

The President just had a news conference at the Rose Garden. Again, I want to point this out, he said that the Congress basically is going to be clipping his wings. He needs more power in foreign affairs. The truth of the matter is that he has had all the power in foreign affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally in order that the House may receive a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana) assumed the chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will receive a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

□ 1637

AMERICAN OVERSEAS INTERESTS ACT OF 1995

The committee resumed its sitting.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK].

Mr. BROWNBACK. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

I just wanted to clarify one other point, if I could, of what is taking place here.

There has been some discussion about Radio Free Asia, and I do not touch any of the funding for Radio Free Asia in the amendment that I am putting in front of this body.

Furthermore, I just would point out that I think the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] makes some good points about what has the foreign aid been used for, at different points in time. Is it really being used for foreign aid, or is it being used for some forms of corporate welfare, like Robert Riech, the Secretary of Labor, has talked about? I think there is a fair amount, and with the streamlining with this reasonable 3-percent cut, we can hope to get back some of that.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and I urge my colleagues to support the gentleman from Kansas in order to bring this bill within the budgetary resolution so that we can move forward.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me first begin my remarks by complimenting the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations for bringing to the floor of the House the first attempt to change the basic course of American foreign policy in several decades.

H.R. 1561 does send a message that America will no longer tolerate nations who receive the helping hand of the United States at the same time they thumb their noses at our generosity by voting against us at the United Nations.

That said, Mr. Chairman, the Committee on International Relations needs to do more. America's foreign policy structure needs to be overhauled immediately. The current system is a relic of the 1950's and 1960's.

The State Department is a labyrinth of competing and overlapping agencies, offices and bureaus whose redundancy and waste has hampered our national interest over the last 30 years. It is up to this Congress to abolish the residue of the cold war and bring the State Department in line with the diplomatic and security needs of the American people as we head into a new century.

Mr. Chairman, the new Republican Congress was sent to Washington to get America's priorities straight. Last week we began the glide path toward a balanced budget. It is not an easy process.

We will eliminate entire Cabinet departments, cut out the welfare programs of the 1960's, and end most Federal subsidies across the board.

Each of us has heard from students, seniors, veterans, and farmers in our districts. Many of them are upset, and they are looking at this bill. They have every right to be. How can we go home and say we are cutting out Commerce, Energy, and Education and perhaps HUD, and reducing the size of every Federal department at the same time we leave the State Department virtually untouched? Despite what some in Foggy Bottom and the bureaucracy there will tell you, will, cuts that are proposed by the Brownback amendment are not Draconian cuts, and the cuts which I would suggest that we also put into the process are not Draconian cuts.

According to the report the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], delivered to the House last week, the State Department budget has grown from \$1.7 billion in the mid-1980's to \$2.6 billion this fiscal year 1995. The Budget Committee's review notes that the continued increase in State Department funding has come from the growth in salaries and expenses, areas that should be addressed.

We need to wake up the State Department. We need to send the word that business as usual has ended.

I am sure that some will say that any cuts in the State Department will hurt our fight against terrorism and out-of-control immigration. Such cuts will do no such thing. The way to combat terrorism and immigration abuses is not to spend more on bureaucrats and diplomatic staff, but it is to boost the morale of our foreign and domestic intelligence agencies, to increase the rapid response capability of our Armed Forces, and to lower the numbers of people who can come to this country at any one time.

Mr. Chairman, the State Department employees over 33,000 people. We have over 300 embassies, consulates, consular agencies, and missions overseas.

The committee bill folds the USIA, the ACDA, and AID into the State Department, and in that sense the bureaucracy will continue to grow. The cuts proposed by both the Committee on International Relations and the Clinton administration merely accept the status quo, albeit on a slightly smaller scale.

As the American people said last year, the status quo is not good enough. America's foreign policy priorities need radical surgery. We can start the process by cutting the fat at Foggy Bottom.

We need to tell the American people we are serious about cutting the budget and we are serious about streamlining and downsizing the bloated bureaucracy at the State Department.

