which do not support the U.S. in the U.N.

Ten resolutions have been selected from the General Assembly to demonstrate the respective support or hostility of a given country towards Western democratic values.

These 10 key resolutions are the most representative of Western interests and values, and are innumerable and explained herein.

The respective support of each country is summarized with a Selous rating. This rating indicates the percentage of incidence, based on the 10 key resolutions, by which these nations cast a vote in agreement with the U.S. position. Finally, the amounts of foreign aid the U.S. gave to these countries in 1985 is listed.

In the statistical analysis of the votes recorded on the 10 key resolutions, there are some important findings and conclusions.

When the ratings for each country regardless of the amount of U.S. foreign aid received are combined and averaged, the U.N. member-nations as a whole supported the U.S. position only 39.15% of the time. Support of the 99 nations to which the U.S. distributed over 13 billion dollars in foreign aid averaged 40.18%. The remaining 59 nations not receiving economic aid supported the U.S. position an average of 37.37% of the time.

Although it is impossible to determine just how much differently the aided nations would have voted had they not been recipients of U.S. aid, the figure of 40.18% support is nonetheless a rather weak one and significantly different from either the U.N. as a whole (39.15%) or those nations receiving no U.S. foreign aid (37.37%).

It can be reasonably concluded, therefore, that the billions of dollars in U.S. foreign aid annually distributed to these nations has not been a very effective investment in gaining their respect for the Western democratic values which the U.S. represents. In fact, of the 29 U.N. member-nations that did not cast even a single vote in support of the U.S. position on any of the 10 key resolutions, 11 were given a combined total of over \$297 million in U.S. foreign aid in 1985 alone.

The United Nations Voting Record also provides three indices: the NATO Index, the Warsaw Pact Index and the Southern African Front States Index.

1. NATO comprising nations of the Western Alliance supported the U.S. position 84.93% of the time. And, five nations received slightly over 2 billion dollars in U.S. foreign aid.

2. The Warsaw Pact nations comprising the Soviet Alliance understandably supported the U.S. position 1.44% of the time and received no U.S. foreign aid, although many Warsaw nations are accorded Most Favored Nation (MFN) status by the U.S. Congress.

3. The Southern African Front Line States, regionally dependent on the economic infrastructure of South Africa, supported the U.S. position only 26.43% of the time, while 4 nations in this group received \$117 million in U.S. foreign aid.

U.N. IDEALS UNREALIZED

1985 marked the fortieth anniversary of the signing by many nations of the U.N. Charter, the U.N.'s founding document of guidelines and principles. The letter and spirit of the Charter embodies three of the most important values so often violated today: the right of free peoples to determine their own forms of government unobstructed from outside interference; the principle of non-aggression by one nation toward another; and a strict adherence by all governments to vigilantly guard the human rights of their people.

The grand ideals the U.N. once personified no longer dominate this international body. Resolutions condemning Communist

expansionism and its inherent institutionalized human rights abuses are a rare occurrence in the U.N. When such resolutions do come before the General Assembly, they are usually offset by a number of resolutions condemning "American Imperialism".

The U.S. contributes over one quarter of the U.N.'s annual budget, or one billion dollars. Unfortunately, the U.N. majority making the decisions in the General Assembly, where the U.S. has only one vote, does not pay the bills. Should the U.S. be giving so many of our tax dollars to an organization that, more often than not, undermines the very ideals for which it once stood?

If the U.N. is to have any constructive meaning in the future, it must be brought back to its original purpose. As a major underwriter, the U.S. should and must utilize its influence.

NATO INDEX

Belgium	86	0
Canada	50	0
Denmark	83	0
France	86	0
Greece	57	\$501,366,000
Iceland	83	22,000
Italy	100	0
Luxembourg	100	0
Netherlands	100	0
Norway	83	0
Portugal	100	207,959,000
Spain	83	414,926,000
Turkey	63	879,490,000
United Kingdom	100	0
West Germany (FRG)	100	0
Group average (percent)	84.93	
Total U.S. foreign aid	2,003,763,000	

WARSAW PACT INDEX

Byelorussia	0	0
Bulgaria	0	0
Czechoslovakia	0	0
East Germany (GDR)	0	0
Hungary	0	0
Poland	0	0
Romania	13	0
Ukraine	0	0
USSR	0	0
Group average (percent)	1.44	
Total U.S. foreign aid	0	

SOUTHERN AFRICAN FRONT LINE STATES INDEX

Angola	0	0
Botswana	40	\$21,227,000
Lesotho	44	16,204,000
Mozambique	0	30,000,000
Swaziland	43	0
Zambia	33	50,000,000
Zimbabwe	25	0
Group average (percent)	26.43	
Total U.S. foreign aid	117,431,000	

RESOLUTIONS AND EXPLANATIONS

1. Vietnamese intervention in Kampuchea (Cambodia) Res. 40/7

The Vietnamese are called to immediately withdraw all troops from Kampuchea. It also states that Vietnam and all other countries are to respect the political and territorial integrity of Kampuchea. The U.S. voted "for" the resolution.

2. Soviet troops in Afghanistan Res. 40/12.

This resolution demands the withdrawal of all "foreign troops" from Afghanistan. It also urges the "interventionists" to allow the indigenous people of Afghanistan to decide its political system. The U.S. voted "for" the resolution.

3. Nuclear freeze Res. 40/90

All nations possessing nuclear weapons technology are to stop developing more sophisticated and advanced weapons systems.

The U.S. was the only nation to cast a vote "against" the resolution.

4. Chemical and bacteriological weapons Res. 40/92C

This resolution prohibits the use, production, and stockpiling of these weapons. The U.S. voted "for" the resolution.

5. General and complete disarmament Res. 40/94H

This resolution calls for all nations possessing nuclear weapons technology to freeze their present nuclear arsenals as a first step towards weapons reduction and ultimately a total elimination of all nuclear weapons. The U.S. voted "against" the resolution.

6. Trade embargo against Nicaragua Res. 40/188

This resolution condemns the continuing U.S. trade embargo against Nicaragua and urges the U.S. to resume trade. The U.S. voted "against" the resolution.

7. Soviet human rights violations in Afghanistan Res. 40/137

This resolution objects to the horrifying human rights violations as a consequence of the Soviet invasion, occupation, and aggression. It expresses particular concern over the military repression being conducted among the civilian population and the military operations that are primarily targeted on villages and agricultural production. The U.S. voted "for" the resolution.

8. Ideologies of terror Res. 40/148

This resolution condemns Nazi, Fascist and neo-Fascist activities as the ideologies that practice terror on the basis of racial intolerance and hatred of certain social groups. This resolution never mentions Communism as an ideology of terror and thus received the full support of all Communist member-nations. The U.S. voted "against" the resolution.

9. The Condemnation of South Africa Res. 40/52

This resolution condemns the South Africa government. It also condemns all multi-national firms doing business in South Africa. Unlike the Communist countries of the world, South Africa did not have a vote on this resolution; they were expelled from the General Assembly in 1974. The U.S. voted "against" the resolution.

10. Third World economic redistribution Res. 40/100

As an effort to introduce massive grants from Western nations this resolution proposes to redistribute economic wealth to Third World countries. The U.S. voted "against" the resolution.

KEY TO U.N. VOTING RECORD

The Selous rating is the percentage of voting coincidence by a U.N. General Assembly member-nation in accordance with the United States' position on 10 selected key votes. Only yes (+)/no (-) votes are tabulated while abstentions and absences or zeros (0) are excluded from calculation.

+ denotes a vote in agreement with the U.S. position.

- denotes a vote opposed to the U.S. position.

0 indicates that the country abstained, was absent or chose not to participate in the vote.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Per-
cent US foreign aid
received in
1985

Afghanistan	- - -	0	\$543,000
Albania	- + 0 0 0 + 0 -	30	
Algeria	0 0 - 0 - 0 -	0	64,000
Angola	- - - 0 -	0	
Antigua and Barbuda	+ + - + - 0 + 0 -	50	45,000
Argentina	+ + - + - + + -	40	
Australia	+ + 0 + 0 - + 0 -	67	
Austria	+ + - + - + + 0	50	49,000
Bahamas	+ + - + - 0 0 -	38	44,000
Bahrain	+ + - 0 - 0 0 -	29	
Bangladesh	+ + - + - + + -	44	198,874,000
Barbados	+ + - + - 0 + 0 -	50	69,000
Belgium	+ + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 -	86	
Belize	+ + 0 0 0 + 0 0 -	75	24,730,000
Benin	0 0 - 0 -	0	2,124,000
Bhutan	+ + - + - 0 0 -	67	
Bolivia	+ + - + - 0 -	33	44,135,000
Botswana	+ + - + - + + -	40	21,227,000
Brazil	+ + - + - + + -	40	
Brunel Darussalam	+ + - + - 0 + -	44	
Bulgaria	-	0	
Burkina Faso	+ + - + - 0 -	33	10,855,000
Burma	+ + - + - 0 -	33	20,669,000
Burundi	+ + - + - 0 -	33	6,035,000
Byelorussia	-	0	
Cameroon	+ + - + - 0 -	33	27,406,000
Canada	+ + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 -	50	
Cape Verde	0 0 - + - 0 -	14	2,795,000
Central African Republic	+ + - + - 0 0 -	38	4,136,000
Chad	+ + - + - 0 + -	44	20,717,000
Chile	+ + - + - 0 + -	44	
China	+ + 0 + 0 - + -	50	
Colombia	+ + - + - + -	40	11,476,000
Comoros	+ + - + - + + -	40	400,000
Congo	- 0 - 0 - 0 -	0	1,000,000
Costa Rica	+ + 0 0 0 + -	43	216,049,000
Cuba	-	0	
Cyprus	0 0 - 0 - 0 -	0	15,000,000
Czechoslovakia	-	0	
Denmark	+ + 0 + + - + 0 0 -	83	
Djibouti	+ + - + - 0 + -	44	7,576,000
Dominica	+ + 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	100	41,000
Dominican Republic	+ + - + - + + -	40	178,699,000
Ecuador	+ + - + - 0 + -	38	58,504,000
Egypt	+ + - + - 0 + -	44	2,479,883,000
El Salvador	+ + - + - 0 + -	50	561,076,000
Equatorial Guinea	+ + - + - 0 + -	44	1,071,000
Ethiopia	- 0 -	0	3,909,000
Fiji	+ + - + - 0 + -	44	2,484,000
Finland	0 0 - + - 0 -	20	
France	+ + 0 + + - + 0 + 0 -	86	
Gabon	+ + 0 0 0 + -	44	1,931,000
Germany, East (GDR)	-	0	57
Germany, West (FRG)	+ + 0 + + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0	100	
Ghana	+ + - + - 0 -	33	17,041,000
Greece	+ + - + - + 0 0 0 0	67	501,366,000
Grenada	+ + - 0 + + 0 0 0 0	11,191,000	
Guatemala	+ + - + - 0 0 -	38	98,124,000
Guinea	+ + - + - 0 0 -	33	11,722,000
Guinea-Bissau	0 0 - + - 0 -	14	3,004,000
Guyana	0 + - + - 0 -	25	80,000
Haiti	+ + - + - 0 -	33	55,021,000
Honduras	+ + - + - 0 + -	44	282,571,000
Hungary	-	0	
Iceland	+ + 0 + + - + 0 0 0	83	22,000
India	0 0 - 0 -	0	176,049,000
Indonesia	+ + - + - 0 -	33	147,020,000
Iran	0 + - + - 0 -	25	
Iraq	0 0 - 0 -	0	
Ireland	+ + 0 + + 0 + 0 + 0 0	80	
Israel	+ + 0 + + + + + 0 0	100	3,350,000,000
Italy	+ + 0 + + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0	100	
Ivory Coast	+ + 0 + + 0 + 0 + 0 -	50	
Jamaica	+ + 0 + 0 0 + 0 + 0 -	67	
Japan	+ + 0 + + 0 + 0 0 0 0	100	
Jordan	+ + - 0 + - 0 -	38	191,877,000
Kampuchea (Cambodia)	+ + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 -	67	
Kenya	+ + - + - + + -	40	78,449,000
Kuwait	+ + - 0 0 0 -	29	
Lao	-	0	
Lebanon	0 + - 0 + 0 0 -	17	19,480,000
Lesotho	+ + - + - + - 0 -	44	16,204,000
Liberia	+ + - + - 0 -	33	81,148,000
Libya	-	0	
Luxembourg	+ + 0 + + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0	100	
Madagascar	0 - 0 - 0 -	0	19,680,000
Malawi	0 + - + - 0 + -	50	26,979,000
Malaysia	+ + - + - 0 + -	44	4,981,000
Maldives	+ + - + - 0 -	38	1,522,000
Mali	+ 0 - + - 0 -	25	32,096,000
Malta	+ + - + - 0 -	38	
Mauritania	+ + - + - 0 0 0 -	43	15,463,000
Mauritius	+ + - + - 0 0 -	38	7,000,000
Mexico	0 + - 0 -	25	9,896,000
Mongolia	-	0	
Morocco	+ + - + - 0 0 + -	50	150,096,000
Mozambique	0 0 - 0 -	0	30,000,000
Nepal	+ + - + - 0 0 -	38	21,791,000
Netherlands	+ + 0 + + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0	100	
New Zealand	+ + 0 + + 0 0 + 0 + 0	67	
Nicaragua	- 0 - 0 -	0	
Niger	+ + - + - 0 + -	44	
Nigeria	+ + - + - 0 -	33	32,793,000

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Percent	US foreign aid received in 1985
Norway	++	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	83			
Oman	++	-	0	+	0	-	0	-	43	60,155,000		
Pakistan	++	-	+	0	+	-	-	-	44	638,013,000		
Panama	++	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	40	79,411,000		
Papua New Guinea	++	-	+	+	0	-	-	-	44	971,000		
Paraguay	++	0	+	0	+	0	0	100		2,078,000		
Peru	++	-	+	+	0	-	-	-	40	70,035,000		
Philippines	++	-	+	0	+	-	-	-	44	269,576,000		
Poland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0			
Portugal	++	0	+	0	+	0	+	0	100	207,959,000		
Qatar	++	-	0	-	0	-	-	-	25			
Romania	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	13			
Rwanda	++	-	+	0	+	-	-	-	44	21,667,000		
Saint Lucia	++	-	+	0	+	-	-	-	50	48,000		
Saint Vincent	++	-	+	0	+	-	0	0	57	56,000		
Samoa	++	-	+	0	+	-	-	-	50			
Sao Tome and Principe	0	0	-	0	0	-	-	-	17			
Saudi Arabia	++	-	0	-	0	-	-	-	38			
Senegal	++	-	+	0	+	-	-	-	44	47,196,000		
Seychelles	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	24,472,000			
Sierra Leone	++	-	+	0	+	-	-	-	56	8,715,000		
Singapore	++	-	+	0	+	-	-	-	50	50,000		
Solomon Islands	++	-	+	0	0	-	0	0	50	982,000		
Somalia	++	-	+	0	+	-	-	-	44	104,869,000		
Spain	++	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	83	414,926,000		
Sri Lanka	++	-	+	0	-	-	-	-	33	65,121,000		
St. Christopher	++	-	+	0	+	0	0	0	71	26,000		
Sudan	++	-	+	0	+	-	-	-	44	253,220,000		
Suriname	++	-	+	0	-	-	-	-	33	42,000		
Swaziland	++	-	+	0	0	-	0	0	43			
Sweden	++	-	+	+	+	-	0	0	50			
Syria	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0			
Tanzania	0	+	-	0	0	-	0	0	29	3,278,000		
Thailand	++	-	0	+	0	-	-	-	50	140,310,000		
Togo	++	-	0	+	-	-	-	-	44	7,307,000		
Trinidad and Tobago	++	-	+	0	-	-	-	-	33	39,000		
Tunisia	++	-	+	0	-	-	-	-	33	96,577,000		
Turkey	++	-	+	0	-	-	-	-	63	879,490,000		
Uganda	++	0	+	0	+	-	-	-	14	7,946,000		
Ukraine	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0			
United Arab Emirates	++	-	0	-	0	-	-	-	25			
United Kingdom	++	0	+	0	+	0	+	0	100			
U.S.S.R.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0			
Uruguay	++	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	40	100,000		
Vanuatu	0	+	-	0	-	-	-	-	25			
Venezuela	++	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	40	96,000		
Vietnam	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0			
Yugoslavia	++	-	0	-	0	-	-	-	25	96,000		
Zaire	++	-	+	0	0	-	-	-	38	67,734,000		
Zambia	++	-	+	0	-	-	-	-	33	50,000,000		
Zimbabwe	0	+	-	-	0	-	-	-	25			
Yemen Arab Republic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0			
North	0	0	-	0	-	0	-	-	0	46,955,000		
Yemen, South (PDR)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0			

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SWINDALL

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey to the amendment offered by Mr. SWINDALL: at the end of subsection (a), strike the period and add the following: "unless the President determines, and reports to the Congress, that national security or humanitarian reasons justify furnishing such assistance to that country."

At the end of the amendment, strike the period and add the following: "and

"(3) With respect to such assistance for each fiscal year thereafter, the most recent report shall be deemed to be the last such report submitted before that fiscal year begins."

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment to 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 share the deep concern of the gentleman from Georgia over the lack of solidarity expressed by our allies in U.N. voting practices.

In the Middle East, except Israel, which is our most reliable friend, a number of countries including Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and Kuwait have seldom backed United States positions more than 15 percent of the time.

Clearly, a U.N. scorecard is a useful barometer in determining friendship with the United States. It should not be the last word.

My amendment provides the President the flexibility to waive the ban on funding to a country, if that country's voting practice falls below the 10 percent of support as envisioned by the Swindall amendment.

The waiver would be triggered if the President determines in reports to the Congress that national security or humanitarian reasons justify assistance to that country.

I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations, and a real leader in the area of U.N. issues, for the gentleman's support and for his leadership throughout the years on behalf of these issues.

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I share the gentleman's concerns regarding the adverse foreign policy implications of countries consistently voting against the United States at the United Nations. I agree that U.N. voting patterns should be an important factor in dispensing military assistance to these countries, but not the sole consideration.

Behavior at the U.N. is but one dimension of a country's relations with the United States. Economic, strategic, and political factors are also extremely important. In addition, many issues at the U.N. are resolved by consensus in which countries with low scores on recorded votes may have been instrumental in supporting our position.

The amendment is too rigid and may jeopardize our ability to improve relations with certain countries, as well as place excessive burdens on existing relations with others. I believe the substitute is a more prudent way of emphasizing the importance of U.N. voting without placing undue constraints on the ability of the President to conduct foreign policy.

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

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

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I want to observe that we accept the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey, and we commend the gentleman from New Jersey for offering the amendment.

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

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

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

I accept the gentleman's amendment. I think that it is an important part of making certain that the President of the United States still controls foreign policy in this country; and for that reason, I accept the gentleman's amendment as a statement to that effect.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. SWINDALL].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. SWINDALL], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DORGAN OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota: Page 7, line 11, strike out "\$1,033,716,000" both places it appears and insert in lieu thereof "\$950,000,000".

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I would like to explain what this amendment is about. It is about the grant Military Assistance Program called MAP.

The MAP Program surely has to be one of the fastest-growing areas of Federal expenditure in the U.S. budget. It has increased by 840 percent since 1981.

I want to restate that. Here is a program that has increased by 840 percent in the last 7 years.

At exactly the same time that the Military Assistance Program is increasing by 840 percent, Food for Peace has decreased 20 percent over this same 7-year period.

Something is out of whack in our spending priorities. Back in the 1970's the MAP Program, which was born in the early days of the cold war to provide special security assistance to certain areas that needed it, back in the mid-1970's Congress indicated it intended to terminate this program. Then we had about five countries getting \$80 million worth of assistance from the MAP Program.

We have not terminated it. Now we have 40 countries that get nearly \$1 billion from the MAP Program.

What do we do about something like that? We have got folks sitting downstairs here in this building this afternoon trying to deal with the budget crisis. Meanwhile, we have a bill on the floor here that authorizes certain

expenditures, and included in that bill is the MAP account which has increased 840 percent in 7 years, and some Members will stand up and say, we do not want you to touch that, it injures the balance of this bill.

My proposal freezes the MAP funds at last year's level; it is a \$83-million decrease to \$950 million.

□ 1430

The question here, Mr. Chairman, is can we freeze a program or can we not, not can we kill a program; clearly, Congress at one point said it wanted to terminate this program, but I was on the floor of the House 4 years ago trying to cut some money from this MAP Program. At that point it was around \$500 million. Now it is projected in this bill to be over a billion dollars, so we are not killing anything.

The question is can we freeze it?

Our priorities are completely out of whack. We know this is not what the world needs. The world out there in countries that are less developed, countries that need our assistance, need food. They need medicine. They need education. They do not need an 840-percent increase in MAP, the Military Assistance Program Fund. It is crazy. It is just nuts.

Are we going to stand up and take a look at accounts like this in the budget and say that we are not prepared to authorize these kinds of increases? Are we prepared to do that? I hope so.

We lost by one vote a few years ago in an attempt to freeze this program account, one vote on the floor of the House.

I offer this freeze amendment on behalf of myself and my colleagues, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. LEACH, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. DOWNEY, and Mr. PENNY.

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

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Vermont.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to join my colleague in this amendment. I realize that the Foreign Affairs Committee has been given an extremely difficult task in the formulation of the authorization bill for fiscal years 1988 and 1989. The committee is in the unenviable position of having to balance the pressure of the administration's demands for greater foreign assistance funding against the constraints of the House budget resolution. I compliment the committee on their tenacity in the struggle to formulate an authorization bill.

However, I must take issue with the 8-percent increase recommended by the committee for the MAP Program.

Three years ago, my colleague, the gentleman from North Dakota, and I attempted to freeze the MAP account authorization at existing levels—\$423

million. We fell one vote shy of success. Today, we are faced with a MAP authorization more than double that amount—over \$1 billion.

Knowing the seriousness of our current fiscal dilemma, I feel it is irresponsible to allow more growth in the MAP account.

MAP was never intended to be the primary component of our security assistance program. The Foreign Military Sales Program provides the bulk of that assistance in the form of loans. MAP was designed to provide emergency military grant aid to indigent nations faced with a sudden security threat. Surely, the world situation has not degenerated so severely since 1981 as to warrant almost a thousand percent increase in such assistance.

Let's put MAP funding in perspective for a moment. Since 1981, the military aid component of U.S. foreign aid has increased by 80 percent. By contrast, bilateral development aid has increased by only half that amount. And food aid has actually decreased by 20 percent over the past 7 years. Yet, if our goal of our foreign aid programs is really to promote international security and development, as the title of this bill indicates, then we should be relying more on development assistance and less on military solutions.