□ 1645

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FUNDERBURK TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWNBACK

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FUNDERBURK to the amendment offered by Mr. BROWNBACK: In the matter amending section 2101(a)(2) of the bill (relating to authorizations of appropriations for salaries and expenses of the Department of State) strike "\$355,287,000 for the fiscal year 1996" and insert "\$337,522,265 for the fiscal year 1996 and

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FUNDERBURK] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment reduces the bill's authorization level for State Department salaries and expenses for 5 percent for the fiscal year 1996.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that since we are asking the American people to cut the rate of growth and to cut in actual expenditures across the board, that the Gilman and the Brownback bills and amendments have cut USIA, ACDA, and AID drastically but have only asked for a very minimal cut of 1 or 2 percent in the State Department. The State Department should not be sacrosanct, and I feel, having worked in the State Department as a U.S. Ambassador overseas for 4 years, that there is a lot of waste and that we have too much money being spent in that area, in the modern age of high technology and instant communications, and what we have had and what we have seen there in the last few years is that, while other Government agencies and programs are being cut back or using a reasonable measure of trying to cut wasteful expenditures, we have actually had an increase in the building of consulates in countries where we really have no major problems and an increase in the building of embassies, and the salaries have been increasing at too high a level.

Now most of the people in this country are being asked to tighten their

belts, those of us in Congress are going to either freeze or reduce our own salaries, and I think the very least we can do is ask for an additional 5-percent cut in State Department salaries and operating expenses, and that is why I propose this amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK].

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

I would like to ask the gentleman on my time a question, if I might, the gentleman from North Carolina. Might I ask?

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Yes, please.

Mr. BERMAN. Go through this one more time with me:

The Brownback amendment, which cuts—the bill, as we know, cuts essentially the Foreign Affairs Committee or the Committee on International Relations' share of \$2 billion from existing levels. The Brownback amendment cuts an additional \$450 to \$480 million from 1997 levels. The gentleman's amendment would cut first how much more in each fiscal year, 1996 and 1997?

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

Mr. BERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Well, only in the year 1996 we are asking for a 5-percent cut which would be 17.7 additional—\$17.7 million. Now the Brownback amendment cuts across the board. This one is only in State Department salaries and operating expenses.

Mr. BERMAN. So, on top of—on top of what the committee cut the gentleman is cutting an additional 5 percent in operating expenses for State Department operations.

Mr. FUNDERBURK. And salaries; that is correct.

Mr. BERMAN. One other question.

I am confused by the gentleman's comment that AID and ACDA and USIA have taken their share of cuts, but the State Department has not. I thought this bill said there is no more ACDA, USIA, and AID. They are all going to be lumped into the State Department. The authorization is going to be for a new expanded, consolidated State Department, and these cuts are all going to impact on what will become the new State Department. So I am not clear what the gentleman means by disproportionate cuts in agencies that will no longer exist if this bill passes.

Mr. FUNDERBURK. They are not immediately done away with, and obviously we have, for example, a 26-percent cut in the actual funding, the actual expenditure, for USIA. That is my understanding.

To give the gentleman an example—

Mr. BERMAN. Reclaiming my time, I just say very quickly it is probably not going to have much meaning in all this thing. I had the privilege of chairing the subcommittee that authorized State Department functions for 4 years, the last 2 years of the Bush ad-

ministration and the first 2 years of Clinton. We made cuts in operating expenses in the State over and over again. As I indicated earlier, the 150 functions had the most dramatic cuts of any—

Mr. FUNDERBURK. The gentleman is talking about cuts in the rate of projected growth spending probably as opposed to real cuts—

Mr. BERMAN. That is true, and we gave salary across-the-board pay increases. We did not select out State Department and say, "You won't get the salaries."

So the cuts were felt in those departments, and this just adds to what I think is the dramatic slashes of the bill as compounded by the even more dramatic slashes of the Brownback amendment.

Now on top of that we have—

Mr. FUNDERBURK. I think most Americans would find this a very minimal cut and very reasonable cut.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Funderburk second amendment basically and point out that what this does is the proposal that I am putting forward in fiscal year 1997, it would do it in fiscal year 1996 and making those reductions in fiscal year 1996.