Mr. Chairman, we are all aware of the severity of our current Federal deficit and the resulting fiscal crisis. Even as we speak, representatives of the House, the Senate and the administration are struggling to come up with an acceptable way to cut Federal spending.

I believe we have no business undermining the progress of those efforts by allowing an increase in MAP above last year's level.

I just want to join him in this amendment. If my memory is correct, I think the gentleman has already stated that this program during a period of time when we have had very little inflation, from 1981 until this present, has gone from \$110 million up to over a billion dollars. When the gentleman and I offered a similar amendment 3 years ago, MAP was at \$423 million, and now it has increased during a period of time when we had about 15 percent inflation. It has doubled, over 100 percent.

It is also my understanding that, fortunately, the appropriations level is still below this, so we really are just making sure that we keep the appropriation process down at a lower level.

Now, there have been a couple of questions asked of me, and I would like the gentleman to clear them up for me.

The question has been asked of me, does this affect Egypt or Israel in any way? Would the gentleman answer that for me?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. The answer is this has no effect on aid to

Israel and Egypt. That is not what the MAP Program is about. It will not affect Israel. It will not affect Egypt.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Also there has been concern raised by some that it might interfere with our ability to compliance with our base agreements. It is my understanding that there is a best efforts requirement in the base agreements and they do not have to have an open ticket, so to speak, to renegotiate those. There are other areas that aid can be utilized in those agreements, other than the MAP Program. Is that correct?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. That is exactly the case. In fact, I have the language with me for some of the base agreements in Spain, Turkey, Greece, Portugal, and the Philippines. This amendment need not impair or impact those base agreements.

In fact, the authorization bill that comes to us today has a \$400-million contingency account which I am tempted to deal with, but will not. The base agreements are not going to be affected by what we are trying to do to freeze this MAP Program, especially in view of this special \$400 million base rights account on title XII.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment, of course, is across the board for this program; but just in reference to taking a microcosm problem, the Arms Control and Foreign Policy Caucus last week issued a report that indicated that by a 3-to-1 margin, assistance to El Salvador is now military, as contrasted with economic assistance.

Speaking this morning on the Senate side of this building was a Lutheran bishop from El Salvador, Bishop Gomaz, who has been jailed in that country by the right, who serves in refugee camps. Many people are there because of leftist insurrection. He says that increasingly in that country not only is the war not being won with this kind of assistance, but America is being perceived as a country supplying aid to curtail life, rather than to expand life.

I think we have here truly an issue of priorities, and whether we want to continue down this route of ever escalating military assistance when what the world is crying out for is for food and shelter and the types of things that can win the hearts and minds of people, not to end their lives.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very modest amendment that should be supported, and I congratulate the gentleman for bringing it to this body.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Well, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Let me just point out that some of the countries, for example among the 40 countries projected for MAP funds are Haiti and Zaire. I was recently in Haiti. Haiti does not need military assistance from the United States. Haiti is desperately poor. It needs education. It needs food. It needs health care. It needs democracy. That is what it needs from this country. I mean, it needs a million dollars in military support like California needs medflies. Haiti does not need that sort of thing. Haiti needs our help in the form of the right kinds of foreign aid that this country can provide. Our grain bins are bulging. It needs food. We can provide help and education.

The gentleman from Iowa is exactly right about Central America, too. Our priorities are out of whack. And how do we put them back on track? We pass this amendment to freeze this account and say to the House of Representatives, "We insist that we get our foreign aid priorities back in order."

It is crazy to have an 800-percent increase in MAP funds and a 10- to 20-percent cut in Food for Peace and that is what has happened in the last 7 years. I hope the House of Representatives will pass what is a modest amendment, but certainly a necessary one.

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

Mr. Chairman, first let me say to my friend, the gentleman from North Dakota, that I can certainly appreciate some of the concerns that prompt him and his colleagues to offer this amendment. I share some of his views about the very rapid increase in the Military Assistance program, but nonetheless, I am constrained to oppose the amendment for several reasons.

First of all, the committee has already cut the executive branch request by over \$300 million. Now, that is about a 25-percent reduction.

Now, we have got a very practical problem here. We are trying to enact a bill, and in order to enact that bill we are going to have to have the support certainly of the President and his administration. They are already unhappy with the fact that we have cut so sharply into the Military Assistance Program recommendation that they have made so that is the first reason. The committee has already cut about 25 percent from the executive branch request.

Now, secondly, the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota is kind of an across-the-board amendment. It does not say where these cuts are to be made. The committee mark has already tried to ex-

amine the Executive request in view of the competing priorities and claims of the several countries, and we have come up, we think, with a difficult judgment, but nonetheless sensible cuts in view of the priorities and challenges that confront nations around the world; so we do not think it is wise then to have a shotgun approach to reduce the Military Assistance Program.

The third point I would make in opposition to the amendment is simply this. If we assume, and I think it is realistic to assume, that the executive branch is going to protect the base rights facilities because of the importance of those countries to our national security, then the impact of the Dorgan amendment would be to make a 50-percent cut in the grant military assistance to the countries in Central America, and it would mean an 80-percent cut in the military assistance to the countries in the Middle East.

In other words, you would have very drastic reductions in Central America, which we all recognize to be critical at the present time, as well as the Middle East.

Moreover, this kind of an amendment would eliminate all grant military assistance to 18 recipient countries in Africa and Asia.

So while I fully appreciate the reasons that the gentleman from North Dakota has put forward his amendment and have some sympathy for that, I really think that this would be a very, very sharp reduction in the Military Assistance Program and would cause great damage to the national security interests of the United States.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, are we on a 10 and 10-minute time limitation here, or are we under the 5-minute rule?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The Committee is proceeding under the 5-minute rule.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that I concur with the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the European Middle East Subcommittee. This amendment is ill conceived and very little work had gone into it, evidently, because it does cut across the board. It cuts base rights treaties that we have with other countries. We cannot do that, any more than we can deal with the next amendment that is coming up; so I will just concur with the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I have listened to some of the debate and I have been watching debates on the cuts and the fervor for cuts in the House on every bill that comes before us. Every time it comes before us, Members come to me and they say, "Traficant, how are you going to put the deficit crisis in America in order if you are not willing to vote for cuts?"

Well, listen to the types of cuts that you have brought to me and other Members. You have brought cuts that deal with education, Pell grants, revenue sharing, vocational education, worker training, and pension programs.

You have brought so many cuts that deal with people programs that you have made it almost impossible for anybody with priorities like mine to make a cut; so today you are having the other side of the issue. Those that want to be fiscally responsible talk about making some cuts.

I think where Congress should be looking is at NATO and the tremendous amount of money we spend to protect NATO and other countries.

Second of all, foreign aid, which definitely makes a whole lot of sense that we should be looking at, and certain programs that benefit every country except America.

Let us talk about the Military Assistance Program and let us talk about foreign aid, which has risen dramatically since 1980 to 1987, over 40 percent, where domestic programs have been cut more than 21 percent, and you are going to come back and say, "Traficant, how can you justify revenue sharing? This is pork barrel."

I say the pork barrel that has got to be cut is the pork barrel we are dealing with right now.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Dorgan amendment, and it is not enough. I have one that will follow it. His is about 10 percent, which is really a freeze. I am saying a freeze is not enough. Let us start cutting some real dollars. Mine will be 20 percent. It will cut \$1.7 billion in the next 2 years and it will still leave with my cuts over \$21 billion for foreign aid.

Let us start talking about some charity at home here, folks. We have a group that is meeting on the deficit right now. They are talking about throwing out COLA's. They are talking about going along with the President. He got his way last year. He wanted to eliminate Federal revenue sharing, and he did. Now he wants to eliminate vocational education. Is that next?

He wants to eliminate and cut drastically the Pell grants. Is that next?

He wants to get rid of the Appalachian Regional Commission. Is that next?

He wants to throw out urban development action grants. Is that going to be next?

I will tell you this. If that is going to be next, to the guy who said that, what should be first is right here, and if you want my vote in any of those domestic programs, I want to see on the record where you are going to vote on this.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of my colleague Mr. DORGAN's amendment to freeze the Military Assistance Program at fiscal year 1987 funding levels. Mr. Chairman, the MAP program has expended at an incredible rate over the past 6 years. The more than \$1 billion included in this bill for MAP would represent an 840 percent increase in MAP funding since 1981.

The expansion of the MAP program and other military assistance programs has been paid for by cutting back on development assistance. In the same 6 years that MAP increased eightfold, development assistance experienced a 16-percent cut in funding.

This cannot be allowed to continue. We must start to bring our foreign aid program back into balance. The American public would not support large increases in foreign military grants at the expense of programs to feed the hungry, to prevent illness, to promote food production, to provide basic education in developing countries. It is time that we put an end to this transfer for funding and put together a foreign aid program which is more balanced, more sensible, and more humanitarian. Freezing the MAP program would be an intelligent first step in this direction.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Dorgan amendment.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LELAND. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, let me clear up a point raised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and also, I believe, by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON]. Our amendment is not an across-the-board cut. I repeat, it is not an across-the-board cut.

This is a freeze which puts a cap on the amount of money that can be spent but protects the President's flexibility in determining where it can be spent.

I just want that to be understood. The allegation that it is an across-the-board cut that will somehow be detrimental to this country or that country, or this account, or that account, is wrong.

The second point I want to make is on the base rights question. The last time this was debated on this floor we

were absolutely smothered by people who talked in a priesthood language that I do not understand about foreign aid and accounts, and bills, and they talked about all these base rights and obligations.

The fact is they have put \$400 million in this bill as a contingency amount to deal with their base rights problems if they have some specific base rights problems. But the base rights that have been negotiated themselves say, and I have the language but I will not read it, but as to Spain, Turkey, Greece, the Philippines, Portugal, it does not mandate a fixed amount. It talks about "best efforts." So the base rights argument, with all due respect, is a bogus argument.

The question is are we willing to do a modest amount of cutting from the recommendations brought to the floor on the MAP. They suggest an 8-percent increase. They say that is reasonable because the administration suggested a much larger increase.

The fact is that all the programs we are asked to cut on the domestic side of the budget are tough cuts, but most of us are willing to vote on them. I do not think we should stand here and say that we support another increase in the MAP Program, which was supposed to have been terminated in the late 1970's, to a level over \$1 billion with military money going to countries like Haiti and Zaire, and the list goes on for 40 countries. It is wrong. What we are trying to do is right and I hope the Members will support it.

Mr. LELAND. Reclaiming my time, I will say the gentleman is correct. His approach is a moderate one, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] just about say it all on this issue, but I would like to add just a couple of words if I might with regard to the entire foreign aid bill. There has been action by the committee already in cutting \$600 million below the administration's request.

The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], the gentleman who offered the amendment, was making the point that we are not doing enough for economic assistance.

It is true that we are not doing nearly as much as what the President requested. Last year we spent \$2.491 billion on economic assistance, the President asked for \$2.6 billion in economic assistance, and the committee bill is \$2.5-plus billion. So we are actually spending more than last year on economic assistance even though it is less than what the administration has requested.

I would point out also as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] did a moment ago that much of the cut, in

fact one-half of the cut we made in this entire bill comes from military assistance. We have cut \$300 million from what the President had requested.

I think it is very important, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] pointed out, to look at the base rights countries and to examine what the effect of this amendment would have on them. We have all been hearing in the last few weeks about the problems with Spain, problems in Greece, and we know about problems in the Philippines with our bases and while there are reasons for opposition to our bases in all those countries not directly related to monetary matters, certainly those are matters that are taken into consideration when decisions are made both directly and indirectly. Most of those countries need the assistance and, second, they do not need the kind of ammunition this gives to their opponents in their being able to say, "See, the Americans made a deal but you can't trust them. They are not carrying it out."

So I would hope that my colleagues would turn down this amendment with a solid vote.

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

Mr. Chairman, the Military Grant Program has been exempted from deficit reduction efforts over the last several years while many other accounts in the Federal budget have been subjected to deep reductions. This part of the Federal budget has grown almost 10 times in the last 7 years, almost a tenfold increase in military grants at a time when we have been telling other aspects of the Federal budget that their reductions were necessary.

This year alone our budget resolution called for a 4-percent reduction in foreign aid and yet the bill we have before us today pegs a 3-percent increase for the foreign aid account.

The least we can do to try and bring this bill back within the budget resolution is to adopt this amendment which would freeze the military grant programs.

In 1980 there were only five countries that received military grants. That number has grown now to 40 countries. We used to give out this money only if those countries could not afford to pay for that military equipment. Now we give the money out indiscriminately. We give the money to countries whether they can afford to pay for these military items or not. We give them this assistance whether they can afford it or not.

But more to the point, even those countries that cannot afford to pay for this military equipment need the military assistance far less than they need housing, educational assistance, and

health care. Let us get our priorities straight around here and let us remember that there is a bottom line, at a time when we are asking sacrifice in other parts of the budget we should not be again increasing the military aid account by another 8 percent. Let us freeze this part of the budget. Let us support the Dorgan amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to reject this amendment. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], the sponsor of the amendment, has suggested that we should be eliminating the MAP assistance funds for Haiti, for Zaire, and if those are the concerns and those are the objections that he wishes to make, then I think that we should be considering a specific amendment to deal with those specific countries.

In fact, that is not what we have before us.

Under other circumstances I might even suggest it would be responsible to consider a freeze across the board but not under the circumstances that we are facing today.

As the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East has already indicated, our committee has done its job at cutting the Military Assistance Program dramatically already. We made cuts from the administration's request of \$300 million. We cut almost 25 percent of that request. So I think in terms of budget savings the committee bill has already delivered on the sentiments in this House.

Second, the amendment clearly strikes at the base rights countries that have been addressed earlier. As we consider this amendment I think Members have to realize that we have struggled to get enough money to the base rights countries to meet our treaty commitments. This cut will create a great deal of difficulty in securing the renewal of base agreements that are in progress right now.

In Turkey, for example, an agreement is signed but it has yet to be implemented. In Greece our agreement will expire in just a few months and we have just begun new negotiations. In Spain we are in the middle of very delicate negotiations, negotiations that have been particularly difficult and will only be exacerbated by a cut in funding.

In Portugal they remain concerned about our ability to live up to our base rights agreements, and they continue to monitor the progress of our negotiations with Spain, their neighbor, as well as other base rights countries.

□ 1455

These countries are crucial to American security. They are especially significant right now as we prepare to consider a very significant reduction, an historic and important reduction, in intermediate range nuclear forces in Europe. This reduction, if agreed to, as I believe it will be, is going to make these bases, the linchpins of U.S. conventional force presence in Europe, even more important. It is simply not responsible foreign policy to take away our ability to meet our commitments to these countries as we simultaneously prepare to eliminate missiles.

If the amendment carries, the administration may find a way, indeed it probably will find a way, to meet our commitments to base right countries. But what will that mean as a consequence?

That means that we will then see cuts in the order of 50 percent in military assistance programs in Central America. Now regardless of Members' positions on Contra aid, I do not know of anybody in this body who thinks that we can responsibly carry out any sort of favorable American policy in Central America with a 50-percent reduction in aid.

In Asia and the Middle East, cuts would be in the order of 80 to 100 percent. In some cases, we would simply have to eliminate programs to those countries. It simply does not make sense from a budget standpoint, and it absolutely does not make sense from a security standpoint.

For those who are suggesting this amendment is essentially a choice between providing better education to Americans, better health care to our elderly, or job training for those who are unemployed, I think that is a great deal of an overstatement. That simply is not the case. The \$83 million that would be saved by this amendment would go much further to deleting our security interests around the globe.

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

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JEFFORDS. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, let me say this is what happened previously on the vote on the floor of the House several weeks ago on this issue. The issue was raised on the growth of grant military assistance program funds, and once the issue was raised we were confronted with a blizzard of information that obscured the real issue.

This issue is not whether we are going to meet our obligations to our base rights in Spain. It is not that, it just is not. I have the language on our

base rights in Spain, and if the gentleman can tell me what our obligation is in Spain and the dollar amount I would love to hear it, because it is not in the base rights agreement, as a matter of fact.

Plus, we have already salted away \$400 million in this budget or authorization that has been brought to the floor to cover contingencies in base rights. This is not a base rights issue. It simply is not.

Simply, we are trying to freeze the MAP Program, probably the fastest growing program in the Federal budget, at last year's level. To do that then we hear charges and claims that somehow this will devastate, cut 100 percent, or cut 50 percent out of this assistance program or that assistance program. That is simply wrong. That obscures the issue.

What we are trying to do is something very modest here, and if this Congress cannot accomplish this, then it ought to say we surrender, we cannot cut budgets. If we cannot cut this one, then we cannot cut budgets, and I am convinced we can start to exercise some restraints around here and that is why I have offered this amendment.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I thank the gentleman for his statement. I would just re-emphasize what he said.

If we cannot freeze this program, what in the world can we do in this body?

So I urge support for this amendment. It is the least we possibly can do between now and the time the economic summit reaches agreement.

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

Mr. Chairman, very briefly, I am a member of this committee and I am a great admirer of the hard work that goes into this legislation. But I am going to support this amendment. I think it is entirely reasonable.

The MAP funds have grown 840 percent during the Reagan administration, 840 percent from \$110 million to \$1.03 billion.

Under the IMET Program, which is a separate program, admittedly, but we have increased the number of countries to which we provide military assistance from 42 countries to 102 countries. We have doubled the number of countries that we provide military assistance to, and we have added such countries as, believe it or not, Finland, Luxembourg, Yugoslavia, Austria.

We can make this reduction without affecting the MAP Program in a serious way. Perhaps it ought to even be larger.

And while we have seen these military programs increase so dramatical-

ment to the floor that would be a true cut in foreign aid accounts and military assistance programs. Every day I learn something new. I do wish to let the Members know who are talking in the back that I will be bringing a 20-percent true cut to the economic support fund, which will total approximately \$670 million per year. I will ask for a vote on that.

I am not surprised that there would be a technical point of order brought against a Member who is trying to take a real cut in the foreign aid account. We protect many areas of our budget with a lot of technicalities. The only thing I will say to the Members is that what we did is we froze the military assistance programs from 1987. But let me say to the Members that we did not freeze general revenue sharing; we eliminated it. That is about what is going on in this country.

So I will be bringing that amendment, regardless of what chairmen talk to me, regardless of what some of us think, and I do not care if it gets beat by 250 votes. That is 20 percent in economic support funds, which will be \$1.35 billion. So maybe we could offset some of the deficits we are going to have to cut off the backs of the people in our districts.

Mr. Chairman, I am asking for the Members' help on this.

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

SEC. 201. AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 532(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 \$3,380,812,000 for fiscal year 1988 and \$3,415,812,000 for fiscal year 1989, in addition to amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated for those purposes.”

SEC. 202. AUTHORITY TO USE FUNDS FOR EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE.

Section 533(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out “1986” and “1987” and inserting in lieu thereof “1988” and “1989”, respectively.

SEC. 203. SEGREGATED ACCOUNTS FOR CASH TRANSFERS.

Section 531 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f)(1) If funds to carry out this chapter are provided to a foreign country as cash transfer assistance, that country shall be required to maintain those funds in a separate account and not commingle them with any other funds.

“(2) Those funds may be obligated and expended notwithstanding any provision of law which is inconsistent with the cash transfer nature of the assistance.”.

SEC. 204. USE OF ESF ASSISTANCE TO PROMOTE LONG-TERM DEVELOPMENT.

Chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 536. PROMOTING LONG-TERM DEVELOPMENT.

“(a) REQUIREMENT THAT ASSISTANCE BE USED TO PROMOTE LONG-TERM DEVELOPMENT.—The following requirements apply with respect to any country with an annual per capita income of less than \$2,500 which receives assistance under this chapter:

“(1) At least 40 percent of that assistance for fiscal year 1988, and at least 50 percent of that assistance for each fiscal year thereafter, shall be used for projects and sector programs in accordance with chapter 1 of part I.

“(2) The remaining assistance shall be used to promote specific economic policy reforms—

“(A) which serve United States national interests;

“(B) which will contribute to long-term economic development; and

“(C) which—

“(i) are reforms that are in addition to reforms that would otherwise be undertaken, or

“(ii) are significant reforms already being implemented which will be directly supported by such assistance, or

“(iii) are reforms being promoted by the United States in conjunction with the efforts of other donors.

Assistance pursuant to paragraph (2) may be provided in the form of balance of payments support or budget support so long as the provision of the assistance in that form will promote the specific economic policy reforms required by paragraph (2).

“(b) EXEMPTIONS FOR CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—Subsection (a) does not apply with respect to a country—

“(1) which receives \$5,000,000 or less in assistance under this chapter for a fiscal year; or

“(2) with which the United States has an agreement providing the United States with base rights in that country or providing for United States access to military facilities in that country.

“(c) WAIVER IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES.—The percentage requirement of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to assistance for a country for a fiscal year to the extent that the President determines that significant unforeseen circumstances exist which necessitate the provision of assistance for that country without regard to the requirement of paragraph (1). The reprogramming notice submitted to the Congress pursuant to section 634A with respect to that assistance shall include a description of the significant unforeseen circumstances which require the waiver and a justification for the waiver.

“(d) DEFINITIONS OF LONG-TERM ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND ECONOMIC POLICY REFORM.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) the term ‘long-term economic development’ means progress in achieving the policy objectives set forth in chapter 1 of part I; and

“(2) the term ‘economic policy reforms’ means macro-economic reforms such as changes in interest rates to encourage saving, divestiture of state-owned enterprises and the development of the private sector, revision of tax structures to encourage growth, and adjustments in exchange rates to achieve market clearing rates.”.

SEC. 205. PROHIBITION ON USE OF ESF ASSISTANCE FOR PORT OR TERMINAL CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS DETERIMENTAL TO UNITED STATES FARMERS.

Chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (as amended by section 204) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 537. PROHIBITION ON USE OF ESF FOR PORT OR TERMINAL CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS DETERIMENTAL TO UNITED STATES FARMERS.

“Funds made available to carry out this chapter may not be used to finance any port or terminal construction project in a foreign country which would have a significant negative impact on the export of United States agricultural commodities.”.

SEC. 206. PURCHASE OF UNITED STATES GOODS AND SERVICES WITH ESF ASSISTANCE.

Chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (as amended by sections 204 and 205) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 538. PURCHASE OF UNITED STATES GOODS AND SERVICES.

“(a) CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING CASH TRANSFERS.—Assistance may be provided to a foreign country under this chapter as a cash transfer only if the President determines that the needs of that country and the interests of the United States would be better met by a cash transfer.

“(b) USE OF CASH TRANSFERS FOR UNITED STATES GOODS AND SERVICES.—Of the assistance provided to a country under this chapter as a cash transfer, not less than 50 percent shall be used for United States financing of the purchase of United States goods and services.

“(c) GAO AUDITS.—Each agreement pursuant to which cash transfer assistance is provided under this chapter shall include provisions to ensure that representatives of the Comptroller General have the access to records and personnel necessary to carry out such monitoring and auditing as the Comptroller General deems appropriate.

“(d) EXEMPTIONS.—This section shall not apply to any country—

“(1) which receives cash transfer assistance under this chapter of less than \$10,000,000 for a fiscal year;

“(2) which, as of April 1, 1987, was receiving cash transfer assistance under this chapter and has an agreement with the United States under which the country agrees—

“(A) to spend an amount equal to the amount of the cash transfer on the purchase of United States goods and services, and

“(B) to carry 50 percent of all bulk shipments of United States grain on ‘privately owned United States-flag commercial vessels’, to the extent such vessels are available at fair and reasonable rates for such vessels, except that a country shall be exempted pursuant to this paragraph only so long as that country continues to agree to those conditions; or

“(3) which, as of the effective date of this section, has an agreement with the United States requiring that the country spend an amount equal to the amount of any cash transfer assistance under this chapter to purchase United States goods and services, except that a country shall be exempted pursuant to this paragraph only so long as that country continues to agree to that condition.

“(e) WAIVER.—The Administrator of the agency primarily responsible for administering part I may waive the provisions of this section with respect to a country to the extent the Administrator determines that the provision of United States goods and services is an inappropriate form of assistance or that it is otherwise important to the national interest to do so. Any such waiver shall be reported to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives

and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

(f) DEFINITION OF UNITED STATES GOODS.—For purposes of this section, the term 'United States goods' means goods and commodities grown, produced, or manufactured in the United States (including agricultural commodities)."

SEC. 207. TIED AID CREDIT PROGRAM.

(a) EARMARKING.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated to carry out chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961—

- (1) not less than \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 1988, and
- (2) an aggregate of not less than \$100,000,000 for both fiscal years 1988 and 1989,

shall be deposited in the fund authorized by subsection (c)(2) of section 645 of the Trade and Development Enhancement Act of 1983 (12 U.S.C. 635r) and shall be used by the Trade and Development Program, as agreed upon by the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, in carrying out the program of tied aid credits for United States exports which is provided for in that section.

(b) USE OF FUNDS FOR OTHER PURPOSES.—Funds that have not been obligated pursuant to the tied aid credit program by the end of the third quarter of the fiscal year for which they were appropriated may be used for other purposes under chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 if the Director of the Trade and Development Program, as agreed upon by the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, certifies to the Congress that—

(1) no trade credit application acceptable and timely under the Trade and Development Enhancement Act of 1983 is pending, or

(2) those funds are not needed for that program because other countries are not engaging in predatory financing practices in order to compete with United States exports.

SEC. 208. RESTRICTION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR NUCLEAR FACILITIES.

Funds authorized to be appropriated to carry out chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for fiscal year 1988 or fiscal year 1989 may not be used to finance the construction of, the operation or maintenance of, or the supplying of fuel for, any nuclear facility in a foreign country unless the President certifies to the Congress that such country is a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons or the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (the "Treaty of Tlatelolco"), cooperates fully with the International Atomic Energy Agency, and pursues nonproliferation policies consistent with those of the United States.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KOSTMAYER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KOSTMAYER: On page 19, lines 1 and 2, strike "or providing for United States access to military facilities in that country."

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment has something to do with something called the Economic Support Fund, ESF. ESF is a component of the Nation's foreign aid. It is not the military component, and it is not the development component; it is

kind of in between. It amounts to 31 percent of our foreign aid budget.

In other words, the so-called Economic Support Fund amounts to \$3.8 billion out of a total bill of \$11.4 billion. Now, what is this ESF? How is it spent? Where does it go?

What ESF amounts to is really an outright check to other countries to do with whatever they want. Last year, for example, 64 percent of the economic support funds went to cash transfers, actual transfers in cash to recipient nations. Now, in the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] offered an amendment to reform the Economic Support Fund Program.

What the Hamilton amendment said was very simple. It said that 40 percent of these funds this year must be used for developmental assistance this year, and that next year that would rise to 50 percent. That would allow that remaining 50 percent not used for developmental assistance to be used for whatever the administration wanted it to be used for, instead of the current law which allows all of it to be used for whatever the administration wants it to be used for.

In the Hamilton amendment there were 4 exemptions to this 40-percent-this-year, 50-percent-next-year requirement. They were, countries with a per capita income of over \$2,500 per year—for example, and only as an example, Israel; second, countries receiving less than \$5 million in ESF funds; and third, those countries that are base right countries. I have no objection to those three exemptions.

I want to speak briefly about the fourth exemption, because my amendment would delete the fourth exemption from the language in the bill. The fourth exemption exempts countries which provide us with access to military facilities. Altogether 33 countries receive ESF. If the fourth exemption is included in the bill, 31 of the 33 countries will be exempted; 31 of the 33 countries will go through that loophole. Without the exemption, 16 of the 33 countries which receive ESF will be covered.

So really what the fourth exemption does is to open up an enormous loophole which exempts 31 out of 33 countries.

Mr. Chairman, I have spoken with the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] about this, and he supports my amendment. I have spoken with the author of the amendment in the committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], and he supports the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say in conclusion that what ESF really amounts to is an unregulated security bonus check going to any country that the administration wants to give it to, and if we examine the trend in the last 6

years, we will see that security assistance as a total component of our foreign aid budget has risen from 46 percent of the foreign aid budget in 1980 to 66 percent of the foreign aid budget in 1987. I think that is too large a component of America's foreign aid budget spent on the military. I think if we can adopt and approve the Hamilton amendment to require that a minimum of 40 percent this year and 50 percent next year of the ESF funds are spent on developmental assistance, that would be a great improvement.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the committee to agree to the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, the proposed amendment is a significant step backward from the more acceptable committee position. Base rights and military access countries were exempted from the provision on the grounds of vital U.S. national interest or obligations. Although the administration still opposes the underlying provision, it was made more acceptable by the exemptions agreed to by the full Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House.

The most noteworthy negative effects of the proposed amendment would be on Kenya, Sudan, Somalia, and Liberia with which we have military access agreements. In these countries we are already engaged in non-project assistance programs whose continuation would be affected by this proposed amendment.

In Kenya, our nonproject assistance is conditioned on freeing the fertilizer market from government controls. In Liberia, we would not be able to support major economic and financial reforms that are necessary if development prospects are to be reestablished. In Somalia, we are in the midst of heavy negotiations over basic reforms in how the exchange rate and the foreign exchange regime are to be operated. In Sudan, we are working with the World Bank, the IMF, and other Western donors in support of a recently announced reform effort, a serious attempt of this democratically elected government to deal with fundamental reforms.

Arbitrarily imposing a requirement for projecting ESF assistance in these countries would undermine our efforts to concentrate resources on the priority problems of these countries. Nor would it respond to these African nations' request for support for economic reform as expressed at the U.N. General Assembly special session on Africa last May.

These countries already receive significant development assistance and food aid resources. Their long-term development needs are not being ignored by the United States.

Now, in Somalia, Mr. Chairman, there are port facilities at Berbera

that we are using. In Kenya, there is port and airfield access. In Liberia, there is an airfield, Roberts Field, and other facilities, including the Voice of America. In Morocco, there is an airfield and port access.

This provides foreign aid to military facilities in access countries, and it is essential to our national security. This is an example of the American people receiving a tangible benefit for their foreign assistance dollar. I do not understand the need for this amendment. Why do we want to unnecessarily complicate this arrangement? It just simply does not make sense to me.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Chairman, will my friend, the gentleman from Indiana, yield to me?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my friend's yielding to me, and I have asked him to do that so I might point out that base right countries are exempted from this. I think that is important. We have included that as an exemption.

I also would point out that there is a presidential waiver. In other words, if the amendment is adopted, we still have one of the exemptions giving the President, whoever he or she may be at that time, the authority to waive any particular country. So I think that allows the protection.

Finally, I would say that without the exemption there are 16 of the 33 countries we are talking about. In other words, 33 countries receive ESF. If we keep in the exemption I am trying to take out, 31 out of 33 would be exempted.

□ 1535

Thirty-one out of 33, the language really has no teeth. The original Hamilton amendment was meant to tighten up the ESF program. If the exemption is kept in, then 31 out of 33 countries will be exempt, so we exempt the base-right countries and provide Presidential waiver, which would give the President an opportunity to waive this in those situations which the gentleman from Indiana described, if the President saw fit.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. It appears to me that we are getting something, a bang for our buck here.

There are countries that are getting aid from us. They are giving us these facilities to use and we jeopardize that with this amendment.

I would urge the Members to vote against it. The funds appropriated for this purpose have been reduced from last year, \$3.5 billion down to \$3.38 billion, so it is a reduction in spending.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I think the amend-

ment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania strengthens the original Hamilton amendment, and it will free up additional funds for economic development, which is the purpose of section 204.

I commend the gentleman and support the amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT: Page 16, line 14, strike out "\$3,380,812,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,704,649,600"; and line 14, strike out "\$3,415,812,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,732,649,600".

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would cut 20 percent from the Economic Support Fund. That is \$676 million the first year, and approximately \$683 million in 1989.

The reasons are right to the point. Today, Members of the House in leadership roles are meeting with White House executives relative to cutting these massive budget deficits that impact upon our national debt. They are talking about holding back and eliminating cost-of-living allowances, putting Social Security on the table, dealing with every part of our budget in an effort to reconcile the books of America.

I say that before we consider cutting American programs any further, we should look prudently at the foreign programs that we have escalated in the last 7 years.

As has been stated so many times on this floor, there has been a tremendous increase in foreign aid since 1981. There has been an 800-percent increase brought forward in the last amendment relative to military assistance.

We find ourselves in the same set of circumstances with an Economic Support Fund that many times has been a disguise for military funds used in military capacities. Specifically, in the 1988 budget proposal of this President, he asked that we eliminate vocational education. The President further wanted to cut Pell grants for higher educational opportunities by \$1.1 billion. He wanted to terminate the Urban Development Action Grant Program for our major cities, completely eliminate the Economic Development Administration of our Government.

He wanted to throw out totally the Appalachian Regional Commission and eliminate the Housing Development Action Grant Program for all America.

He did the same thing several years back, and many Members were laughing. When Federal revenue sharing was cut out of this budget, this city of Youngstown, OH, for example, relied upon it in its economic problems to pay its policemen and firemen. That was seen as an American program that was pork barrel.

I am saying today, and the Members can laugh and do whatever they want, but the Members are going to go on record as having to vote up or down in having to make a cut today, a real cut, not a token freeze.

They did not freeze revenue sharing; they cut it out, \$1.35 billion in real cuts that we could send over to our negotiating team to try and reconcile the debt problems in America.

I close by saying that I find it hard to believe that we could justify to America paying the rent bills of our neighbors while the bank is foreclosing on our own home. This exempts title XII.

I realize there are specific strategic defense rationales necessary to that hotbox in the world. This would mean the committee would have to go back and make some more priority decisions on distribution of funds.

We have been doing that in America, and we can do it in our foreign aid programs, I think.

With that, specifically I ask the Members of this House to stand today and vote for this amendment that would make real cuts to the tune to \$1.35 billion.

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

Some amendments kill with a stiletto. Other amendments kill with a meat ax. This is a meat-ax amendment.

I want to say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT], my good friend, that I share the concern which the gentleman so eloquently expressed about the cuts, and a lot of the domestic programs which are so important for the future of our country.

I certainly hope that ways can be found to avoid some of those reductions, but I do not think that this is the way to solve that problem; and even if this amendment were to be adopted, most of the cuts the gentleman referred to to the domestic programs would take place anyway.

What would the gentleman's amendment mean for our ability to provide vitally important assistance to a whole slew of strategically important countries around the world?

The amendment before the Members offered by the gentleman from Ohio would have the effect of cutting by 20 percent the level of economic se-

curity assistance provided for in this bill, but in reality, the actual reductions it would require among those countries to which it would be applied would be substantially greater.

The reason for that is that the committee bill earmarks the ESF assistance contained in the legislation for Israel, Egypt, and the Philippines.

Consequently, the cuts called for in this amendment would not apply to any of those countries. They would have to be applied to the rest of the countries which receive ESF assistance whose funds are not earmarked.

When this cut of roughly \$800 million is applied to the countries that are not protected, it would result in a cut of close to two-thirds in the overall level of ESF assistance to those other countries.

What countries are we talking about? We are talking about, for example, Turkey, which is the key to the viability of the southern flank of NATO, a nation which has the largest land border of any country in the Atlantic Alliance with the Soviet Union.

We are talking about substantial cuts in the level of our assistance to Spain, which recently joined NATO, and with respect to which we now have very delicate negotiations under way to renew our base agreement in that country.

We are talking about cuts in the level of our assistance to Pakistan. I have other problems with Pakistan, and I hope we will be able to address those problems on the floor a little bit later on in the year.

If we can solve our problems with Pakistan in terms of their nuclear weapons program, there is no question we ought to be providing assistance to them. They are standing up in a stalwart fashion against the Soviet invasion and occupation in Afghanistan, but this amendment would require a substantial cut in the level of aid to Pakistan, and also require reductions in the level of our assistance to El Salvador and Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras.

We may disagree about whether or not to renew our aid to the Contras, but I thought all of us agreed that we had a significant interest in sustaining the fledgling democracies in Central America.

It surely cannot be in the interests of the United States for the democratically elected governments of Central America to be utterly unable to respond to the legitimate social and economic needs of their people.

If they are unable to respond to those needs, then the objective prospects for the emergence of viable Communist insurgencies in these countries will increase, so I say to the Members on both sides of the aisle, we live in a world in which the defense of our vital interests depends on the viability of

friendly governments elsewhere around the world.

We make a modest contribution to sustaining those governments through our ESF program. This amendment would be a meat-ax approach, reducing by approximately two-thirds the level of our assistance to a whole slew of strategically important countries.

If it is adopted, it could undermine vital American interests around the world, and do nothing at the same time to avoid serious cuts in very important domestic programs.

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

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

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

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

I commend the gentleman for the eloquence of the gentleman's arguments, and I agree with the gentleman.

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

Mr. SOLARZ. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

No one talked about the meat ax last year on revenue sharing. Before we talk about El Salvador, Nicaragua, the gentleman should talk about Philadelphia, Cleveland, and Youngstown, OH, and New York, maybe, for a change.

Be advised that my amendment still would leave in \$2.7 billion per year for economic support funds.

Third, it does not cut \$800 million. It specifically cuts \$676 million, the type of cuts that we should be making, real cuts.

Mr. SOLARZ. I have been to Philadelphia, and even been to Youngstown, where I found out what a high regard the gentleman's constituents have for him.

I suspect after this amendment, they will have an even higher regard.

Mr. TRAFICANT. If the gentleman is making light of it, I take exception.

My area is hurting, and I am tired of us taking care of everybody all over the world and not taking care of our own. I am serious about that.

It is not a play on words.

Mr. SOLARZ. I am not making light of your concerns. I share those concerns.

I would like to see the Revenue Sharing Program resumed, but I know very well that if this amendment is adopted, it will not do one thing to resume or resuscitate revenue sharing.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Maybe it will help us from going bankrupt, because America bankrupt will not have any foreign aid for anybody.

Mr. SOLARZ. Foreign aid is less than 1½ percent of the entire Federal

budget, and we could eliminate it entirely, and we could still have close to a \$200 billion deficit. Are we going to walk away from our responsibilities around the world? If we want to be a superpower and defend freedom in Africa, Asia, Central America, and elsewhere, we have got to be prepared to pay a small price for it. I urge the rejection of the gentleman's amendment by the Members of the House.

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

□ 1550

Mr. Chairman, the easiest thing and probably the wisest thing for me to do would be to say "Amen" to the remarks of the gentleman from New York, but I would like to point out just a couple things that I do not believe have been pointed out yet.

ESF earmarked for Israel and Egypt alone total \$2 billion 15 million. Passage of the amendment would leave only \$700 million for all other foreign policy challenges requiring an Economic Support Fund response. The cuts probably would not allow sufficient funds to cover probable congressional earmarks, let alone anything that is not earmarked. The United States would be unable to meet its commitments to base rights in military access countries, including the Philippines, Turkey, Portugal, Spain, Oman, and Kenya, among others. There could be a devastating effect on economic stability and growth of countries in our own hemisphere, as has already been pointed out. ESF assistance for the Caribbean, including Haiti and Granada, and for South America, would probably be zeroed out completely.

The gentleman from New York said it very well. Are we going to be a second-rate country, are we going to be?

Little or no ESF would be available for Africa, including the military access countries, and smaller programs in the Near East, Asia, and the Pacific, would be eliminated. These could include Jordan, Tunisia, Morocco, the South Pacific regional program including the Tuna Treaty Islands and Thailand.

Some of us, and again the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] has been heavily involved in this, as I believe I have, have been very active in trying to project a better image and a strong presence for the United States in the South Pacific. We do not spend much money there, and we are not going to under this bill, but a little bit goes a long ways, but withdrawal of that little bit will go a long ways, too, a long ways in advancing the cause of the Soviet Union.

You know, if we eliminated the entire foreign affairs budget, which incidentally as proposed by the commit-

tee is below last year's level, way below what the President has asked for, we would not even meet half the Gramm-Rudman target. You know, that is \$23 billion. This is \$11 billion. \$11 billion is a lot of money, but I think our interests around the world are important also.

How much more, my colleagues, would it cost us, not this year, but probably next year and the year after that, for Department of Defense spending if we eliminate our rights to defense access in some of these countries? How much more will it cost us for refugees coming from south of our border if we eliminate assistance to the countries south of our border?

I think this amendment is bad and should be rejected.

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

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. The gentleman makes mention of a second-rate country, a second-rate superpower.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I think we will become a second-rate power if this is enacted.

Mr. TRAFICANT. I would like to submit for the record that one good way of doing that is to continue to let America fall on its face. Then we will be no help to anybody else.

I say that we make these cuts. They are not bad cuts and they will send a signal out; no more "Yankee Go Home," a little better relations and we take care of our own people first. I think they are prudent and make sense, and I disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Well, Mr. Chairman, I take back my time, and I disagree with the gentleman very strongly.

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

Mr. Chairman, there is no Member of this House who has given this administration more heartburn on foreign aid than have I. You are looking at the only appropriations subcommittee chairman in the history of the world who has received three letters from OMB in a row saying that they are going to veto my appropriation bills because we do not give them enough money.

We have cut the administration bill in our appropriation bill \$2.7 billion below their request. I think you can justify every dime of that cut, given the budget crunch we are in and given the Gramm-Rudman situation imposed on us by the administration; but I have to say, this amendment goes too far.

There is no person in this House who has more directly squeezed the American foreign aid budget than have I, and the administration's for-

eign aid budget than have I; but this proposal would virtually make it impossible for us to function in any area of the world, except the Middle East, and I think it would be a very grave mistake for our national interests in many places around the world.

I do not want to beat a dead horse, but I say if you wanted to vote to cut the administration's foreign aid request or to cut this bill, the last amendment was a much more reasonable amendment for you to vote for, but this amendment is beyond the pale. It would mean that we would literally pull the plug on our ability to provide economic support assistance virtually anywhere in amounts necessary to keep a straight face, except the Middle East. I do not think we want to do that, given the other problems facing this country.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge a vote against the amendment.

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

Mr. OBEY. Surely, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman saying that almost \$700 million in aid, other than that for the Mideast would be of no consequence and help to some of these other nations?

Mr. OBEY. That is not what I said at all. You are looking at the only appropriation subcommittee chairman in the history of this Congress to suggest to the administration that we provide a token cut of 2-percent in the military credit sales program for Israel and Egypt in order to provide more resources for other countries, so I do not have to take a backseat to anybody in terms of my willingness to deal with that issue.

What I am saying is that the effect of the gentleman's amendment effectively guts the ability of the United States to perform as it needs to perform in any area of the world, except the Middle East, and I think that is a grave mistake.