The other things that I would like to point out were that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FUNDERBURK] can also properly be responded to and called Ambassador Funderburk. He was Ambassador to Romania. I do not know how many other people we have in this body that have been Ambassador, and have worked inside the State Department and been able to see the sorts of things that he has and the operations within the State Department. He comes with great credentials in that particular area and one that can say: "Look, folks, this is something that we can get done. This is something we are pushing to do in FY 97. I think it's reasonable to be able to do it in FY 96."

Now, as far as these are totally irresponsible, it is the sort of things we cannot do, we cannot make these sorts of things happen, I would point out again that this is we are talking about a 5-percent cut at a time when we are nearly \$5 trillion in the hole. We have got to make these sorts of decisions, these sorts of reductions, if we are ever going to get to a balanced budget by 2002, and, if this is not reasonable, I am not sure what is, nor in what other functions we might look, that we would ask our own people at home to be making these sorts of reductions in the foreign affairs area.

So, with those points, Mr. Chairman, I would rise in support of this secondary amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, we are all familiar with the human emotion that some

people have that when someone is down, they come and kick them again, kick them again. It is called bullying in most circles, and it has been going on toward Federal employees for the last several months. Here we have an example at the State Department, people who work very hard, people who have to have specialized training, go to the Foreign Service school, have devoted their careers to peace and diplomacy, and now we have a bill that substantially cuts personnel, and their compensation, and their ability to operate. We have another amendment on the floor just to show the American people we are going to kick them again for good measure, and now we have a secondary amendment that says, "Let's kick them a third time."

Mr. Chairman, it is not based upon any kind of analysis of how the State Department might better operate, how we might better ensure the spread of democratic values, the preservation of human rights, the development of free-enterprise markets for our businesses in the United States. Those are all the objectives of State Department personnel. They are really the principles upon which this country was founded. The people in the State Department believe very strongly in those principles.

Why are we doing this? It is not based upon any kind of organization analysis. We are doing it to punish people in the State Department because they fit into the larger context. They are part of the Federal bureaucracy.

We did a little analysis and found that the Federal bureaucracy has been used in derogatory terms 388 times since January. That cannot be any accident, and it is no accident that at every opportunity some people are going to try to gain political benefit among their constituencies by kicking Federal employees when they are already down, and that is what this amendment is all about.

Mr. Chairman, it is disappointing. I know that it is what a lot of people out there would like. But it is going to hurt us.

As my colleagues know, there is a book that has been written by Secretary McNamara, and there have been any number of books written about the tragedy of Vietnam. As my colleagues know, when the decisions were being made to get into Vietnam, the person who had been the desk officer who knew the most about Vietnam was selling refrigerators and air conditioners in New York City because he had been a victim of the McCarthy purge. The State Department has been kicked as a scapegoat in previous years, particularly during the 1950's, and it cost us. To some extent it cost us 58,000 lives in Vietnam. It is going to cost us in terms of democratic values.

We are trying to spread throughout the world in terms of development of free-enterprise markets. We are trying to create in terms of protecting the human rights of people who live in oppressed societies throughout the world.

Those are the people who will pay for this kind of piling-on, bullying tactic against Federal employees who work within the State Department.

There is no loss; in fact, there is a lot of political gain, for people who offer these kinds of amendments, but they are not constructive amendments. They are destructive amendments, and I would urge my colleagues to vote against this particularly destructive amendment, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to speak out very vociferously against these amendments, which I think are ill-timed and, frankly, poorly thought out. The bill in my opinion devastates American programs abroad. The United States is not only the leader of the free world, but the leader of the world, and what are we doing in this bill? We are stepping back and taking back our leadership, and we are saying to other countries, "We really don't care what goes on."

Mr. Chairman, these amendments would make the bill even worse by further cutting back. I know it may be good politics to say to the folks back home, "Gee, I'm cutting back on this unpopular foreign aid program." But in reality I think it does our Government a great disservice and it does our country a great disservice.

Foreign policy for years has always been bipartisan. That has been the strength, in my opinion, of American foreign policy. During the Persian Gulf war I was one of a handful of Democrats to break with my party and supported President Bush in sending troops to the Persian Gulf. I did so not because the President was a Republican and I was a Democrat. I did so because he was the President and I felt that what he was saying was right. It was being conducted in the best way in terms of bipartisan foreign policy. In my opinion this bill is not and these amendments are not even more so.