Mr. TRAFICANT. I do not believe that it does.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 57, noes 366, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 4381]

AYES—57

Applegate	Brennan	DeFazio	Lancaster	Smith, Robert (NH)
Bennett	Bryant	Dyson	Marlenee	Solomon
Bentley	Conyers	Early	Martinez	Staggers
Bilirakis	Dannemeyer	English	Miller (OH)	Stenholm
Boulter	Daub	Evans	Holloway	Stump
			Huckaby	Tauzin
			Jacobs	Traficant
			Johnson (SD)	Traxler
			Jones (NC)	Valentine
			Jones (TN)	Vucanovich
			Jontz	Walker
			Kastenmeier	Watkins
			Kolter	

NOES—366

Ackerman	DeWine	Hyde
Akaka	Dickinson	Inhofe
Alexander	Dicks	Ireland
Anderson	Dingell	Jeffords
Andrews	DioGuardi	Jenkins
Annunzio	Dixon	Johnson (CT)
Anthony	Donnelly	Kanjorski
Archer	Dorgan (ND)	Kaptur
Armeny	Dornan (CA)	Kasich
Aspin	Downey	Kennedy
Atkins	Dreier	Kennelly
AuCoin	Duncan	Kildee
Badham	Durbin	Kleczka
Baker	Dwyer	Kolbe
Ballenger	Dymally	Konnyu
Barnard	Eckart	Kostmayer
Bartlett	Bartlett	Kyl
Barton	Edwards (CA)	LaFalce
Bateman	Edwards (OK)	Lagomarsino
Bates	Emerson	Lantos
Beilenson	Erdreich	Latta
Bereuter	Espy	Leach (IA)
Berman	Fascell	Leath (TX)
Bevill	Fawell	Lehman (CA)
Bilbray	Fazio	Lehman (FL)
Billey	Feighan	Leland
Boehlert	Fields	Lent
Boggs	Fish	Levin (MI)
Boland	Flake	Levine (CA)
Bonior	Flippo	Lewis (CA)
Bonker	Florio	Lewis (FL)
Borski	Foglietta	Lewis (GA)
Bosco	Foley	Lewis (GA)
Boucher	Ford (TN)	Lightfoot
Boxer	Frenzel	Lipinski
Brooks	Frost	Livingston
Broomfield	Galleghy	Lloyd
Brown (CA)	Gallo	Lott
Brown (CO)	Garcia	Lowery (CA)
Bruce	Gaydos	Lowry (WA)
Buechner	Gejdenson	Luken, Thomas
Bunning	Gekas	Lukens, Donald
Burton	Gibbons	Lungren
Bustamante	Gilman	Mack
Byron	Gingrich	MacKay
Callahan	Glickman	Madigan
Campbell	Gonzalez	Manton
Cardin	Goodling	Markey
Carper	Gordon	Martin (IL)
Carr	Gradison	Martin (NY)
Chandler	Grandy	Matsui
Chapman	Grant	Mavroules
Chappell	Gray (PA)	Mazzoli
Cheney	Green	McCandless
Clarke	Gregg	McCloskey
Clay	Guarini	McCollum
Clinger	Gunderson	McCurdy
Coats	Hall (OH)	McDade
Coble	Hamilton	McEwen
Coleman (MO)	Hammerschmidt	McGrath
Coleman (TX)	Hansen	McHugh
Collins	Harris	McMillan (NC)
Combest	Hastert	McMillen (MD)
Conte	Hatcher	Meyers
Cooper	Hayes (IL)	Mfume
Coughlin	Hayes (LA)	Mica
Courter	Hefley	Michel
Coyne	Henry	Miller (CA)
Craig	Hertel	Miller (WA)
Crane	Hiler	Mineta
Crockett	Hochbrueckner	Moakley
Daniel	Hopkins	Molinari
Darden	Horton	Mollohan
Davis (IL)	Houghton	Montgomery
Davis (MI)	Howard	Moody
DeLay	Hoyer	Moorhead
Dellums	Hughes	Morella
Derrick	Hunter	Morrison (CT)
Daub	Hutto	Morrison (WA)

Mrazek	Rogers	Stallings
Murtha	Rostenkowski	Stangeland
Myers	Roth	Stark
Nagle	Roukema	Stokes
Natcher	Rowland (CT)	Stratton
Nelson	Rowland (GA)	Studds
Nichols	Royal	Sundquist
Nowak	Sabo	Sweeney
Oakar	Saiki	Swift
Oberstar	Savage	Swindall
Obe	Sawyer	Synar
Olin	Saxton	Tallan
Ortiz	Schaefer	Tauke
Owens (NY)	Scheuer	Taylor
Owens (UT)	Schneider	Thomas (CA)
Oxley	Schroeder	Thomas (GA)
Packard	Schuette	Torres
Panetta	Schulze	Torricelli
Parris	Schumer	Udall
Pashayian	Sharp	Upton
Patterson	Shaw	Vander Jagt
Pease	Shays	Vento
Pelosi	Shumway	Visclosky
Pepper	Shuster	Volkmer
Petri	Sikorski	Walgren
Pickett	Sisisky	Waxman
Pickle	Skaggs	Weber
Porter	Skeen	Weiss
Price (IL)	Skelton	Weldon
Price (NC)	Slattery	Wheat
Pursell	Slaughter (NY)	Whittaker
Quillen	Slaughter (VA)	Whitten
Rahall	Smith (FL)	Williams
Rangel	Smith (IA)	Wilson
Ravenel	Smith (NJ)	Wise
Ray	Smith (TX)	Wolf
Regula	Smith, Denny	Wolpe
Rhodes	(OR)	Wortley
Richardson	Smith, Robert	Wyden
Ridge	(OR)	Wylie
Rinaldo	Snowe	Yates
Ritter	Solatz	Yatron
Roberts	Spence	Young (AK)
Rodino	Spratt	Young (FL)
Roe	St. Germain	

NOT VOTING—10

Biaggi	Frank	Roemer
Coelho	Gephardt	Towns
de la Garza	Hawkins	
Dowdy	Kemp	

□ 1735

Messrs. BADHAM, FOGLIETTA, MAZZOLI, WHEAT, and HAYES of Illinois changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. BOULTER, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, and Mrs. BENTLEY changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to advise my colleagues that as far as this bill is concerned today we will rise shortly. I understand the leadership is bringing up the DOD conference report, and it has to be acted on today.

Tomorrow we will resume where we left off. I am advised, subject to an announcement by the leadership, we would come in at 10 o'clock. It would be our purpose on the Foreign Affairs Committee to try to get through titles V or VI by tomorrow. Hopefully not any later than 4:30 we would rise. We are not going to be finished tomorrow.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr.

BONIOR of Michigan, having assumed the chair, Mr. AU COIN, 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. 3100) to authorize international security and development assistance programs and Peace Corps programs for fiscal years 1988 and 1989, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

There was no objection.

RULE ON H.R. 3436, THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform the House that the Rules Committee today reported a rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 3436. The rule makes in order the consideration, as original text, of an amendment of mine which would provide long-term home health care to the chronically ill of all ages. The text of my amendment is printed in the report which accompanies the rule. The rule provides that only amendments which will be printed in a supplemental report will be in order during the bill's consideration.

Any member who may wish to offer an amendment to my substitute should submit his or her amendment to the Rules Committee. Members may begin to submit their amendments immediately and the Rules Committee will notify those members when a meeting of the committee is scheduled to consider the supplemental report. The committee will consider for inclusion in the supplemental report all of those amendments which are received by a deadline which will be announced at some later date. We will determine that deadline after the leadership has notified us that the bill has been scheduled for consideration on the floor.

To reiterate, any member who wishes to offer an amendment to my substitute for H.R. 3436—which will be printed in the report to accompany the rule on the bill—should have the amendment delivered to the rules committee.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their cooperation.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3436, OLDER AMERICANS ACT TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 100-449) on the resolution (H. Res. 314) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3436) to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to make technical corrections, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3100, the bill just considered.

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

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, CONSUMER PROTECTION AND COMPETITIVENESS OF THE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE TO SIT TOMORROW, NOVEMBER 19, 1987, DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Commerce, Consumer Protection and Competitiveness of the Committee on Energy and Commerce be permitted to sit tomorrow, November 19, 1987, while the House is meeting under the 5-minute rule for the purpose of considering pending legislation.

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

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there is no Member of this House for whom I have more respect or affection than the gentleman from New Mexico. He has labored long and constructively and usefully on the Energy and Commerce Committee, and I regard the work he has done with extraordinary admiration.

But on this particular bill, it has come in its final form to the subcommittee only this afternoon around 2 o'clock. Many Members have not had a chance to see it. There has never been a day of hearings, and because of this, in order to do our work professionally and properly, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard. The Chair will state that it requires 10 Members to object.

(Messrs. EDWARDS of California, BRYANT, STARK, SMITH of Florida, BATES, MARTINEZ, ROSE, DANNEMYER, BERMAN, and DOWNEY of New York also objected.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A sufficient number has objected.

Objection is heard.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1748, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 1988 AND 1989

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 309 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 309

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1748) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1988 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for fiscal year 1988 for the Armed Forces, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1989 for certain specified activities of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes.

All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are hereby waived, and the conference report shall be considered as having been read when called up for consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 309 is the rule providing for the consideration of the bill H.R. 1748, the conference report for the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989.

Mr. Speaker, under the rules of the House, conference reports are considered privileged and are considered in the House under the 1 hour rule, and no amendments will be in order. Under the resolution, all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration in the House are waived. In addition, the conference report is to be considered as having been read when called up for its consideration.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report on H.R. 1748 authorizes two levels of spending; one would be a low-tier spending ceiling of \$289 billion, the amount that was agreed to in the current budget resolution. The other level would be a high-tier ceiling of \$296 billion. Under the provisions of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1988, the \$296 billion budget authority level would be available only if Congress is able to enact an amount of deficit reductions that exceeds the required reductions. The higher authorization level in the bill reported from conference will only be available if such action is finalized. The deliberations of the participants in the budget summit negotiations are expected to have a significant impact on which level of budget authority will be the appropriate one for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act.

Mr. Speaker, this conference agreement resolves over 2,000 different defense items on which both Chambers had differed. Included in the agreement is funding for the strategic defense initiative, the continuation of the moratorium on tests of antisatellite weapons against objects in space, and provides for a 3-percent military pay raise.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report is a result of hard work and determination, though some Members might disagree with specific provisions in the conference report, I know of no opposition to the rule and I urge my colleagues to adopt this rule.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, because of the uncertainty surrounding an agreement to

reduce the budget deficit, the conference agreement provides for two levels of authorization. Both of these authorization levels will impose a decline in defense authorization levels for the third year in a row, although the agreement does represent a determined effort to increase Army combat equipment as a top priority.

This is the first time I have ever encountered such an authorization bill containing such language, but it is appropriate. We are fighting to balance the budget and reduce our deficit, and in order to get this bill passed, which is mandatory, in my opinion, the language is very appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, I support the rule, I support the conference report, and I urge the Members to vote likewise.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to try to understand if I can the provision in this particular rule that waives all points of order. I wonder if the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] might enlighten us a little bit. When waiving all points of order, are we waiving the fact that the conference committee exceeded the scope of the bills before it?

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, we are waiving scope.

Mr. WALKER. So, in other words, there is material in this bill that is being brought out that was not in either the House or the Senate bills, is that correct?

Mr. MOAKLEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WALKER. And are we waiving germaneness as a part of this particular exercise of waiving all points of order? In other words, is there language in this bill that would otherwise be nongermane?

Mr. MOAKLEY. The gentleman is correct.

□ 1630

Mr. WALKER. So in fact there is a germaneness problem. Does this legislation include appropriations in an authorization bill?

Mr. MOAKLEY. Yes; there are technical.

Mr. WALKER. So we have got a bit of a problem there. Does the bill, in fact, have entitlements in it for military personnel that exceed the entitlement authority under the Defense budget function?

Mr. MOAKLEY. No; there are no entitlements.

Oxley	Sensenbrenner	Stump
Packard	Shays	Sundquist
Parris	Shumway	Swindall
Petri	Slaughter (VA)	Tauke
Porter	Smith (NE)	Thomas (CA)
Pursell	Smith (TX)	Upton
Rhodes	Smith, Denny (OR)	Vander Jagt
Ridge	Smith, Robert (NH)	Vucanovich
Ritter	Smith, Robert (NH)	Walker
Roberts	Smith, Robert (OR)	Weber
Rogers	Snowe	Weldon
Roth	Solomon	Whittaker
Schaefter	Stangeland	Wylie
Schuette		Young (FL)
Schulze		
NOT VOTING—12		
Biaggi	Frank	Michel
Coelho	Gephardt	Roemer
Daniel	Kemp	Solarz
Dowdy	McGrath	Towns

□ 1645

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

Mr. MILLER of California changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rule just adopted, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1748) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1988 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for fiscal year 1988 for the Armed Forces, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1989 for certain specified activities of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Pursuant to House Resolution 309, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see part II of the RECORD of Tuesday, November 17, 1987.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the conference report which the Committee on Armed Services is bringing before the House today is different in several respects. One very important respect is that this authorization conference report marks the Department of Defense bill to two levels. This is following the directions of the budget resolution which passed both Houses of Congress and which also had defense at two levels, and those two levels were to be resolved depending upon whether the President was to sign the tax bill. Given the fact that we do not yet know whether the President will sign a tax bill, the authorization bill marks at the two

levels in the budget resolution, two budget authority levels. One is \$289 billion at the low level, and the other is \$296 billion at the high level. Others, I think, will talk more about this, but let me make just two points.

One point is that the defense budget is now going down in real terms. This is the third year in a row in which we have had a real decline in defense spending. If we are going to continue this operation, we are going to have to start to look at ways to make savings that we have not done in the past, and in particular, I refer to the issue which we raised here in this conference report of actually shutting down production lines. That has to be faced, I think, by this Congress next year.

At the lower level of the two levels, we shut down two lines of aircraft, the A-6 line and the AV-8B line. That was not a happy choice. It was not something that any of the conferees wanted to do, but we realized that there are limits to how far we can go with this continual problem of stretch-outs.

What we have done in the past will no longer suffice in the future, and that is just to stretch out the production levels of all the equipment we are buying, so we have to just buy fewer of them every year. It gets to the point where the unit cost of these things gets to be too high, and we end up wasting a lot of defense dollars.

That is moral No. 1 that comes out of this year's effort. Moral No. 2 that comes out of this year's effort is that it is important, in spite of the reductions, to try to protect those parts of the defense bill which we think are important. I think the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] should be commended for his work on protecting some of the Army programs. We were able to do that in this bill in spite of the fact that we brought defense spending down under both the high and the low tiers. In spite of the fact that we have a real decline in defense spending at both the high and the low tiers, we were able to increase the defense spending for some very important Army programs.

I think that is the second moral of the story that should be noted in the year's defense bill, because we are going to have to do it next year and the year after if present trends continue.

The only other thing worth mentioning here, Mr. Speaker, is the arms control provisions, and I think other Members will talk at greater length about those. I would just point out that the principle behind the arms control negotiations and the agreements we have here is in essence to keep what the House wanted to do and in a couple of cases what the Senate wanted to do without forcing the administration, if it signs this bill, to admit that they are adhering to the

SALT II treaty and to the ABM narrow interpretation.

□ 1655

The House and the other body on both sides of those issues had that language written into the bill. The administration did not want to abide by that, but what we have here is that we have programmatic changes that allow us to stay within those kinds of limits that we sought in those two amendments without actually mentioning the arms control agreements themselves. That is the way we worked the conference on that.

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

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

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

I rise in strong support of the conference report, and I want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON], the ranking member, and all of the members of the conference, really, in this significant effort to achieve a bipartisan consensus.

Mr. Speaker, in an effort to forge a bipartisan consensus on arms control issues before the American-Soviet summit in Washington on December 7, the House and Senate leadership and the White House reached an accord last week on a number of important provisions, including: the traditional interpretation of the ABM Treaty, preservation of the SALT agreements, SDI funding limitations, preservation of the moratorium on Asat testing, and chemical weapons funding limitations.

For the past 7 years, the Congress has been the driving force for including arms control as an integral part of our national security policy. We welcome the administration's willingness to work with the Congress this year and hope that such a partnership can continue in this and future administrations.

A brief overview of the compromise agreement on the arms control provisions in the fiscal year 1988 defense authorization conference report follows:

ABM TREATY

As reflected in their respective Defense authorization bills, both the House and the Senate, strongly opposed the administration's attempt to implement the broad interpretation of the ABM Treaty. The final conference report contains language that has the practical effect of requiring the administration to adhere to the traditional interpretation of the ABM Treaty. In effect, the administration is restricted to the SDI tests included as part of its fiscal year 1988 budget request. The Congress—hopefully in

partnership with the administration—will continue to uphold the traditional interpretation of the ABM Treaty as the law of the land.

At a hearing of the Subcommittee on Arms Control, International Security and Science last October 27, Lt. Gen. Brent Scowcroft, former national security adviser under President Ford reaffirmed the traditional interpretation of the ABM Treaty. He stated that the interpretation of the treaty "presented to the Congress [was the] narrow interpretation" and the administration's attempt to reinterpret the treaty was "unbefitting."

SDI SUBLIMITS

The House and the Senate agreed to preserve the SALT II Treaty sublimit on permitted numbers of MIRV'd SLBM's. Specifically, the bill requires the dismantlement of one Poseidon submarine, the *Andrew Jackson* and urges that Poseidon submarines due for overhaul in the future, be dismantled accordingly, to keep us in relative compliance with the SALT sublimit.

Widespread congressional sentiment in favor of continued adherence to the SALT regime was reflected in legislation passed by the House of Representatives on June 19, 1986 that called upon the President to continue to adhere to the numerical sublimits of the SALT agreements, binding language in the House version of the fiscal year 1987 Defense authorization bill which prohibited the expenditure of funds to exceed the SALT sublimits, and binding language in both the House and Senate fiscal year 1988 Defense authorization bills requiring the administration to adhere to the SALT sublimits.

The Congress strongly supports continuation of the existing arms control regime until there is a new regime to replace it. It is our hope that United States and Soviet negotiators will reach an agreement to significantly reduce the strategic arsenals of both superpowers at the Geneva arms control talks. In the interim, our belief is that United States national security interests are best served by maintaining arms control limitations on Soviet offensive strategic systems.

SDI FUNDING LIMITATIONS

The House Foreign Affairs Committee has held numerous hearings over the past several years on the administration's strategic defense initiative [SDI]. The adverse arms control and budgetary implications of the SDI were exposed during these hearings, leading many in the Congress to support funding limitations on the SDI.

For fiscal year 1988, the administration requested \$5.8 billion for the SDI. The House authorized \$3.1 billion for the SDI and the Senate authorized \$4.5 billion. The conference committee agreed on \$3.9 billion. The Congress will continue to support funding for

the SDI that keeps us abreast of Soviet activities in the strategic defense area and is consistent with the traditional interpretation of the ABM Treaty and our national security objectives.

ASAT MORATORIUM

The conference report preserves the moratorium on testing antisatellite [Asat] weapons against objects in space for as long as the Soviets refrain from such testing. Continuation of the Asat weapons ban reaffirms the congressional belief that an agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union on banning Asats would represent a major step toward averting a costly and destabilizing arms race in space.

BINARY CHEMICAL WEAPONS

Before commenting on the compromise struck by House-Senate conferees on the binary chemical weapons provisions in the DOD authorization bill, I would like to highlight the progress and significant developments in chemical arms control. This Friday a Soviet expert delegation will visit our chemical weapons facilities at Tooele, UT, as part of a reciprocal United States-Soviet agreement to exchange such visits which focus on chemical weapons destruction, demilitarization, and production. This official Soviet visit on Friday to United States chemical facilities combined with the October 4 official United States visit to the Soviet chemical weapons facilities at Shikhan represents important confidence building measures toward the realistic prospects for a mutual and verifiable elimination of chemical weapons.

Two years ago, in November 1985, President Reagan and Soviet leader Gorbachev pledged to work for a worldwide ban on chemical weapons. Consistent reports of progress toward a worldwide ban on chemical weapons have been received from the 40-nation U.N. Disarmament Conference negotiation in Geneva. During this past year the Soviet Union has been active on the chemical weapons issue and there have been some public Soviet concessions which could be quite significant once they are negotiated into a treaty. This past year the Soviet Union announced that it had halted production of chemical weapons and began building an incinerator to begin destroying its present chemical weapons stocks. The Soviets also agreed to "on-site" and "quick-challenge" inspections. They also carried out a multilateral demonstration visit to one of their chemical weapons facilities at Shikhan. They have also presented some new ideas on the question of chemical weapons data exchange. This seemingly positive chemical arms control attitude by the Soviets must, of course, be translated into the necessary written provisions in the arms control document. An adequate verification regime

will probably be the most difficult problem to resolve in addition to the problems of treaty organization and funding and of worldwide adherence to the treaty by possessor nations. Despite these remaining problems this movement on chemical weapons arms control sets the stage for a truly historic opportunity to reach agreement on the worldwide elimination of all chemical weapons.

A. BINARY CHEMICAL WEAPONS AND DOD CONFERENCE

The binary chemical weapons provisions contained in the DOD conference authorization bill for fiscal year 1988 represent a compromise between the House and Senate positions and between proponents and opponents of the binary chemical weapons production program.

There are no production funds for the Bigeye bomb program in the conference bill, production funds for the binary 155mm artillery shell in the amount of \$59.3 million were approved, and language was included which reflected congressional support for a policy that links the removal and replacement of existing chemical weapons in Europe with binary chemical weapons.

B. BINARY CHEMICAL WEAPONS—HISTORY OF CONTROVERSY

In order to understand the significance of this year's compromise on the binary chemical weapons program, it is important to recall the long history of the Binary Chemical Weapons Program.

For 3 consecutive years, 1982-85, Congress wisely rejected the Pentagon's persistent requests to produce binary chemical weapons. Congress ultimately prohibited all funding for the binary production program during fiscal year 1986 and made funding after fiscal year 1986 conditional. For example, binary production could begin after October 1, 1986, only if environmental, safety, and testing requirements were satisfied. Allied acceptance of these new binary chemical weapons was also a condition.

In 1986 the authorization for fiscal year 1987 postponed final assembly of the Bigeye bomb for 2 years and the 155mm artillery shell for 1 year. Funding of production facilities and eventual funding of final assembly for both binary and chemical weapons were both made contingent on Presidential certifications on testing, environmental safety, and national security.

Ongoing GAO investigations of the Bigeye bomb testing programs will play an important role in the final decision by Congress regarding the advisability of funding production and final assembly of the Bigeye bomb. Congress has also funded DOD research and development of long-range stand-off chemical delivery systems.

The latest report to me from GAO indicates that there are still very serious problems with the Bigeye bomb test program. This June 4, 1987 letter from GAO analyzes the Bigeye bomb's operational test plan:

U.S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE,
PROGRAM EVALUATION AND METH-
ODOLOGY DIVISION,

Washington, DC, June 4, 1987.

Hon. DANTE FASCELL,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In a June 26, 1986, letter, you requested GAO continue its work on examining the operational issues of the Bigeye bomb. This is a status report which provides an evaluation of the operational test plan. As you know, GAO was also assigned the task of monitoring and evaluating the operational tests of the Bigeye in the FY 1987 Defense Authorization. This report does not address any operational test results, but only discusses the test plan.

We evaluated the Bigeye test plan on the basis of conformance with test plan criteria laid down by the Defense Department. Drawing upon both the DOD criteria for test plans, and the work of experts in defense OT&E, GAO found that the Bigeye test plan presents four major problems, and several minor ones.

DOD Directive 5000.3 specifies eight elements that must be present in an operational test plan: a statement of objectives; measures of effectiveness; operationally realistic scenarios; threat simulations; a list of required resources; a statement of known test limitations; data gathering methods; and data analysis methods.

GAO believes that the Bigeye test plan has four important limitations which will seriously affect the usefulness of the overall test program:

1. **Unrealistic Mission Profiles.**—There is no explanation for why operational scenarios based on little or no threat are used as the basis for 60% of the test runs by the Air Force; only 11% of the Navy runs assume such scenarios. Similarly, there is no explanation for the absence in either service of test runs based on a scenario that assumes a high air and high ground fire environment. Given circumstances considered likely for the use of Bigeye—a full-scale ground war in Europe against the Warsaw Pact—it is unclear why the Bigeye scenarios assume a "moderate" threat level as the highest for testing purposes. While there may be a good reason for the choices made by DOD, no explanation is offered in the test plan. As things stand, it is clear that, whatever the reason, Bigeye will not be tested under operationally realistic conditions.

2. **Absence of Data Analysis Plan.**—The Bigeye test plan contains no data analysis plan. In general, test experts believe that a data analysis plan is one of the core requirements for a properly conducted test, since it specifies how the collected data will be analyzed, including what defines the failure or success of the test. The absence of a data analysis plan can permit the collected data to drive the later analysis, thereby introducing the possibility of both problematic evaluation and bias. Furthermore, the lack of a plan prevents outside evaluators from thoroughly understanding the assumptions used by testers, along with the criteria for judging test results. In the case of Bigeye, numerous questions remain unanswered about how data will be evaluated precisely because there is no data analysis plan.

3. **Proliferation of Independent Variables.**—There are at least 22 independent variables which affect testing of the Bigeye. "Independent" variables are, by definition, factors that can be controlled by testers in order to judge the effect of a variable on the performance of a weapon (e.g., day versus night flights, type of aircraft, number of bombs used, fuze time, height of bomb release, etc.). GAO believes that given only 33 missions and 22 independent variables, it will be very difficult, if not impossible, to decide what factors are responsible for the success or failure of the Bigeye. GAO also believes that some of these variables could have been controlled (e.g., using only one type of aircraft, only having daytime flights, only using one weapon at a time, or using crews of roughly equal experience). For example, only two night tests will be conducted, and there are so many other variables at work that even if both succeeded, or failed, it would be impossible to state that night employment was the factor responsible for success or failure.

4. **Significance of Known Test Limitations.**—In the Bigeye test plan, DOD cites 10 limitations to achieving operational realism, ranging from the absence of electronic countermeasures to no correlation between simulant and lethal agent. While some of these limitations are necessary (to conform to existing law), GAO believes that the limitations raise two related problems. First, some of the limitations could be removed (e.g., by testing ECM effects in the laboratory, simulating hostile fire maneuvers through jinking); second, the test plan does not make any attempt to quantify the effects of the cited limitations. An adequate data analysis plan would have addressed this important problem.

In addition to these four major concerns with the Bigeye test plan, GAO has encountered problems with obtaining data on the Bigeye test results that we were promised would be made promptly available. DOD stated that data from the test runs would be sent to GAO in no more than 20 calendar days from the time they were available, approximately 10 days after each test run. However, GAO has not received one piece of data as of this writing, 105 days after we filed our first request on February 19.

While this information on the test plan has several new aspects, I am struck with a feeling of *déjà vu*. In our past work on Bigeye, we have encountered three of the same problems we face now: namely, a lack of realistic testing, an absence of a stated analysis plan (laying out, for example, the criteria detailing which tests will be counted and which not), and an inability to obtain data in a timely manner. The absence of realistic tests in the developmental phase of Bigeye testing is partially responsible for the current decertification of the weapon; and unclear criteria have led to questionable and varying rates of success and failure. Unfortunately, we see the same problems occurring again. Unless they can be resolved, the results of operational testing will not generate the information needed to determine if the Bigeye is ready for production.

A similar letter is being sent to the Chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee and to the Chairman, House Armed Services Committee. Staff from those committees were briefed orally on May 11, on this subject.

Sincerely,

ELEANOR CHELIMSKY,
Director.

This short overview of the Pentagon's Binary Chemical Program demonstrates persistent congressional opposition to engaging in a "chemical divad" program. That's why the compromise as contained in this fiscal year 1988 Defense authorization says "no" to flawed weapons—that is the Bigeye bomb—and why we should say "no" to the flawed strategy of unilateral chemical disarmament in Europe. Our hope is that the superpowers can agree to an arms control agreement that would obviate the need for the final production of any binary chemical weapons.

This last point takes on added significance in view of the joint pledge originally made at the November 1985 summit by President Reagan and Secretary General Gorbachev to actively seek an agreement on the mutual elimination of chemical weapons. Both leaders discussed this issue again just last year in Iceland and identified an arms control agreement on chemical weapons as desirable and possible.

This position will hopefully be reaffirmed during the upcoming United States-Soviet summit in Washington, DC, on December 7 to 10.

While not as conclusive as many of us would like the conference position on chemical weapons reaffirms Congress' position that we should not be funding a weapons system that does not work, is not proven safe for our troops, needlessly adds billions of dollars to the deficit, unilaterally eliminates the present chemical deterrent in Europe, and undermines efforts of the superpowers to agree to an arms control agreement that bans chemical weapons.

As we address this problem in the future, we should not fund a full and final binary chemical production program unless progress on an arms control agreement with the Soviets proves impossible and an independent assessment by GAO concludes that binary weapons are technically ready for production and operationally safe and usable.

NUCLEAR TESTING

Although strong language in support of nuclear testing limitations is not included in the conference report, such limitations do remain a high priority of the Congress.

For the past 2 years, the House Defense authorization bills have included binding language prohibiting the expenditure of funds for nuclear test explosions above 1 kiloton unless the President certifies to the Congress that the Soviets have tested above 1 kiloton or that they have refused to accept reciprocal in-country monitoring arrangements. This achievement was an outgrowth of legislation (H.J. Res. 3), initiated by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and passed by the House of Representatives in

1986, which urged the administration to seek ratification of the threshold test ban treaty and the peaceful nuclear explosions treaty and to resume negotiations on a comprehensive test ban treaty.

We are pleased that the administration is now implementing the spirit of House Joint Resolution 3 by agreeing to begin nuclear testing negotiations with the Soviet Union on November 9 of this year.

As we monitor these negotiations, we will continue to support efforts to reach the ultimate objective of bringing an end to nuclear testing.

FOREIGN AID PROVISIONS

A similar bipartisan relationship existed relative to a number of foreign aid provisions in the Defense authorization bill, in which Foreign Affairs Committee members were conferees.

I am pleased to report that in cooperation with the House Armed Services Committee conferees, the few foreign aid provisions were resolved to the satisfaction of the Foreign Affairs Committee conferees.

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

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for making it possible for us to bring the conference report up at this particular time.

Because of a parliamentary situation, if we did not bring it up today, we could not bring it up tomorrow, because it will be brought up in the other body. There is a threat of a filibuster in the other body; and that being the case, it would go over until the other body finished, which would put it after the Thanksgiving break.

The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs was very nice to accommodate us.

Mr. Speaker, speaking to the conference report itself, I have real mixed feelings. This is a better bill, the bill as it now stands, than it was when it passed the House on May 20. It is about the best defense bill that we could produce, given the position that we had been voted in in the House.

I say in all honesty, with the hand that we were dealt, the chairman and the conferees did the best possible job. For that reason, I support the conference report, both the core section of the bill as we refer it, and the arms control section of the bill.

Speaking as to the core bill, so to speak, as the chairman has pointed out, we had to mark at two levels, which was necessitated by action of the Committee on the Budget that said we did not know how much money we would have, so they would authorize two levels of spending, \$296 billion or \$289 billion.

This was a substantial reduction from the request of the administration, which was \$312 billion. As the chairman has pointed out, this is the third year in a row that we have had a negative growth in our defense authorization bill.

We do not know yet what the final figure will be, because they are still in conference, the so-called summit budget committee; and if they do not come out with an agreement tomorrow, we face sequestration that could take this bill down almost \$11 billion more, so I am told.

It is a very serious thing that we are faced with here. I would hope that the conferees on the Joint Budget Committee can work out some resolution to the problem, so that we can avoid the sequestration, because it would really create a great deal of harm to our natural posture if we have to cut additional billions out of this.

The chairman has mentioned that we were threatened with closing two lines, a Grumman line for the A-6 aircraft. They make two kinds.

They propose to make the F model, which is a follow-on, a newer model of the A-6E and the AV8-B Harrier for the Marine Corps. The Harrier for the Marine Corps is one of their most important programs and would very much upset the Marine Corps.

Mr. Speaker, this bill makes deep cuts in a number of strategic programs: the advanced-technology bomber, the Midgetman, the rail garrison basing research and many others.

This is not necessarily good, although some of the cuts were made for valid, programmatic reasons.

The up side of this is that we funded a number of conventional programs at or above the requested levels. Army helicopters and tanks benefited from our action, as did a number of tactical programs across the board.

I would like to commend all of the Members for their diligence and hard work during the conference with the other body. It was a very long and arduous process, probably the longest and most arduous that I have ever experienced. It got to the point where there were many items that could not be resolved within the panels of conferees, and these were referred back to the chairman and ranking member of the House and Senate conferees, and then we had to work on them.

We did the best that we could under the circumstances; and by and large, we did as good a job as could be hoped for.

There was a second aspect to the bill. Mr. Speaker, and that had to do with arms control. Before I leave the core, let me just mention to some of my colleagues, we are talking about closing down lines, and the chairman of our committee was very diligent in trying to protect the interests of certain Members who had constituents

that would be negatively impacted. If we marked to the lower tier, there will be two lines closed down, but I might just point out to some of the Members from New York and other places, the next time they vote on a budget level, keep that in mind, because this year they do it to themselves.

They voted that budget at a lower spending level with no regard as to what it is going to do to the programs, weapons programs, and so that is the level we were faced with when it left the floor.

It was for that reason, I voted against the bill when it left the floor, and you cannot have it both ways. You cannot vote for the lower spending level and think that your programs are so important, your own constituencies are going to be protected. That is just not the way it works.

There were four big items dealing with arms control. Mr. Speaker, they had no business being in our bill.

They were in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and should be dealt with by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

These were matters that affect ongoing negotiations that the United States has right now with the Soviet Union in Geneva, and we were mandating by legislation things that we would be giving to the Soviets that they could not get by negotiation in Geneva.

We were voluntarily giving them away in many instances. They have consulted with the people that are directly involved here, with the administration, people from the State Department; and I have reason to believe that the bill as it presently is will not be vetoed.

There are certainly no assurances there, but I can give the Members one firm assurance. The bill as it was reported out of the House originally would be vetoed.

I have discussed this with the administration, and I do not think there is any question about that. I think we did a good job all around. All of the participants are certainly to be congratulated.

I do have some ambivalence, as I have said. I do not think we can do better, and for that reason I am going to vote for the conference report.

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

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in support of the conference report, and I would like to thank and commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN], the chairman, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] for working so hard. There

were many areas of disagreement, and the gentlemen were able to work it out; and I support the conference report.

The bill treats the National Guard and Reserve well. Under the bill, new equipment will go directly to the Reserves, which includes planes, guns, and tanks. The end strengths for the military, the increases have been in the Reserve Forces, and there are provisions to increase the number of AGR's, and technicians to the Reserve Forces.

However, if we do not have a budget resolution, and we have to trigger the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings provision, it would be a disaster to the National Guard and to the Reserve.

I point out in all the accounts of the Reserve Forces, you have to cut them by 19 percent. That includes the personnel count of the Reserves.

In cutting it by 19 percent, that would mean you would have to reduce the number of drills of these units, and let people that are in the Reserves go.

You would have to discharge them out of the Reserve Forces, put them on inactive duty. If you are talking about hearing from home, you would get some reaction then.

□ 1710

So we need a budget. We need to pass this conference report and we do not need to trigger Gramm-Rudman, or you would bring total chaos to the Reserve Forces.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BADHAM].

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Chairman, I as one member of the committee who has been on the conference between the House and the Senate for the DOD bill for the past 4 or 5 years have seen them come and I have seen them go. This bill is not much different when you come to the bottom line on the bill, but I have voted for this rule today and I intend to vote for this bill.

I would just like to maintain for a couple of minutes what is in this bill and what is not in this bill.

I have read, as everybody else has, the letters in the news magazines and I find it somewhat startling to read in the news magazines that we should cut the deficit and we should cut the budget and we should cut defense as long as it does not destroy or weaken the defense of our country. I read things like that and I am somewhat amazed, because we are at that point now, Mr. Speaker, and Members of this body, that we are going if we continue in this direction to weaken the defensive stature, the deterrent posture of our country in the future.

This bill basically has two parts, the core bill that has to do with defense, and then the rest of the bill that we

have referred to with extraneous or additional conferees as the arms control part.

As the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] correctly said, these things did not even belong in this bill, but in the bill they were there and we had conferees and agreements were reached.

Now, what has changed in this bill is that when this bill left this House in late May, almost 6 months ago, when this bill left this House I would say a majority of the members of the Armed Services Committee on both sides of the aisle voted against the bill for which we have the conference report before us today. Why? Because it was a bad bill. It did not take into account the true needs of the defense of our country.

As it comes back here today in the conference report, after diligent staff work of almost 6 months, and I would commend the members of the Armed Services Committee staff on both sides of the aisle, we have a unified staff that have worked tirelessly to bring this bill into some sort of position that we can support.

I would say as a result of the work of the staff, as a result of the work of this body and the other body and the members of the committee, what went out of this House as a bad bill comes back to this House in terms of a conference report, in terms of something that is by far the best we could possibly hope for this year, and I will vote for this bill, as I believe a majority of both sides of the aisle and members of the committee will vote for.

We have hard choices, and we have had in the past, stretching out programs as we found in the late seventies that were terribly destructive to the defense of the United States. We had a situation where the bill went out of this House with many of us, I would say a majority of both sides voting against it, where the bill surely in that form would have been vetoed, and as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON], our ranking member of the full committee, said, we are given strongly to understand that this bill in its present form with this conference report will be signed.

So, I would ask my colleagues in this body to support this bill, while understanding full well and from now on that next year, and we constantly stand here each year and say next year it is really going to get tough, but the decisions we have next year are going to be to eliminate programs, to lower troop strength, to bring troops back from parts of the world, to leave undefended large areas of the ocean portions of this world by cutting defense, if we continue in this present mode.

I will support this bill and I do so freely, voluntarily, and eagerly, not because it is the best bill in the world. If

I were to write it, or any of us were to write it, we would have written it differently, but it is by far the best agreement, the best bill we have and it will maintain for at least 1 year the adequate defense of our country, and when I say for 1 more year I would refer now just in closing to the arms control portion, and that is saying that we more or less restricted the arms control portion to 1 year, and that was apparently acceptable to the administration and it was acceptable to most of us, and next year we will have that battle to fight all over again, testing whether our agreements with the Soviet Union will last for more than 1 year.

I thank you and I encourage an aye vote on this bill to preserve the defense of our country.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCURDY].

Mr. McCURDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this conference report and I commend the chairman, the ranking member, and all the conferees for the diligent work that they put into reaching this very difficult compromise.

This year we have had a very tough time in coming to a consensus on the defense bill. The dollars have been short and we have been forced to make a number of important choices, set some priorities, and the decisions that we have made, I think, have important policy implications in the future.

We have tried in this bill to protect readiness. We have tried to protect personnel. We have tried to place as a high priority those operations and maintenance accounts which are so important to our overall capabilities.

We tried to place emphasis on conventional systems, which in my opinion have been shortchanged by the Reagan administration for strategic nuclear systems.

We have tried to elevate the importance of those conventional systems. We have restored a number of accounts for the Army, which when we started out this past year, we found that many of the research and development accounts were larger than the Army procurement account, whether it was for helicopters or other vital systems.

We have continued to place a strong emphasis on airlift and on sealift. I think these have been successes.

As I said, the choices were forced on us by some of the decisions that had been made earlier. I, for one, still want to remind this body that when we make decisions here this year, it has tremendous impact in the future. When we decided to facilitate the production of two new aircraft carriers, we were forced to cut naval aviation, because we did not have the money to

put aircraft on those carriers when we made those decisions. Those were tough and the Appropriations Committee, I think, is going to have to come to grips with that decision also.

Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, I think those who are meeting on the budget and certainly those who helped set those decisions here in the Congress, we need stability in this area. We cannot achieve the savings through competition or procurement reforms if we do not have stability in this budget. We need a 2-year budget and we need to set that as a high priority. Even though we passed the amendment last year, it is imperative that we come to grips with this and start stabilizing this account over the years.

With all that, Mr. Speaker, I still rise in strong support of this conference agreement. I think it is the best that we can achieve. It falls short in some policy areas, but I think that over all this is one that the House and the Congress can be proud of.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN].

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished gentleman from Alabama yielding me this time. I will try not to consume all of it.

Were I to state all of the concerns that I have as we move hopefully to the passage in this body of the defense authorization bill, it would take a great deal more than 3 minutes.

Let me say to the Members of the House that I will be voting for this conference report. I will not be doing so gladly or happily. I will be doing so very sadly, because I think we are passing a deficient national security authorization bill.

We should have learned the lesson that by buying less than you need and stretching programs over longer spans of time we waste a great deal of our fiscal capability in this country, while denying ourselves the defense capability we need immediately. We should not be doing that.

I am going to vote for the conference report. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Notwithstanding having said that, I think it is only fair to point out that this member of the committee and of the conference committee did not sign the conference report. That is based in large measure upon objections on my part to the processes followed in the course of the conference, which I think were flawed and were departures from what I understand to be the norm for the conduct of committees of conference. For that reason, I did not sign the conference report, but when it comes to the question of should this bill pass, then clearly I must come down on the side of let us pass this bill.

I would further say that in my extension of remarks I would like to make comments with reference to the specific decisions on officer-in-strength reductions mandated in this bill, which I think is a terribly flawed decision on our part, one which should not have been made and one which I would be among those who would insist that we revisit that issue at the earliest possible opportunity.

I commend my chairman and ranking member for the amazing amount of work and stamina that they have shown in bringing us to this point. I am sorry that the circumstances did not permit them to bring us a better bill and a better report.

Mr. Speaker, as the ranking minority member on the Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel and Compensation, I regret that I must register a serious reservation about the final conference agreement on H.R. 1748, the Department of Defense Authorization Act for fiscal years 1988 and 1989. I am referring to section 402 of the conference report concerning reducing the number of officers on active duty in fiscal year 1988 and beyond.

Mr. Speaker, the background on this issue could serve as a case study on how Congress should not conduct business. Last year, both the House and the Senate passed provisions to reduce the size of the active duty officer corps. The Senate acted because some Senators had a "gut feel" that the officer corps had grown fat and that the ranks should be pared back to size. The House, on the other hand, acted out of pure budgetary considerations. We had a dollar reduction to meet in order to live within the budget resolution and officer cuts was one of the many imprudent ways we reached our mark. At no time, let me emphasize, did either chamber have empirical evidence that the growth in the active duty officer corps since 1980 was inappropriate; but that didn't stop us from mandating the cuts anyway: 1 percent in fiscal year 1987, 2 percent in 1988, and 3 percent in 1989 for a total reduction of 6 percent.

Although the services and the Secretary of Defense reluctantly complied with the 1 percent reduction in 1987, they asked during authorization hearings on the fiscal year 1988 bill to be relieved of the remaining 5 percent reduction. In the meantime, each of the military services compiled data explaining that the bulk of officer growth was closely tied to changes in combat and combat support capability. A synopsis of this data was then submitted to Congress by the Secretary of Defense and, unfortunately, was not as complete as it should have been. It was obvious to me and my colleagues on the subcommittee that more time and analysis was needed before we could make valid judgments about the

proper size of the active duty officer corps. That's why we delayed the mandated cuts by 1 year and ordered a General Accounting Office study in the interim. We wanted to see if full and impartial data supported a reduction before we effected more cuts in the officer corps and possibly harmed our combat capability.

Unfortunately, the Senate did not see the wisdom of this position and insisted on keeping the full 2- and 3-percent reductions in fiscal years 1988 and 1989. I am extremely disappointed with the final conference agreement, which retains the 2-percent reduction in 1988, but allows the Secretary of Defense to waive up to one-half of that reduction if he requests legislative relief from certain defense officer personnel management statutes—in other words, the laws that protect many senior personnel from reductions in force. The final agreement also requires the Department of Defense and the General Accounting Office to perform additional analytical work on why the officer corps has grown and how many officers the military needs to perform its mission. Finally, the conference agreement stipulates that if the Secretary of Defense waives one-half of the 1988 cut, he would have to make that up by cutting 2 percent in 1989 and 2 percent in 1990. The bottom line, therefore, would be the same. The officer ranks would be trimmed by a total of 6 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the officer cut issue represents Congress at its worst: shooting from the hip without having the evidence to support its case. I will certainly be among those to insist that we revisit this issue next year following the completion of the DOD and GAO reports and I only hope that facts will govern what we do next year and that "gut reactions" will not be the driving force for policymaking.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DARDEN].

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of this conference agreement and I urge its adoption.

As a member of the Committee on Armed Services and also having had the privilege of serving on the conference committee, I believe we have drafted the best possible bill to ensure the continued viability and strength of our Armed Forces.

As in all conference agreements, I have concerns regarding specifics in the bill. I would rather have a higher funding level, but last May we passed the Aspin amendment to ensure that the Department of Defense lived within a budget, just as every American family must. We as a Nation are saddled with the economic realities of a \$2 trillion debt and an annual deficit

exceeding \$150 billion. Accordingly, the tough choices have to be made now by this Congress if our national defense structure is to remain sound and strong in the future.

There has been some criticism by supposedly impartial study groups around the Capitol concerning the arms control provisions agreed to by the conferees. I was not a conferee on the arms control provisions, but if I had been I do not believe I could have recommended any better solutions. Of the House-passed amendments, I supported only the provision which required the traditional or various interpretation of the anti-ballistic missile treaty. However, the conferees reached a compromise position that should please the Members of the House, the Members of the Senate, the President, and the American people. No, this conference report does not include letter-for-letter the arms control provisions as passed by the House. But, it does include the essence of these provisions and is a suitable compromise that will ensure the security of this Nation. Even such watchdog groups as Common Cause have supported the arms control provisions approved by the conferees.

Again, there are specific programs and line items in this agreement that I do not agree with. However, we cannot allow a disagreement with one program or with one line item to affect our final decision on the funding levels for our national defense. After reaching agreement on almost 2,000 discrepancies between the House and Senate versions of H.R. 1748, I believe we should be proud that we, as the most representative legislative body in the world, have met the challenge of ensuring our national security while showing concern for the budgetary restraints.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the adoption of this conference agreement.

□ 1725

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I am not a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I am sorry to say. Therefore, I guess I do not speak with expertise on this material in front of me but we have got some pretty good people on that committee and especially the ranking member on the full committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON], and I usually blindly follow him when it comes to armed services issues. But I am a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, one of the senior members on that committee, and I did serve as a conferee on this measure, and the arms control panel compromises in this bill, in my opinion, should be opposed. They should be opposed be-

cause the compromise interprets in statutory fashion what the United States can and cannot do under the ABM Treaty. I think that is wrong.

The compromise provides for new son-of-SALT-II restraints resulting in for instance the dismantlement of the U.S. submarine U.S.S. *Andrew Jackson*; and given continuing SALT II violations, and I invite my colleagues all to go upstairs and look at the Central Intelligence Agency reports, this new requirement for interim restraints negates appropriate U.S. responses. I think that is dangerous.

Also the conference continues the United States ASAT moratorium and in light of Soviet space programs that we all know about, the moratorium should be dropped.

Finally, funding for the SDI remains disproportionately low.

Mr. Speaker, the compromise does not meet, in my opinion, United States national security requirements. It is a sell-out, and I have heard Member after Member take the floor and say this bill is deficient, I have heard almost every Member including, I think, even the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN], the chairman of the committee, say that these arms control issues should not be in a DOD bill, they ought to be over in our Committee on Foreign Affairs where they should be.

Mr. Speaker, I just do not agree that we think it is deficient and, therefore, we ought to vote for it. I think it is deficient and, therefore, we ought to defeat it.

I will be asking for a vote on this bill on final passage but again I commend all of the Members on both sides of the aisle. I know they have done yeoman work on a very difficult issue.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill. I do not think that many people across our country understand the difficult task that the Committee on Armed Services has in putting a bill together such as this and then trying to resolve the literally hundreds of issues with the U.S. Senate. Yet this was done and done successfully. I wholeheartedly congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN], the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, on the leadership he afforded. I also commend our very able staff for the hours they put in on it.