We traveled, some of us, to foreign countries, or we meet some people, foreign dignitaries, here in Washington. Last November a group of us on the Subcommittee on Africa visited West Africa, met with officials, leaders, of five countries. They pleaded with us for American assistance and helping democracy take root, and we are not talking about large sums of money here. A little bit of money goes such a long way.

□ 1700

We defeated the Soviet Union in the cold war, and now are we going to throw it all away? Are we going to say that we do not care if these countries all across the Earth have democratic values or democracy in governments or parliamentary governments? Are we now going to say we do not care? That is the effect of the cuts in this bill.

I just think it is a terrible, terrible thing to want to get up and say well, let us cut it all back, let us not even have any more. It may play great again

to the folks back home, but in reality I believe it is one of the most destructive things that we in Congress could do.

Let us look at the effect of this. The effect of this proposal, cutting \$227 in fiscal year 1996 and \$625 million in fiscal year 1997 from the President's request, on top of the committee cut of \$38 million, will absolutely devastate the Department's ability to carry out U.S. foreign policy. Four years of steep cost cutting has left the State Department where nearly all the funding is spent just to support basic operations. An additional reduction in 1996 alone would shut down 160 overseas posts and radically reduce presence at those remaining U.S. missions. It would close half of the domestic passport agencies. It would eliminate 5,700 positions, including 3,500 Americans. It would stop plant infrastructure investments that are essential to restructuring and streamlining both overseas and headquarters operations.

Are we to strip ourselves so bare that we can no longer effectively carry on foreign policy? Are we going to strip ourselves so bare we are now going to say America does not care what goes on in the rest of the world? Surely what happens in this ever-shrinking globe will affect us here back home.

So I would urge defeat of these amendments. I think they are very, very shortsighted, and very, very destructive.

I also do not think it is right to keep beating up on Federal workers, frankly, as the majority here, the Republicans, have been doing all session long. People are working hard at their jobs. They earn their money. They work hard. They took employment with the Federal Government knowing what the benefits were. For us now to simply cut them I think is absolutely ridiculous, unfair, demoralizing, and not something that ought to be done.

Again, foreign policy ought to be bipartisan. People who say that America is the strength of the world ought to put their money where their mouth is or else there is no way we can conduct foreign policy.

Foreign aid is 1 percent of the budget of the United States; 1 percent. It is the lowest in terms of gross domestic product of any democracy in the West. We are something like 25th. We are behind a country like Ireland and all the Western democracies in terms of what we contribute in gross domestic product for foreign aid. This is shameful for us to think that we can cut it even further. I urge my colleagues to defeat these amendments. They are terrible for America and ill-thought.

MODIFICATION OFFERED BY MR. FUNDERBURK TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FUNDERBURK TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWNBACK

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Chairman, I offer a modification to my amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK], and I ask unanimous consent that the modification be accepted.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification offered by Mr. FUNDERBURK to the amendment offered by Mr. FUNDERBURK to the amendment offered by Mr. BROWNBACK: Strike "for the fiscal year 1996" both places it appears.

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

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would do so pending an explanation by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FUNDERBURK].

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

Mr. ACKERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Chairman, it was shown to me there was a typographical mistake, and the wrong year was entered into the amendment sent to the desk.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, to make a change in a year is not necessarily correcting a typographical mistake.

Mr. FUNDERBURK. That had to fit the figures that we had. I just did not change the year.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Once again, we hear these prophets of doom because we are making a draconian cut in a department, the State Department. This is a 5 percent cut, 1/20th of their budget. We cut the congressional staffs here by a third, 33 percent.

For people to tell the American taxpayers that we cannot cut this agency by 5 percent I think is giving them the wrong information. There is not any Government agency in the United States that cannot be cut at least 5 percent, including the State Department. When you are talking about making hard choices to get to a balanced budget, it seems to me that the State Department can take their share of the burden as well as any agency in the government. A 5-percent cut is certainly not draconian.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to introduce this amendment to get the attention of the State Department, for one thing. There are a lot of very good people who work at the State Department. But at the same time, I think we need an America desk at the State Department. Maybe we can talk about that at some later point.