The various issues including the arms control issues are in the ball park. They are not as all of us would want them, but they are there and it is a bill that we can wholeheartedly support.

Just two items very quickly, Mr. Speaker, that I wish to make reference to and they both deal with the State of Missouri but they both deal with

areas that are of national importance. One is the upcoming transfer of the Army Engineering School from Fort Belvoir, VA, to the State of Missouri. This is on track. I compliment the committee on this. I also compliment the committee on the second area of forging ahead and making it possible for the Stealth bomber base to be the first base in America coming into Whiteman Air Force Base in Missouri.

I support the bill. I will vote for it.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out one provision in the bill that I think is a good provision, and I am pleased that the conference committee was willing to leave it in, and that involves the area of accidental launch, the protection against accidental launch of a ballistic missile.

As I think most people understand in this Chamber, but many do not understand at home, if there was to be an accidental launch of a nuclear weapon today, we have no protection by design against that kind of a failure. I think it is important to remember that just in the last couple of years we have had a Soviet cruise-missile crash in Finland that fortunately was unarmed; a Soviet submarine-launched missile landed in China and it also was unarmed. There is not a very good safety record when it comes to Soviet Yankee-class submarines, particularly when we consider the one that burned and sank off Bermuda last year.

I offered an amendment in committee to put language in to study what we would do to protect ourselves against an accidental launch. It passed the House, and Senator WARNER was interested in that issue over in the Senate and it was kept in the bill.

What it will mean is that by March 1988 we will have a report on technology available to protect ourselves against this kind of an accidental launch. I think it is a very positive thing. It is something we can agree upon on a bipartisan basis and that conservatives and liberals together can agree that we ought to be able to use this kind of technology against an accidental launch.

I think this overwhelms the question of SDI. SDI, of course, is the comprehensive approach. This is clearly a more modest approach to what we can do against this kind of possible tragedy.

So I want to thank the chairman for this support of this amendment and to thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] and expressly express my pleasure that this is in the bill and hopefully something that will be enacted and something we clearly need.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. AUCOIN].

Mr. AUCOIN. Mr. Speaker, I think the conference report is a mixed bag. I say that as a liberal and I know that conservatives feel the same way but for different reasons. I signed the conference report with reluctance. I am sure conservatives have as well for their own reasons.

I want to say to my liberal friends in the House on both sides of the aisle that I am as concerned about arms control as I think any Member of the House is, and the reason I am supporting this bill is that we have broken new ground on the question of arms control. I would respectfully disagree with my conservative friends who have spoken prior to me today when they have made assertion that there is no place in a defense bill for arms control.

I would submit that there is no place in a war bill for arms control but for a defense bill I think that there is a place for arms control.

We have two provisions in the bill for arms control. One is the continuation of the ASAT flight test ban. This will make it 3 years in a row that Congress has approved this measure. I think that is sound and as a result America's satellites will be more secure as a result of what we have done here for the last three times now.

Second, we have a major victory in the narrow interpretation of ABM without specifically mentioning the A word, meaning ABM. That apparently passes muster at the White House.

For those Members who wish we could have achieved more on arms control, I say to them that a 100-percent victory simply is not possible. I do not know when it ever is, but I think we have a package that we can support. I urge Members to support it and I thank the chairman of the committee for the good job he has done under very difficult circumstances.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I have several problems with the conference report and I wanted to simply say to my colleague that I think it was really a mistake for us as a legislative body to give up a number of chips to the Soviet Union in arms control that are very much in dispute and that would have accrued to the benefit of the Executive in this country if President Reagan had been allowed to retain these chips on the table before the House and Senate swept them off.

No. 1, with regard to the narrow interpretation of the ABM Treaty which is left in some form in the conference report, our arms ambassador who negotiated the treaty, Paul Nitze, said that the Soviet Union rejected his offer to narrow the ABM Treaty. He

offered it to them and they would not have it.

Now this Congress has unilaterally imposed on our negotiators the position that we had that the Soviet Union rejected at the time that we put this treaty together.

Again this is stripping the Executive of some important chips, some important assets that he could use in negotiations.

Second, I think Members of this Congress are going to look back and reflect on how very critical the Asat Program would have been for the survival of this country's armed forces in time of conflict.

The satellite systems of the Soviet Union are very capable at tracking our naval ships and pursuing them and monitoring them even at a time of conflict.

I might remind the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN] that those same satellite system will be capable of monitoring Midgetman small missiles as they disperse in a time of heightened tension or a time of conflict.

In other words, it may not make any difference whether or not we can move the Midgetman around the country and disperse them if the Soviets have a capability of monitoring these systems on an ongoing basis, and then eliminating them with missiles.

□ 1735

The very safety of our men and women in the Navy depends on our being able to blind the Soviets very quickly in a time of conflict. We are stripping ourselves of that capability by maintaining this Asat moratorium.

So I would say to my colleagues I think we have done some things here that will accrue to the great detriment of the security of the United States, and I am going to vote against this one.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of the conference agreement. I want to compliment the leadership of the committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Chairman ASPIN, and the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. DICKINSON, in crafting a balanced legislative package under very difficult circumstances. I want to take my hat off to the staff of this committee which under remarkable circumstances has been able to produce about four variations of this very important bill, whichever the Chair liked that particular day.

My purpose of being up here is to talk about the arms control package. I noticed that some of my conservative friends are not very happy. I can tell them that there is a pain on this side of the aisle as well, because many Members worked long, diligent hours

trying to craft amendments to keep an arms control structure for this country, and we are not totally satisfied with the work of the conferees either.

But I do believe that what we have done here on restricting the kind of research to the narrow interpretation of the ABM agreement for fiscal year 1988 and fiscal year 1989 is extraordinarily important, and is an amendment I think all of us can be proud of.

On my own amendment on SALT II, we had to give up the language dealing with subceilings, but in a different way we have attacked the problem of the growing offensive weapons deployment beyond the limits of SALT II by allowing for the retirement of a Poseidon submarine. So we keep within close all of being in a policy of interim restraint, and I think it was a decision that was balanced and fair.

We have maintained the very important ban on testing against an object in space, but that is a bilateral agreement, not a unilateral agreement as was suggested by the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER]. If the Soviets break their pledge not to test, then we are in a position to test. So I think this is a fair package.

I want to say one final thing. Right now is an historic moment in this country's history. Mr. Gorbachev is coming here in December, and I am glad to see that a new Secretary of Defense, Mr. Carlucci, was willing to sit down with the chairman and ranking member and work out compromises on these issues, because I believe it is essential for our country to pull together at this critical time in time, for the Congress and the Executive to be unified in an approach to dealing with the Soviet Union because, frankly, I believe we can achieve both an INF agreement and a START agreement during this President's term in office, and I believe for the next 14 months that bipartisanship and cooperation should be the hallmark and what we should be working to accomplish. I would urge my colleagues to support this bill as the first real indication of this administration's willingness to deal with this Congress in an honorable and bipartisan way.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN], a former marine and a fellow who has worked a long time on this bill.

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to clear one thing up with reference to some comments that were made earlier I was detained on the telephone, but I think reference was made to cancellation of the AV8-B Harrier program as well as the A-6 program. The language in the legislation speaks to a level of funding for those 2 programs. If indeed the ne-

gements that are going on in this building and downtown reach a budget authority of 289 or more they are deemed to have been authorized for appropriation. So certainly not in this bill, unless it would be below 289 is there any talk about cancellation. Those programs are very important.

It is interesting to note that as far as close air support is concerned for the Marine Corps, both AV8-B's are a basis upon which the Marine Corps has been planning over a decade as far as their tactics are concerned, and that is very important to the program.

The A-6, which is of course the bulwark of our fleet attack unit, is the kind of weapons that our sailors and our aviators right now in the Persian Gulf point to as being so all important to them.

So I have every confidence that if there is an agreement reached, and we all hope that there is an agreement reached, that that budget authority is going to be above 289 and that certainly does not speak to termination of either of those programs. And I think that is good for the defense of this country.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HUTTO].

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. Like many others, I am not completely happy with it, but I think it is the best conference report we can get. I particularly want to talk a little bit about special operations forces. I am pleased this bill continues our move forward for the special operations forces, and as this body and the world knows, this has been an area that has been neglected by our services.

But last year in our bill, mainly through the work of our Readiness Subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Virginia, DAN DANIEL, and others, we passed some landmark legislation creating a unified command, the U.S. Special Operations Forces. And in this bill we also have some provisions asking the Defense Department and services to continue to move forward.

We have now created a Major Force Program 11, so we will have more vision for the Special Operations Forces and more budgetary authority. We have in place now the CINC commander in chief, Gen. Jim Lindsay, who is going to do an outstanding job. We still do not have the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations Forces and low intensity conflict. We hope we will have that soon.

But in this conference report and this bill we provide that the Secretary of the Army will take this position until the new Assistant Secretary of Defense is confirmed. So it is moving forward for our Special Operations

Forces, and I am pleased we are moving in this direction, and I ask support for the conference report.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, as Members of the House are aware, we have some problems in our nuclear capability with the turning off of the N-reactor in the State of Washington, and the running of the nuclear facilities in Savannah River at a 50-percent rate. As a result, the Subcommittee on Nuclear Military Systems has included in this bill the authorization for a restart of the N-reactor after certification of safety by the Secretary of Energy.

We have authorized \$20 million for a new production reactor, and a report on the site and the technology and schedule of that new reactor.

We are maintaining inertial confinement fusion research which has the prospect of being a source of tritium for the future, in the far future, but it is very important.

We have also accelerated the construction of a special isotope separation facility in the amount of \$30 million, and we are establishing a procedure for interim oversight of the DOE military activities. This would provide for two annual reviews by the National Association of Science, and allow time for the committee to consider a permanent oversight mechanism.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this may be the best bill achievable at this time with this Congress, but in my judgment it is not good enough.

I do not think it makes any sense for us to be legislating arms control restrictions on ourselves as we face a summit with the Soviet Union who is quite capable of negotiating arms control restrictions on us without any assistance from this Congress.

The Antiballistic Missile Treaty must be interpreted under the narrow interpretation. That is something I would like to have the Soviets give something away to get.

It inhibits the development, the testing and the ultimate deployment of the strategic defense initiative, the very reason that the Soviets have come to the table. It underfunds the strategic defense initiative.

I never thought I would live to see a bill in Congress, a Defense authorization bill, that instead of providing for new ships provides for taking ships out of the line, for dismantling, for not overhauling ships. What a lovely message that is to the Soviet Union.

Most telling to me is the antisatellite testing moratorium which effectively kills the program.

So this is great arms control, it is great disarmament, but it is on our shoulders. We are not disarming anybody else, we are just disarming ourselves. These restrictions do not belong in this bill, especially at this time. I think it is counterproductive, I think it is unwise and, therefore, I am going to vote no.

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

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I just briefly want to join with the gentleman from Illinois in his opposition to the DOD authorization.

As a conferee on the arms control panel provisions of this legislation, I must oppose the arms control compromises.

Although I was pleased that the conference dropped unverifiable limitations on nuclear testing, I remain distressed over the conference's statutory interpretation of what this administration can and cannot do under the ABM agreement.

I am also disappointed in the overall level of SDI funding that was agreed to by the conferees.

Given continuing Soviet SALT II violations, I am especially displeased with the conference's new statutory demands for interim restraint, which will result in the dismantlement of a United States submarine.

I am especially displeased with the conference's statutory requirement that we continue to adhere to a hybrid SALT II agreement, an agreement the Soviets have violated, which has expired, and has never been ratified. Moreover, under this compromise, the United States must dismantle a submarine with no similar Soviet action.

Finally, given Soviet programs, I am sorry to see the conference continue the United States Asat moratorium.

Overall, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this compromise does not meet our national security requirements, and I urge my colleagues to seriously consider the implications of the conference's arms compromises.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER].

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, and someone who has spent 25 years of his life involved in aerospace engineering, I rise in support of this bill.

But let me also point out that there is no bill which is perfect, and this bill has its imperfections. I worked on the avionics of the original A-6A aircraft back in the early 1960's at Grumman, and it is a great aircraft, one that has been the workhorse of the Navy over these past many years, and I am greatly disturbed by the fact that in this conference report we have language which specifically prevents us from developing the A-6F, which is the logical and appropriate follow-on to the present A-6E. The A-6F, if it had been funded, would have been

provided with new engines and updated avionics, and would have given our aviators the best possible equipment they could go into the future with.

Let us recognize that A-6 aircraft are going to be on our aircraft carriers for the next 22 years, and with normal attrition, and with the new aircraft carriers we will be adding we will need to buy additional A-6 aircraft. I think it is unfortunate and foolish for us to be denying the opportunity to go ahead with the A-6F aircraft.

The fact of the matter is that it could very well be more expensive over time if we went ahead and bought A-6E's rather than A-6F's, because we must reopen the A-6E line, and we have to pay termination costs on the existing A-6F contracts. I think we will find that for a few dollars more now, we could have given our naval aviators a much better aircraft to fly for the next 22 years.

□ 1750

So it is a good bill overall, it is a good report and I support it. But obviously this is not a perfect conference report. And from my perspective I feel we would have served our Nation better by putting up the money for the A-6F.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I am voting against the conference report on the Defense authorization bill because the agreement represents significant concessions on arms control to the administration and Senate positions. The agreement drops entirely the House provision calling for a moratorium on nuclear testing. On the ABM Treaty provision, the House bill called for no SDI testing that would violate the treaty's narrow interpretation, but the compromise holds the administration to that limit only for 1 year. The House bill called on the Reagan administration to return to the SALT II sublimits, but the compromise simply says Reagan can't violate that treaty any more than he already has. In general, the conferees made substantial concessions to Reagan on arms control matters and, although there is some progress over last year's bill, we could have done better.

Furthermore, the conference report called for a two-tier spending limit, raising spending if the budget negotiations allow. That limit of 296 billion is \$7 billion higher than the bill I supported in the House. The bill also includes millions for MX missiles, rail-mobile MX, and the B-1 bomber, programs that I am opposed to.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on defense authorization, and I would like to congratulate the conferees on a job well done under very difficult circumstances.

However, this is not a perfect conference report and I have some reservations about many funding levels and provisions. Both the low-tier and high-tier funding levels are a little low to complete our commitments and to continue our present defense strategies that have been formulated in the past 6 years. I have long been concerned about the effectiveness of our defense budgeting process. Defense

contractors look to Congress for a rational budget, but we haven't provided it. In 1981 we increased defense spending by 13 percent but then began a period of heavy reductions in 1986 that continues today. With this kind of funding we send confused messages to our contractors, our allies, and the American people. A policy of modest but consistent increases in defense funding would bring some rationality back after the feast of famine approach of the last several years.

The compromise on arms control provisions, though not completely satisfactory, makes passage and enactment of the bill much more likely. I congratulate the conferees on their agreements on the ABM Treaty, although I oppose the limitation on antisatellite weapons development.

On the whole, the bill is a series of workable compromises which, though not pleasing to all, represents balanced funding in today's tight budgetary environment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I have one remaining speaker. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I came to this Chamber to vote for defense authorization and defense appropriation bills but because we appropriate so much of the purview of foreign affairs and foreign affairs duties and those duties assigned to the executive branch of Government, I find myself for the first time voting against the Defense authorization bill last year and I will do it again this year.

Now we have a fast-moving train to allow the first dictator ever, the first head of a police state, the first Communist ever to address this body in not joint session, but joint meeting. It is going to take place 3 weeks from today unless some of us block it, at 10 o'clock in the morning. And he is going to stand right up here at this lectern where Douglas MacArthur stood and Winston Churchill stood three times. And I will tell you what Mr. Gorbachev will probably tell us, if he is allowed in here: That he likes this authorization bill, he likes son-of-SALT II, that he likes shutting down our Asat testing, that he likes this cutting of the defenses of the United States of America.

I do not want to vote for something that Mr. Gorbachev would like and frankly I look forward to meeting with Mr. Gorbachev in the halls, in one of our caucus rooms but I do not want that Communist dictator standing up there congratulating the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a conference report that we are asked to approve

today, almost 1,800 pages. It has been a long, arduous process. I think we have done the best we could under the circumstances. I am going to vote for it. I am asking my colleagues to vote for it.

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

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device and there were—yeas 264, nays 158, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 4401

YEAS—264

Ackerman	Davis (MI)	Hayes (LA)
Akaka	de la Garza	Hefner
Alexander	Derrick	Hertel
Anderson	Dickinson	Hochbrueckner
Andrews	Dicks	Holloway
Annunzio	Dingell	Horton
Anthony	Dixon	Houghton
Aspin	Dorgan (ND)	Howard
Atkins	Downey	Hoyer
AuCoin	Duncan	Hubbard
Badham	Dwyer	Huckaby
Baker	Dyson	Hughes
Barnard	English	Hutto
Bateman	Erdreich	Jacobs
Berman	Espy	Jeffords
Bevill	Fascell	Jenkins
Bilbray	Fawell	Johnson (CT)
Billey	Fazio	Jones (NC)
Boehlert	Fish	Jones (TN)
Boggs	Flake	Kanjorski
Boland	Flippo	Kaptur
Bonior	Florio	Kennelly
Bonker	Foglietta	Kleczka
Borski	Foley	Kolter
Bosco	Ford (MI)	Konnyu
Boucher	Ford (TN)	Kostmayer
Boulier	Frost	Lancaster
Brennan	Gallo	Lantos
Brooks	Garcia	Leath (TX)
Brown (CA)	Gaydos	Lehman (CA)
Bryant	Gejdenson	Leland
Bustamante	Gibbons	Lent
Byron	Gilman	Levin (MI)
Callahan	Glickman	Levine (CA)
Campbell	Gonzalez	Lipinski
Cardin	Goodling	Livingston
Carper	Gordon	Lloyd
Carr	Gradison	Lott
Chandler	Grandy	Lowry (WA)
Chapman	Grant	Lujan
Chappell	Gray (IL)	MacKay
Clarke	Gray (PA)	Madigan
Clinger	Green	Manton
Coats	Gregg	Markey
Coleman (MO)	Guarini	Martin (NY)
Coleman (TX)	Gundersen	Martinez
Conte	Hall (OH)	Matsui
Cooper	Hamilton	Mavroules
Coughlin	Hammerschmidt	Mazzoli
Coyne	Hansen	McCloskey
Daniel	Harris	McCurdy
Darden	Hatcher	McDade

McHugh	Ravenel
McMillen (MD)	Ray
Meyers	Regula
Mica	Richardson
Miller (OH)	Ridge
Moakley	Rinaldo
Molinari	Ritter
Mollohan	Robinson
Montgomery	Roe
Moody	Rose
Morella	Rostenkowski
Morrison (CT)	Roukema
Morrison (WA)	Rowland (CT)
Murtha	Rowland (GA)
Myers	Sabo
Natcher	Saiki
Neal	Sawyer
Nelson	Saxton
Nichols	Schneider
Nowak	Schulze
Oakar	Schumer
Olin	Sharp
Ortiz	Shays
Owens (UT)	Shuster
Oxley	Sisisky
Panetta	Skaggs
Parris	Skelton
Patterson	Slattery
Pepper	Slaughter (NY)
Perkins	Smith (FL)
Pickett	Smith (NJ)
Pickle	Smith (TX)
Porter	Smith, Robert (OR)
Price (IL)	Snowe
Price (NC)	Spence
Quillen	Spratt

NAYS—158

Applegate	Hastert
Archer	Hawkins
Armey	Hayes (IL)
Ballenger	Hefley
Bartlett	Henry
Barton	Herger
Bates	Hiler
Beilenson	Hopkins
Bennett	Hunter
Bentley	Hyde
Bereuter	Inhofe
Bilirakis	Ireland
Boxer	Johnson (SD)
Broomfield	Jontz
Brown (CO)	Kasich
Bruce	Kastenmeier
Buechner	Kennedy
Bunning	Kildee
Burton	Kolbe
Cheney	Kyl
Clay	LaFalce
Coble	Lagomarsino
Collins	Latta
Combest	Leach (IA)
Conyers	Lehman (FL)
Courter	Lewis (CA)
Craig	Lewis (FL)
Crane	Lewis (GA)
Crockett	Lightfoot
Dannemeyer	Lowery (CA)
Daub	Lukens, Thomas
Davis (IL)	Lukens, Donald
Defazio	Lungen
DeLay	Mack
Dellums	Marlenee
DeWine	Martin (IL)
DioGuardi	McCandless
Donnelly	McCollum
Dornan (CA)	McEwen
Dreier	McGrath
Durbin	McMillan (NC)
Early	Mfume
Eckart	Michel
Edwards (CA)	Miller (CA)
Edwards (OK)	Miller (WA)
Emerson	Mineta
Evans	Moorhead
Feighan	Mrazek
Fields	Murphy
Frenzel	Nagle
Gallegly	Nelson
Gekas	Oberstar
Gingrich	Obey
Hall (TX)	Owens (NY)

St Germain	NOT VOTING—11
Staggers	Biaggi
Stenholm	Frank
Stratton	Gephhardt
Sweeney	Kemp
Swift	Dowdy
Synar	Roemer
Tallan	
Tauzin	
Taylor	
Thomas (GA)	
Torricelli	
Traxler	
Sabo	
Upton	
Valentine	
Vander Jagt	
Vento	
Visclosky	
Volkmer	
Walgren	
Watkins	
Waxman	
Weldon	
Wheat	
Whitten	
Wilson	
Wise	
Wolpe	
Wortley	
Wylie	
Yates	
Yatron	
Young (AK)	

□ 1805

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Solarz for, with Mr. Kemp against.

Messrs. APPLEGATE, LEWIS of Georgia, SAVAGE, PASHAYAN, RHODES, BARTLETT, LEACH of Iowa, BEREUTER, MOORHEAD, LATTA, and STANGELAND changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. SWEENEY, PARRIS, MOODY, and RITTER changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

CONGRATULATIONS FROM THE AUSTRALIAN SENATE ON THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF OUR CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to alert our colleagues to the fact that on October 7, 1987, the Australian Senate adopted a resolution congratulating the United States on the 200th anniversary of our Constitution.

The President of the Australian Senate, the Honorable Kerry Sibraa, and the Australian Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade, the Honorable Bill Hayden, MP, wanted Members of the House of Representatives to know of the passage of this resolution. Australia is a longtime friend and trusted ally of the United States. We value that friendship very highly, and I am pleased about the action taken by the Australian Senate.

So that our colleagues might have the benefit of reading the congratulatory message from Australia, I include the text of the resolution at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

RESOLUTION OF THE AUSTRALIAN SENATE

* * * the Senate

(a) notes the 200th Anniversary of the United States Constitution and conveys its congratulations to the people of the United States on the 200 year existence of this dynamic document which has been the foundation of efforts to protect and maintain some of the most important fundamental rights in a Democratic country; and

(b) applauds the United States Constitution as a splendid example of commitment to liberty and wishes the people of the United States well for their celebrations and the continuing vitality of their Constitution.

At a time when democracy seems buffeted and under attack from many quarters, those nations, founded on the principle of the rule of law and the sovereignty of the people, need to maintain the closest possible ties and cultivate the deepest possible mutual understanding. I am sure that I speak for all Members of this House—indeed for all Americans—in expressing our sincere gratitude to the Australian Senate and to the people of Australia for the warm sentiments contained in this resolution.

PLANNED ADDRESS BY GORBACHEV IN JOINT MEETING FACES EXTREME OPPOSITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I just want to take the floor for a few minutes to talk about the idea that we are going to have a dictator, the head of the Soviet empire, speak to a joint meeting of the Congress and stand right up here.

It seems to me that anyone who looks back in history would ask the question: Would Winston Churchill have sat and allowed the Parliament to listen to Adolf Hitler? Would we ask any one of our friends who is worried about apartheid in South Africa if they would tolerate the head of the South African Government to speak to a joint session? We can appreciate why those of us who love freedom and who are worried about the Soviet empire think it is impossible to allow Gorbachev to speak to the United States House.

Let me draw the distinction. I think the head of the Soviet empire should come to Washington. I think the head of the Soviet Union should talk to the President of the United States. I think diplomacy at that level makes sense. But to suggest that we should honor a dictator because he heads a police state, that we should allow him to stand in this Chamber flanked by the portraits of Washington and Lafayette, that we should pretend that he has moral legitimacy when he is a tyrant, strikes me as not only wrong, but as a Georgian I am particularly offended at the idea that the man who promoted the general in charge of killing Larry McDonald and shooting

down 007, the man who was in charge of Maj. Arthur Nicholson, who was killed, the man who is in charge of the Soviet Army that continues to occupy Afghanistan, killing children and burning villages, the man who is in charge of a country which uses a legal framework for psychiatric torture, a man who was in charge during the period when Daniloff, the Moscow correspondent for U.S. News & World Report, was arrested, the man who was in charge at a time when Anatole Marchenko died in Cristobal prison because of starvation and the tactics used in the Soviet gulag, that that man would be allowed to speak in the United States House strikes me as something that no American could stand.

I hope that every one of my colleagues will follow one of two paths: That they will either join me in standing up and walking out before Gorbachev speaks, protesting the allowing of a tyrant to speak in this House, or if they find that too disruptive, then they can boycott the session. And I hope we will ask those who are witnesses to freedom, people like Shcharansky, to stand up and offer an alternative speech at the same hour.

Finally, I would say to every Member of this House that we should recognize that in the 1 hour we would be honoring Gorbachev, 10 or 15 people will be killed in Afghanistan, probably 1 or 2 children crippled, several people will be tortured in the Soviet empire, dozens of people will be sent to the gulag, hundreds of people in Poland and East Germany and Czechoslovakia will be repressed, 3 or 4 people will be killed in Angola, and 1 or 2 people will be killed in Nicaragua; all of that will happen during the hour that Gorbachev will stand here.

□ 1815

I would say to all of the Members before they suggest to me that it would be inappropriate to insult Gorbachev by standing up and walking out, ask yourself if this was 1938, and Adolf Hitler had been invited to speak to the British Parliament, what would Winston Churchill have done?

In looking backward, would we be prouder of those who stayed and applauded, or prouder of those who stood up and said, "Freedom is too important to pretend that a tyrant is free."

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

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

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

I want to commend the gentleman for his comments and associate myself with his remarks, but I am wondering if it has occurred to the gentleman that now that it has been established that the House of Representatives has

a coequal right in the conduct of foreign policy, maybe Mr. Gorbachev is going to be down here negotiating a separate agreement from that which is going to be negotiated with the President.

It might be altogether appropriate to have him down here.

Mr. GINGRICH. If our choice is to have a 90-minute secret meeting between Gorbachev and Speaker WRIGHT, or appear in public on the Hill, probably America is safer to not allow Gorbachev and the Speaker to meet in secret for 90 minutes.

I hope every Member of this House will keep their seat in the gallery and will give that seat to a freedom fighter, that an Afghan or a Nicaraguan or Cuban or Angolan can sit on, so if Gorbachev is allowed to come, he will face true freedom.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

I certainly would be the last one to stand here and defend Mr. Gorbachev, but I think if we are going to get the entire perspective of the gentleman's argument, the gentleman would also have to point out that the Soviet Union lost more than 20 million people fighting as an ally of the United States in World War II, so the gentleman ought to take that into consideration.

TRIBUTE TO HOUSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS EMPLOYEES WITH 10 AND 15 YEARS OF SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, last week I had the opportunity to present length-of-service awards to employees of House Information Systems and I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues their exemplary, loyal and dedicated service. Thirty employees were recognized for 10 or 15 years' service with H.I.S.

TEN YEARS

Joe David Berg, Gerald L. Boho, Michael Botos, Michael B. Bowman, Mark D. Brickman, Richard M. Carfagno, John Timothy Cavanaugh, Teddy R. Compton, Gail A. Grieder, Trevera R. Jackson, Sandra A. Jolley, Keith Edward Keller, Charles R. McCall, Jr., Frank J. Milasi, Linda M. Preshlock, Harry Sanders, Memory F. Sherard, Carolyn S. Stoneberg, William E. Wade, Jr., William Welch, and Gary A. Winters.

FIFTEEN YEARS

K. Michael Frazier, William E. Freeman, Jr., Robert William Garrett, Thomas J. Hawk, Margaret Mary Hyland, Roberts J. Mumma, John T. Reed, Jasper T. Wagliardo, and Vernon J. Walters.

These employees are among our most skilled; they collectively represent 345 years of computer experience in the House. Some of them see to it that the electronic voting system functions at the highest degree of reliability. Some work with the Clerk's staff to ensure that our payroll is met on time every month. Thanks to their efforts, the H.I.S. computers have achieved a reliability of over 99.5 percent. They respond to our computer needs, produce our charts, process our surveys, answer our questions, provide information as needed, and help us publish our hearings.

I know all of you join me in extending our thanks and appreciation to these invaluable members of the House family.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, usually it has been the procedure to allow unanimous-consent requests before we went to the 60-minute special orders.

Could I avail myself of that, and ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

GORBACHEV SHOULD NOT ADDRESS JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, before I address this Gorbachev problem, and I have some new insights and some new information to share with the Members, let me respond to the gentleman from Illinois who served in this distinguished body for 24 years, and in all of those 24 years, the gentleman has never seen a dictator ever take that sacred spot, sacred in the political sense, at that lectern that Winston Churchill has stood at. Going over history, and my heart goes out to a nation that has to suffer the Nazi onslaught and lose 20 million people, but remember that government under a terrorist leader who killed more people than Adolf Hitler, Stalin, had signed with Hitler the most ignominious, disgraceful pact in all of modern History, the Hitler/Stalin pact signed off on by von Ribbentrop and Molotov.

They sliced the country of Poland in half and condemned three brandnew republics to tyranny; Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and just because Stalin got cross with his defenses, ignoring all the advice of his intelligence and spies, killed over 2 million of his soldiers, rolled all the way up to the gates of Moscow on December 6, 1941,

because that happened to them under the tyrant who killed in the 1930's in the purges 98 of his 137 best friends.

Because Stalin got it in the teeth from his former partner, Adolf Hitler, does not mean that we have to cave in on that piece of history of 20 million citizens killed by Adolf Hitler, and allow a Communist dictator to speak from this platform.

I want to tell the Members what the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] said earlier. He said that Mr. Gorbachev represents a state that is the largest violator of human rights on this fragile little planet. There are more people in Soviet gulag prisons than anywhere else in the world, because their population is bigger.

Ortega has more prorated to population, but the Soviet Union has more, because it is a nation of 278 million people.

Consider this: A Soviet fighter, a Sukhoi 15 on September 1, August 31 here, murdered 269 innocent people on KAL, Korean 007, and one was a Democratic gentleman, very far to the right in this Chamber, the most conservative of all the Democrats.

I did not vote with him sometimes, but he was a medical doctor, a Navy captain, and as decent and pleasant a person as ever served in this Chamber.

They not only have never apologized for murdering a U.S. Congressman, only the second to die in the line of duty, the first murdered in November 1978 doing constituent service in Guyana; but this Congressman, Larry McDonald, they promoted the pilot to colonel, and had a rare Western-style press conference in Moscow where Ogarlov conducted this press conference and said, "We are glad we did it, we will do it again."

No reparations have ever been talked about for the 269 victims of that flight. Do you think we are going to invite Captain McDonald to sit in the gallery, or the parents of Arthur D. Nicholson, from the district of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. ROWLAND] who was gunned down a couple of years ago, and his sergeant begging to give first aid to Major Nicholson, bleeding to death in front of the Soviet soldiers who killed them. They said it was a mistake.

Do you know that the reason not many people will watch Ronald Reagan on television, and here is the quid pro quo, that Reagan is going to get to tape something, and it will be sent to the Soviet Union.

How many TV sets are in the Soviet Union? Look at your U.S. statistical abstract book. Do you know why there are not more consumer goods in the Soviet Union? Because they give \$4 million every day to Ortega, \$13 million to Castro, \$9 million to the Communist oppressors in Vietnam.

That is why there is no money in the Soviet Union. Their colonies are all

over this Earth, and they are expanding, denying their people freedom and consumer goods to fund these Communist revolutions everywhere.

□ 1830

The reason our good Speaker got his tail in the wringer this week is because Ortega gets \$4 million a day. That is \$1½ billion a year from Gorbachev. Gorbachev himself has ordered that Soviet combat commanders command every battalion and regiment that began an offensive in mid-July against UNITA and Jonas Savimbi in Angola.

Gorbachev has signed off on these KGB-designed bombs that blow the hands off children in Afghanistan. They have genocided over 2 million people in Afghanistan.

A Democrat leads a delegation there. A week from tonight I will be at the Khyber Pass. Am I going to tell the Mujahadeen there fighting for their freedom that December 9 we got the world's leading dictator who finances other dictators? No. We cannot do this. Meet with him at the Departmental Auditorium on Constitution Avenue. Let us meet with him in other venues. Let us talk with him. Let us toast our grandchildren, but not in this sacred citadel of liberty will a Communist dictator break that 200-year rule of no dictators defiling this chamber. It would be like the Romans coming into Solomon's temple. Even the Romans who conquered the Jews knew they had to meet with them on neutral ground.

THE GORBACHEV VISIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the Speaker for this time.

That is a tough act to follow, Bob.

Let us just talk a little bit about current history. Four hundred thousand Soviet Jews want to leave the Soviet Union. They are suffering under oppression right now, as well as other religious leaders over there.

We send letters to Secretary Gorbachev on a weekly basis, Democrats and Republicans alike, pleading for those people, pleading for fair treatment for those people, pleading for them to be reunited with their families here in the United States, but most of the time those letters fall on deaf ears.

The Bolshevik Revolution, which took place in 1917, 70 years ago, started a genocide that has been unparalleled in human history. Fifty million people have been killed at the hands of the Soviet tyrants. Millions of people have been committed to gulags. The repression goes beyond the borders of the Soviet Union. They sent \$2 billion in military assistance into

Angola to fight the freedom fighters there under the leadership of Dr. Savimbi. They have Soviet generals there right now trying to expand the Soviet empire.

In Mozambique, they sent \$2 billion, and they have Soviet advisers there, as well as Cubans.

In Angola, they have 40,000 of their surrogates, the Cubans there, trying to impose their will on a people who want to be free.

In Afghanistan they have their own troops. In Afghanistan they have their own troops and have killed over 1 million people and have forced 4 million people to flee that country.

In Nicaragua, in Central America, we debate this all the time in this body, there are 36,000 tons of additional war materials going in there this year.

They sent 68,000 tons into Cuba last year and they are going to send more than that into Cuba this year, and that military tonnage is going to be used to expand the Soviet empire through her surrogates in Central and South America.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the gentleman yielding. He is raising, in my opinion, some very important points. The previous gentleman from the State of California has raised some important points.

I think it is important that the American public knows that this is not a partisan debate. The gentleman from California and the gentleman from Indiana who have risen are both members of the President's party. Of course, the Speaker and the leader of the Senate are of the Democratic Party.

Is the gentleman aware, and I believe he is, that the President has requested this, that Secretary General Gorbachev speak to a joint session of Congress.

Furthermore, I know the gentleman is aware of the fact that the Speaker and the majority leader of the Senate have never in that same 200-year history, of which the gentleman from California spoke, denied a President's request to have somebody speak before a joint session of Congress.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Well, if I might reclaim my time, I have great respect for and admiration for President Reagan, but as an elected Representative of the people of the Sixth District of Indiana, I beg to differ with him. I think he is wrong. I think the President is dead wrong in inviting Gorbachev to speak before this body.

Mr. DORAN of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DORNAN of California. I want to reinforce, in fairness, what the gentleman has said, because I have spoken to all four of our major leaders in this Chamber and the other today. Mr. WRIGHT is uneasy about this, and so is the gentleman who leads the other Chamber, so are the minority Republican leaders.

God knows I have defended this President for 22 years. I have been with him in every battle and he is my hero, but there is one thing in his great life he has not done and that is to serve in this great House or the other great Chamber. His Vice President has.

The President cannot seem to distinguish, and he is starting to now, between a state dinner, a function at the Departmental Auditorium or the Caucus Rooms or the ballroom of one of our hotels, us toasting our grandchildren as I have done in the Soviet Union, and that gets their attention because we all love our children and grandchildren, but that is all different.

I am telling you, Mr. President, and I have spoken to you outside the walls of this House before, using the unmentionable electronic means, I beg you, Mr. President, this Chamber is different than a state dinner or the Ben Franklin top floor at the State Department. The President is dead wrong. The gentleman is correct.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am happy to yield to our distinguished leader.

Mr. MICHEL. I was not sure, I was not paying attention to everything that was being said here during the course of this special order, but if I heard the gentleman say that the President was wrong in inviting Mr. Gorbachev to come to this Chamber, then that is in error. The President invited Secretary Gorbachev to come to our country to participate in the signing of an INF agreement.

Now, when it comes to this body, that is something else again. The way I understand it, first of all, I think we have made it clear as a government that just talking to the President, you know, there are several elements in our system and he may very well converse and have an agreement with the President, but we do have one body of this Congress that under our Constitution has got to ultimately ratify a treaty.

Do not be misled that simply getting the President's agreement locks up the deal for posterity, because it does not. Just getting a point across of how important the Congress itself is in what-

ever the President does in combination.

Now, having said that, it is my understanding through the Soviet Council and our State Department, there has been a request that they be given an opportunity to present the Secretary to the Congress in some form. I guess, let us face it. Dobrynin spent so many years here, he knows exactly how this system works. They are all probably better informed on how we operate than we are on how they operate.

So some request was made, but I would be remiss if I did not say that it has been discouraged, because I think people are quite well aware of the strong feelings that not only the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but a good body of the Members do feel.

Now, the President, obviously, will courteously accept the General Secretary when he is here, because he has invited him. He certainly has got to have a state dinner under protocol. I suspect they will have something over at the Russian Embassy the night following and the President will be obliged to go there.

Now, what happens in between I am not sure what will be orchestrated. Security is absolutely a critical matter in this thing.

I know that in times past we have had foreign dignitaries come to this country and we have had maybe coffees or teas or something less formal than an address before a joint session of the Congress and we have been able to handle that to some degree.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I continue to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. Well, I did not want to intrude, other than to correct the record so far as who was issuing what invitations.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Well, the gentleman on the other side indicated that the President extended that invitation to speak before the Congress. I assumed that he was correct. I said on the basis of that assumption that if the President made that statement, then I think the President was in error, but assuming the President did not say that, it was an invitation extended by the leadership of this body and the other body, then I would say that they are in error.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DORNAN of California. I just wanted to make something clear. If we

look at this from the Soviet position, Mr. Khrushchev asked permission to address this body and it was denied under President Eisenhower's administration. He also was denied a trip to Disneyland, which I thought was rather frivolous. I thought we should let him see how our parents enjoy their free time with their children. I would hope that Mr. Gorbachev will visit Disneyworld or Disneyland or the Presidential ranch at Rancho del Cielo, and he will see the flavor of American life. Let him drive through, if not Granada, the San Fernando Valley, Granada Hills, let him drive through some neighborhood in the area of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], one of these beautiful middle-class neighborhoods, see what we enjoy in this country; but if we could deny Mr. Khrushchev going to Disneyland, I think we have to explain to the President how we feel about this Chamber and its rare courtesy that we extend to people, even if they are monarchs who respect political rights, human rights, and democracy.

I think that the President has to realize that he has put our leadership in both parties in a terribly embarrassing position and they are rolling their eyes at me and saying, "Well, help get us off his book."

So I repeat, Mr. President, suggest a departmental auditorium or some beautiful hotel and we will all meet with Mr. Gorbachev and exchange questions and answers after he gives us his world view of liberty and freedom, which has got to be rather peculiar.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Well, let me just end my part of this special order by saying that I think back to the beginning of this Republic when our Founding Fathers were fighting King George because of taxation without representation. I cannot imagine George Washington and Thomas Jefferson and Adams and Franklin sitting down with King George addressing the Congress. He was much less of a tyrant than what we see in the Soviet Union today.

So I think we ought to urge our leaders to withdraw this request. Everybody will be happy. Mr. Gorbachev can meet with our leaders and discuss what he wants to in some other place that is more appropriate, but I certainly do not think he ought to be in the bastion of freedom and liberty as a tyrant and the leader of the Communist world.

LET MR. GORBACHEV ADDRESS THE CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, first let me say that I had not planned to take any time on this subject, but so my colleagues know where I am coming from, I was in a foxhole for 2 years in North Africa and Italy, a past commander of the American Legion, and a lifetime member of the VFW, so I do not take a backseat to anybody on either side when it comes to patriotism.

But here we are, Mr. Speaker, spending ourselves into oblivion, building weapons on top of weapons, on top of weapons, because of one single country, the Soviet Union.

There is a building down here very nearby the Capitol called the National Archives, and Mr. Speaker, inscribed on that building are the words, "The past is prologue."

I can recall Haile Selassie, who was a dictator, coming here and speaking to this Congress. I can recall when we had the adversaries of Communist China speaking like those on the floor today. China had their death squads and we could enumerate all the numbers that have been mentioned by the minority Members. I recall a member of your party, a President Richard Nixon, who said, "It's time we stopped confrontation and tried to find some type of accommodation to bring peace in the world."

And he sent GEORGE BUSH to China, a Communist country. You can recite all the same history you have recited about the Soviet Union, and thank God because of the foresight of Richard Nixon we now have one-fourth of the entire population in the world who are now our friends and who are trading with us. We even have a surplus in trade of over \$500 million in the last calendar year. We go there. They come here. We now have friends in that part of the world, right on the border of the Soviet Union.

Here is a man who has been invited by President Reagan to the United States; we probably know what he is going to say, but this is the bastion of freedom. What is wrong with opening up our hearts and our doors and saying, "Let's hear what you have to say, Mr. Gorbachev."

Are we afraid of the truth? Are we afraid of lies? This is a country of people who are an intelligent class of people. They are not afraid of what is going to come over the airwaves or what Mr. Gorbachev is going to say from the podium in the House, but it is a gesture of saying, "We are tired of building weapons. We are tired of the threat of destroying humanity with these God-awful weapons. Let's at least talk."

And your President, I would say to my friends on that side of the aisle, feels that way or our country would not have worked so hard for this INF

Treaty. We would not be working so hard to eliminate intercontinental ballistic missiles. We would not be working so hard to find some day, some way of cutting down on all nuclear weapons, and you are not going to do it with the adversarial position that you take of asking people to get in the galleries and walk out in protest and walking out yourselves and not allowing the leader of the Communist world to come, by slapping him in the face. You are not going to get Mr. Gorbachev to come and say, "I want to cut back on intermediate range missiles. I want to do all these things," when he knows that Congress, the people's representatives, are slapping him in the face.

Let us show them our hand. We do not have to believe everything that he says, but let us listen to what he says and hope that somewhere, some time, somehow we will be able to get rid of these awful weapons and have peace in America and around the world, so our children and generations yet unborn will not have to worry about what we have to be worried about today, and that is spending ourselves silly on defense. We just voted almost \$308 billion for just 1 year. Look at the jobs, housing, education, and other people programs we could buy with just a portion of that money.

Let us give him a chance. Let us vote unanimously to bring him to that podium, hear what he has to say. Then we have all the time we want under the 5-minute rule or under an hour's special order to get up and answer him if we need to.

□ 1845

But what is the gentleman afraid of, I say to my friend from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], what is my colleague afraid of? Let the man come and talk and see what he has to offer?

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

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. I yield to my friend from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. First of all, my friend talks about disarmament. I just want to touch on that briefly. They have violated almost every treaty they ever signed with us. That is No. 1.

No. 2, I do not know whether my colleague heard the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] a while ago, but they are still dropping plastic bombs that are blowing off the hands and feet of children of Afghanistan, these bombs are made to look like toys. They have killed 1 million of the people of that country and they have driven 4 million Afghans out of their country and they are supplying Communist regimes that are expanding their revolutions in other parts of the world.

I am vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, and I can tell the

gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] with certainty that they are exporting revolution right this minute in southern Africa and in Central America and in South America. Having him come into this bastion of freedom is the wrong thing to do.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman keeps saying "they." Most of the things that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] talks about, Mr. Gorbachev was not even in control of the central committee at that time. We have a new day. We have at least a new hope and let us find out what that hope is. We are not going to be able to find out unless the leader of the Soviet Union comes here and is able to say what is on his mind.

We do not have to agree with him, but I think this bastion of freedom ought to be able to open up the doors just like a minister does at church. The preacher does not stand at the front door saying "You are a sinner, do not come in." Or, "You have committed this act or that act, and you are not welcome here."

He brings them all in and gives them the message of love, peace, and the church.

That is what we ought to do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] has expired.

THE STANDARD FOR THOSE WHO ADDRESS A JOINT SESSION OF THE CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the question we have been talking about here is not a question of patriotism, I would say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY]. It is not a question of free speech. The question that we are asking here is a moral question. It is a question of who shall be given the honor of addressing the greatest single legislative body in the world, the most democratic body in terms of its election by people, that exists in the world.

If my colleague will look over here to my left, he will see Lafayette. Lafayette set the standard by which we judge who it is who steps to that podium.

What we decided when we had Lafayette be the first person who addressed a joint session of Congress was that those who stand at that podium ought to be people who stand by our side in defending our freedom, in defending human rights, in promoting the goals of democracy. That is what that podium is all about. That is the reason why presidents come and speak from that podium. That is the reason

why that podium does hold a special honored place, and why people like Churchill have been invited to address us from that podium, as was Konrad Adenauer, and why some people have been turned down even though they are allies of ours.

On many occasions we have turned down people who have requested that they be given a chance to address a joint session because they have not met the standard that has been set. They do not meet the standard that was set at the time that Lafayette first came here.

I would say to my colleague that that is the key question here.

Last evening I attended a dinner where the chief speaker was Vladimir Bukovsky, the famous Soviet dissident. At that dinner Mr. Bukovsky made the point that too often in the West we fail to understand when we are presented with real moral questions.

I hope we do not misunderstand at this time. I hope we understand that there is a moral question involved here about who steps to that podium and who uses that bully pulpit in order to address the world.

In the case of Mr. Gorbachev, Mr. Gorbachev may be trying to do things better in the Soviet Union, however we do not know. But that does not give him the right to suggest that he stands for freedom, to suggest that he stands for human rights, and to suggest that he stands for the advancement of democracy.

I would say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] that free speech is wonderful and we ought to arrange an opportunity for Members of Congress to go somewhere and exchange ideas with Mr. Gorbachev while he is here. That would be very appropriate. It would be very worthwhile I think.

But to accord him the singular honor that we have denied to so many others I think would be a travesty. I am disappointed that the President may have extended an invitation. I am disappointed that we would go along. But I would say, in trying to clear up some misconceptions here tonight, we have turned down a Soviet leader before and that was Mr. Khrushchev. It is my understanding that the Congress turned down Mr. Khrushchev. It was not the administration as my friend from California [Mr. DORNAN] has stated. It was the U.S. Senate who at that time made a determination that they did not want Mr. Khrushchev to come before a joint session of Congress.

I would hope we would do the same again. I would hope that we would say to this Soviet leader that we will be glad to meet with him, will be glad to talk with him but we are not going to accord him the singular highest honor that this country can bestow upon a visiting foreign head of state. We are not going to send him before a joint

session of Congress. We are going to reserve that for the people who meet the test of Lafayette that they stand for freedom, democracy, and human rights.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Can the gentleman mention one single world leader that has been refused the chance of standing at that podium and speaking to the House of Representatives at the request of the President of the United States.

Mr. WALKER. I do not have the exact names at this time for the gentleman, but I will tell the gentleman that I could get a list.

Wait a second, I can. Nikita Khrushchev.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. If the gentleman will continue to yield, but he was not rejected by this body. The U.S. Senate did that, but not this body.

Mr. WALKER. But it was by the Congress.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I asked the gentleman about the House of Representatives.

Mr. WALKER. The House of Representatives, I cannot name them, but I can give the gentleman a considerable list. I think we have had some people in the fairly recent past who have been visitors to this country whose names I cannot give off the top of my head. I do not want to make a mistake. I am trying to be very accurate here. But I will tell the gentleman that we have turned down people from holding that honored position and it seems to me there is a particularly good case for holding that standard very high now and in the future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has expired.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the gentleman to have 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker does not think that in the normal course of business under the regular order that speeches should be prolonged. Generally a speech over 5 minutes is in the longer category, and speeches during special orders are supposed to be limited to 5 minutes.

We made an exception already for the minority leader. The Chair is afraid should this trend continue.

Mr. DORNAN of California. The Speaker is correct, and I accept that ruling.

Mr. WALKER. The Chair is correct.

CONSEQUENCES OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN HIGH-TECH COMPUTER EQUIPMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, An economic world war is being fought over machines. Who is making them, who is selling them to whom, and who is losing market and the manufacturing capacity to produce machines.

The American people are hearing about Toshiba selling machinery to the Russians, several sales as a matter of fact. And it is an accepted fact that the United States is losing its machine tool manufacturing to foreign import penetration of the American market.

However, little is heard or talked about of the impact of computers—ours, theirs, anybody's—on our every day lives.

□ 1855

The biggest stories about machines—computers, recently—was the impact the programmed computer sales had on the stock market. Everyone became aware—almost in a few hours—of the effect on the markets of the automatic sale orders moving through the software programs of the computers.

It is interesting to me that the Stock Exchange board of governors recognized the power of electronic transfers inside the system so quickly and moved to stop them until the market settled down.

In a study of the run on the Continental Bank of Illinois a couple of years ago, in news reports, I noted the lack of preparation the bank had, both physically and mentally, to handle the tremendous sums which were being drawn out of the bank by electronic impulses.

This movement of wealth over telephone wires is a modern phenomena which has made me wonder about the capability of our institutions to cope when there is hardly the time to think about what is happening—let alone stop it.

Watching the zip-zip movement of money across international boundaries makes me wonder if all of our institutions are as prepared as the stock market to handle international monetary demands which can occur every time crisis situation develops.

I have never been comfortable with the idea of global interdependence and I am not at all sure that we have projected all the possible ramifications of being dependent upon the good will of a neighbor or ally when it comes to needing money.

Mr. Watson's wonderful machine has dulled the lustre of gold and silver as wealth—too difficult to move across international lines—now, wealth for a nation seems to have only become

what the blips on a machine say it is. This bothers me. Coming from a District—in Maryland—where we have part of the port business—I have seen too many big longshoremen challenge each other “to prove it.”

In a way, I think the recent foreign purchases inside this country of real assets is an effort by our creditors to insure that the electronic blips we’ve been sending abroad are real. They ask us to “prove it!” And we are.

Now the blips going abroad will not only represent money for our purchases of foreign items, but will be representing the income being sent offshore on wealth producing properties inside the country. The blips will also be taking tax revenues with them—revenues which formerly were paid to the Treasurer of the United States.

Has the Treasury come to grips with the electronic transfer of wealth offshore? Do we have mechanisms in place that foreign investors pay the government on profits moving offshore? I don’t know. Since the requirement for foreign investors to register with our Government has been dropped out of the trade bill—I seriously doubt it. In the 1984 tax bill, a law which collected a 30-percent tax on foreign profits made in this country was deleted.

Since that time, we have had a lot more foreign investments coming in and I suspect, we have lost a lot of taxes.

If I am right, I think we had better bring our taxing structure into the modern world and study what we can do about it.

In this whole area of computerization, I have been doing some investigating. Like many of us, in my previous professions, I was not exposed to computers—oh, the word processing, was familiar, but the information storage and retrieval, the electronic transfer of money, book keeping—all of those procedures were not familiar to me.

I have found out some interesting things which I would like to share with you. The government uses a lot of computers and many of them are made by foreign corporations. I asked about the security of the information stored in those computers and I found out that computer security is a very difficult thing to guarantee.

If you recall some of the NATO computer security was breached by “hackers”—I believe—within the last month.

I am also told by a very successful electronic inventor, that a computer—when it is built—can have a by pass manufactured inside it which would allow access to the software programs by anyone—at any time—and that it would be impossible to detect. It has been explained to me that it is similar to every hotel room having a separate

key, but the maintenance man has one key which fits all doors.

This causes me grave concern when I look at the numbers of foreign national companies which have built computer hardware for the IRS, the Federal Reserve, possibly DOD—I don’t know just where all this computer hardware is inside our Government, but wherever it is, after my investigation I am convinced that it cannot be proven to be secure against manufacturer’s curiosity or possible cupidity.

I think that this attitude is entirely too trusting, but I really wonder if we are not in this position because we have been too unaware of bringing our institutionalized mind-sets into the computerized age? It is interesting to me that the Government of Japan will buy no foreign computer for any of its operations—not even word processing let alone critical information storage.

I think global interdependence is going too far when we are depending upon the goodwill of foreign nationals not to “peek” at critical information. And Mr. Speaker—if we are using computers—we are placing ourselves at the mercy of their goodwill. It is true of any computer hardware, but if Americans are “peeking” they are subject to our laws—foreign contractors are not.

Right now, I am concerned about the pending purchase of an Optical Disk from the Japanese Sony Corp. by the U.S. Patent Office. I would like to share with you a letter which I have sent to Secretary of Commerce Verity:

DEAR SECRETARY VERITY: For the last few weeks, I have been looking into the U.S. Patent Office decision to purchase the Sony Corporation optical disk system for storing patent information. The results of my discussions with your staff indicate a potential lack of oversight by the Commerce Department.

It also appears inconsistent for the Commerce Department to make a major purchase from Japan at the same time that Commerce is publishing statistics which show a trade deficit with the same country.

As I understand the technology concerning optical disks, they were originally invented in the U.S. and the technology was allowed to be exported to Japan. To help me in understanding the Commerce decision to purchase the Sony system, I would like your office to provide answers to the following questions:

OPTICAL DISK TECHNOLOGY

1. I understand that because of the speed and capacity of optical disks, the systems require an approved Commerce export license before they can be exported from the U.S. because they are of National Security concern. Can you explain why the original technology (produced by Drexler Technology, Energy Conversions) to make and use the optical disks was allowed to be exported by the Commerce Department in the first place?

2. I also understand that the Department of Defense publishes a list of Military Critical Technologies as a result of the Export Administration Act of 1979. Commerce was charged in that act with incorporating those technologies in its regulations. Optical disk technology is included in that list, but is not

included in the list of technologies published by Commerce.

Can you explain:

- a. Why Commerce has not published the Military List for the past seven (7) years?
- b. What are Commerce’s plans to expand the list of technologies which require an approved export license.

PROPOSED SONY OPTICAL DISK PURCHASE

1. How many U.S. companies make or sell optical disk systems and could you provide the names, addresses and names of the president of these companies?

2. I understand that Commerce did not actually conduct the study which resulted in the decision to purchase the Sony system, but made it on recommendation of a contractor.

a. Please provide me with the name and address of the contractor and the principal officers and personnel who conduct the study.

b. Provide copies of the financial statements of the contractor and Patent Office personnel associated with the Sony purchase which show that none of the parties involved had (or have) a financial interest in the decision.

c. Provide copies of reports and memorandums of telephone conversations which show that the contractor contacted the company in (1) above prior to the Sony recommendation to Commerce.

d. Provide documentation to support the qualifications of the contractor in the area of optical disk technology (i.e. how many systems have they installed to date, which were of U.S. manufacture and which were foreign, and are any of these comparable to the Patent Office project).

3. Relative to the Patent Office personnel who accepted the contractor’s recommendation:

a. What independent assessment was made by the government to verify the quality of the recommendation?

b. What are the technological qualifications of the government personnel in the area of optical disk technology?

4. I realize that there are more costs associated with the Sony purchase than the initial hardware installation. Could you estimate the total cost of the purchase—including spare parts and support personnel costs—anticipated over the next ten years.

5. Based on these costs and Commerce statistics, how many U.S. jobs will be displaced by the Sony purchase?

6. In the next statement on the trade deficits, how will Commerce explain the Sony purchase to the American people?

7. Other than cost, if the contract were awarded to a U.S. company, what would be the benefits and disadvantages of such a decision?

Hopefully, the answers to these questions will clear the air on these issues and show that Commerce had conducted an in-depth analysis of the factors prior to making the decision.

Thank you for the prompt attention you will give my questions.

As I said to the Secretary, and I realize he was not in office at the time that the decision was made, I am saying that I hope that the answers to these questions will clear the air on these issues and show that the Department of Commerce has conducted an in-depth analysis of the factors prior to making the decision. My information is that they did not.

But I would like to also point out that I failed, finally, I failed to ask the Secretary how much will be lost to the United States in taxes by this deal, and I wonder whether the bureaucrats in this country who work in our bureaucracies realize that it is the Americans working in the United States who pay the taxes which keep this Government going and that 46 cents out of every dollar spent in this country goes to taxes, Federal, State, local, unemployment compensation, Social Security taxes, et cetera.

I would like to emphasize some of the points I have raised.

Optical disk technology was developed in America. It was restricted for shipment offshore by defense requirements.

How did the Japanese get it? Has there been an investigation? Why has it not shown up on the list of restricted technologies and why has Commerce not published that list?

And, if indeed it needs to be protected for this country—why ever in this world would we buy from a foreign producer impacting the sales of American manufacturers who are needed to produce for our own defense industrial base?

I hope I get some good answers to these questions.

Now, in the last month observing the quick response of the stock market to the possible mischief of computers in their midst, I wondered if we—on this Hill—should not take a lesson from their book.

□ 1910

I wonder if we have not all been guilty of thinking of the computers in our office—most of them used mainly for word processing—as just advanced electric typewriters?

They are not! Not over at the White House! Not over at IRS! Not in the Federal Reserve or at Defense! I think it is time we begin to look at these remarkable little machines which turn blips into gold and collect information which may be made available to anyone.

The recent report defending secrets, sharing data: new locks and keys for electronic information advisory panel—a report put out by the Office of Technology Assessment—which addresses this very issue—seems to totally overlook foreign access to sensitive data, both in the commercial and defense sectors through the supplying of the machines.

I have read only the executive summary of the report, but at no point is the issue raised of foreign supply of hardware or software. If this is true, and I will be pursuing this issue with the Technology Assessment people, it will be a grave oversight.

During the past few days as I have been spending more and more time concerning technology transfer and

the loss of United States industrial base, I was presented with a book entitled "The Japanese Conspiracy, Their Plot To Dominate Industry Worldwide and How To Deal With It." This book is not available in the United States. It was brought to me from London. I had heard about it and I asked somebody who was going over there to please bring me over a copy.

I am not going to read the entire book, but there are a few quotes in here of Martin J. Wolf's that I just want to get on the record in connection with this technology transfer that we are very concerned about, and with the possible loss of our patent secrets in this country.

It says in here that—

These Japanese companies have worked closely together to target United States markets. It became obvious to them that adopting an American standard would open the huge Japanese domestic market to American software and later perhaps to American hardware. This deals strictly with computers.

And so they felt that they should adopt a standard solely of their own so that they could control everything that they did with the computer.

"They have laid a base for a computer invasion of Europe," the book goes on to say, "and then in late 1984 Clyde Smith predicts that the Japanese computer-makers will target the United States market" and they have. Quoting again in here, "The Japanese got ahead of us with sex appeal in cars," said Robert Bozeman, marketing director for Altos Computer Systems, and if they get ahead of us on the sex appeal of computers we are dead but they are not going to do it by standardization."

Jumping over it goes on to point out that the Japanese have adopted a stealthy approach to marketing in part as a defense against trade friction. This is a Japanese euphemism for the dawning international realization that Japan is out to monopolize markets all over the world while protecting its own. The Japanese do not want protective barriers raised in countries they have targeted. Another reason for treading softly is that while the United States and North America are giant markets for computers, they are not the only ones. Japanese-style totalitarian economics demands continuously expanding markets and the Japanese, it says, "are now eyeing southeast Asia as well to sell their computers in the decades ahead. They estimate a \$30 billion market in office automation by 1990." And that is what we started and we are losing that, while we are losing our industrial base.

Then in connection with telecommunications under the chapter entitled "Targets for Tomorrow" it points out that the "net effect of the ruling in 1981 where Japan supposedly lifted purchasing restrictions to encourage

foreign imports," it goes on to say, "Once again over there it was an empty gesture, but the net effect of this ruling was to double the United States electronic industry's 1982 Japanese trade deficit by nearly \$1 billion." It is like the semi-conductor industry; as long as the Japanese telecommunications industry can hide behind their government's wall of protection, there is a zero American competition for telecommunications in Japan. That is something that we should all be aware of.

I just want to point out, for example, that in telecommunications Japan had made an agreement with Motorola Corp. of America that Motorola would have half of a certain communications system over there and many, many months after that agreement was made Motorola still was not able to step inside that door.

My last word out of this book this evening will be that, again under "Targets for Tomorrow," "Today as more of communications has moved to digital and optical technology, Japan's strengths have been magnified." This again goes to what I was talking about on the optical disk. They have taken our technology and have magnified it into becoming the giant of the world. The big question is: How did they get it? I am asking that of the Secretary of Commerce and I hope that this Secretary will review that agreement with Japan and will say this is information that we should keep in the United States and not let any foreign contractor have access to it whatsoever.

I thank the Speaker and I yield back the balance of my time.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BUECHNER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GILMAN, for 60 minutes, December 2.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CRANE, for 60 minutes, November 19.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WRIGHT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANK, for 60 minutes, November 19.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DORNAN of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WALKER, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BUECHNER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DORNAN of California.

Mr. GUNDERSON.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. KYL.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO in two instances.

Mr. OXLEY in two instances.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. LENT.

Mr. DREIER of California in two instances.

Mr. MADIGAN.

Mrs. BENTLEY.

Mr. McEWEN.

Mr. MACK.

Mr. SCHUETTE.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

Mr. FRENZEL.

Mr. WORTLEY.

Mr. BLILEY.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GARCIA.

Mr. UDALL.

Mr. SOLARZ.

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. FAUNTRY.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.

Mr. BERMAN.

Mr. LANTOS in two instances.

Mr. HAMILTON in three instances.

Mr. SKELTON.

Mr. FAZIO in two instances.

Mr. FEIGHAN.

Mr. TOWNS.

Mr. SKAGGS.

Mr. TORRES.

Mr. GUARINI.

Mr. MILLER of California in two instances.

Mr. MAVROULES.

Mr. STALLINGS.

Mr. SCHUMER.

Mr. LELAND.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1451. An act to amend the Older Americans Act 1988, 1990, and 1991; to amend the Native Americans Programs Act of 1974 to authorize appropriations for such fiscal years; and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and Joint Resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1158. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program and to otherwise revise and extend the program for the National Health Service Corps; and

S.J. Res. 98. Joint resolution to designate the week of November 29, 1987, through December 5, 1987, as "National Home Health Care Week."

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 19, 1987, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2418. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report on the safety of commercial motor vehicles being used in interstate and intrastate commerce, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. app. 2515(a); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

2419. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agency for International Development and First Vice President and Vice Chairman, Export-Import Bank, transmitting the Agency's semi-annual report on the amount and extension of credits under the Trade Credit Insurance Program to Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador as of September 30, 1987, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2184(g); jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PEPPER. Committee on Rules. House Resolution 314. H.R. 3436, a bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to make technical corrections (Rept. 100-449. Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BERMAN (for himself, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. HAMILTON, and Mr. HYDE):

H.R. 3651. A bill to prohibit exports of military equipment to countries supporting international terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.R. 3652. A bill to eliminate the authority for the performance of nonadvisory functions by the National Security Council; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 3653. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, with respect to comparability adjustments under the provisions relating to grade and pay retention for Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GOODLING (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. YATRON, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. McDADE, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. RITTER, Mr. WALKER, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. WELDON, and Mr. SCHULZE):

H.R. 3654. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint and issue \$1 coins in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Dwight David Eisenhower; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. HERTEL:

H.R. 3655. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that interest on car loans will be exempt from the provisions denying a deduction for personal interest; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 3656. A bill to establish an interagency committee to review proposed international scientific and technological agreements and increase through negotiations for such agreements equivalent technological access between the United States and foreign countries; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs; the Judiciary; Science, Space, and Technology; and Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. PENNY, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Ms. KAPUR):

H.R. 3657. A bill to amend titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act to ensure proper payments for reimbursement for reasonable and necessary costs of vocational rehabilitation services under State vocational rehabilitation plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD (for himself, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. ROTH, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. HYDE, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MACK, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MILLER of Washington, and Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS):

H. Res. 315. Resolution urging President Reagan to call the attention of the Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, during their upcoming meeting, to the ongoing human rights abuses in the Soviet Union which are in clear violation of the spirit and the letter of the 1975 Helsinki accords; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII.

244. The Speaker presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Illinois, relative to free trade between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 245: Mr. RIDGE.
 H.R. 513: Mr. MOLLOHAN.
 H.R. 637: Mrs. COLLINS and Mr. GINGRICH.
 H.R. 1213: Mr. ROE and Mr. EVANS.
 H.R. 1214: Mr. SHAYS and Mr. WISE.
 H.R. 1235: Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. JACOBS, and Mr. LEACH of Iowa.
 H.R. 1291: Mr. BORSKI.
 H.R. 1645: Mr. CLAY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DIXON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. ENGLISH.
 H.R. 1815: Mr. JACOBS and Ms. KAPTUR.
 H.R. 2138: Mr. KOLTER.
 H.R. 2173: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. WHEAT, and Mr. CROCKETT.
 H.R. 2214: Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi.
 H.R. 2260: Mr. WYDEN.
 H.R. 2476: Mr. LOWERY of California.
 H.R. 2585: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. BATES.
 H.R. 2724: Mr. SHAYS.
 H.R. 2801: Mr. McDADE.
 H.R. 2879: Mr. FOGLIETTA.
 H.R. 2880: Mr. FAUNTRY, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. EMERSON, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. SABO.
 H.R. 2934: Mr. BRENNAN and Mr. COLEMAN of Texas.
 H.R. 3071: Mr. DOWNEY of New York and Mr. FOGLIETTA.
 H.R. 3119: Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. PENNY.
 H.R. 3193: Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. SABO.

H.R. 3199: Mr. HILER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. COMBEST, and Mr. MARTIN of New York.

H.R. 3259: Mr. HOWARD, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. ECKART, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. FAUNTRY, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 3303: Mr. EMERSON, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. ROE, Mr. BEILENSEN, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. FISH, Mr. MINETA, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, and Mrs. PATTERSON.

H.R. 3321: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. STARK, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. FIELDS, Mrs. SAIKI, and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 3348: Mr. BROOKS, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 3410: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 3518: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 3598: Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. BIAGGI.

H.R. 3614: Mr. DICKS, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. BONKER, and Mr. MILLER of Washington.

H.R. 3627: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 3628: Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. WELDON, Mr. DORAN of California, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. FRANK, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. FAUNTRY, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. PENNY, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. CRANE, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. KONNYU, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.J. Res. 388: Mr. CLARKE, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. COURTER, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MOAKLEY,

Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. WEBER.

H.J. Res. 389: Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. RODINO, Mr. GREGG, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DELUMS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. GUNDERSON, and Mr. LEHMAN of California.

H.J. Res. 390: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. DYSON, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. VENTO, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. APPELAGE, Mr. FRANK, and Mr. FAZIO.

H. Con. Res. 192: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MFUME, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MAVROULES, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. HEFLEY.

H. Res. 272: Mr. NIELSON of Utah and Mr. DANNEMEYER.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

S. 1667

By Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska:

—Page 6, after line 12, insert the following:

(c) In addition to any other review which may be available by law, a decision of the Secretary to close, consolidate, automate, or relocate any Weather Service Office may be reviewed in accordance with chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code, in an action brought by any State served by such Office. For purposes of this subsection, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Island, and the Northern Mariana Islands.

(d) Any determination or decision made by the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration with respect to the closing, consolidation, automation, or relocation of a Weather Service Office shall be considered for purposes of this section to have been made by the Secretary.