But we have asked a lot of people in this country to make some sacrifices, and the State Department was really making very few compared to other agencies under the foreign aid bill and

the Overseas Interests Act. So I think this is a very minimal cut, and this is not a severe or draconian cut. I think the American people have sent us here after November 8th to actually do this.

So we are trying to put some reason into bloated government, waste in government, and the just never ending process of growth. We are living in a high tech age, and communications can zip around the world instantly. Of course we all know that we need a Foreign Service and we need a State Department. You need the personal contact. But I think in terms of the growth of consulates and embassies and salaries and operating expenses, it has gotten out of hand and we need to rein it back in.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, let me just end by saying we are concerned about Federal employees. We have some great people working for the Federal Government. But we have great people working in the private sector, too. When General Motors and Chrysler and other major companies across this country start feeling the financial pinch, they have to downsize and economize in order to keep their companies afloat.

The difference is the Federal Government does not have to answer to anybody because we can deficit spend. As we deficit spend, we create a terrible problem for the future generations of this country. So just like the private sector, Government has to downsize. For the State Department to cut 5 percent is not too much to ask.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will make this very brief. I rise in support of the Funderburk amendment. Let me just note that this is not, with all due respect to my colleague from Virginia, Mr. MORAN, who characterized this as kicking Federal employees while they are down, this is not kicking Federal employees while they are down.

The people that work at the State Department have our deepest respect and they have a very difficult job. To characterize it as kicking Federal employees while they are down is wrong, just as if I would say well, the Democrats have been kicking the American taxpayers around all of these years and the taxpayers are down, yet you are kicking them while we are trying to help them up. That is not really an appropriate analysis, just as I do not think the proper analysis is kicking Federal employees while they are down.

We are trying, as we have said over and over again, to make do with a bad situation. We are headed toward economic oblivion with this budget that is totally not only out of balance, but is leading us to an economic catastrophe unless we do something. So we are trying to be effective, make things more effective, to downsize the government that exists.

The Funderburk amendment is a fine amendment. All it does is say we are going to kick in this 5-percent reduction in the State Department a year earlier than what we had in and what was presented to us in the budget before.

Now, we are in the post-cold-war world. Can we absorb a 5-percent decrease in the State Department budget a year earlier? But of course we can. The fact is that since the cold war is over, perhaps we do not need the same presence that we had and that we needed 10 years ago and 20 years ago.

Furthermore, technology, the communications technology that has just exploded in the last 10 years, perhaps makes it less important that we have the same number of people stationed overseas and working for the State Department that we had 10 years ago.

In fact, the author of this amendment, Mr. FUNDERBURK, was an American ambassador for 4 years. He understands the necessities of what is needed overseas. Now with increased technological capabilities, the end of the cold war, Mr. FUNDERBURK was in Romania, I believe, perhaps we do not need that same type of staff in Romania that we needed before. He understands that.

Furthermore, the most important thing we are talking about, instead of saying we are attacking Federal employees, what we are really trying to do here is say that we need productivity increases in the Federal Government, just like we have had in the private sector. During the 1980's what happened was the private sector learned, our private businesses learned, if they were going to compete and could do a good job, they were going to have to become more productive. They actually downsized their work force and, lo and behold, some of our companies found that by downsizing and not spending so much on upper echelon management and employees at higher levels, what happened was they actually increased productivity and their companies are operating more efficiently.

Well, Government can do that. We should expect the same thing from Government that we had in the private sector. Furthermore, we have also asked other areas in the Federal Government, and we are asking that in our budget, to decrease in the amount of money they spend. It is not, it is not then some sort of an assault on people working for the State Department to suggest that they have to be part of this downsizing of Government, increase in productivity as well. That is what this is all about.

I applaud the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FUNDERBURK] and I know that every time that we try to have a responsible and minor reduction, that we are going to be attacked as if it is some sort of a malicious intent involved. But I applaud the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FUNDERBURK] and I applaud the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for the great leader-

ship that they have really shown at a time when we have to decrease the size of the budget. It is a very difficult thing to do and maintain the civility and mutual respect we should have here.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman aware, with all this talk of downsizing, that we hear about the downsizing efforts that worked, but the majority of corporations who have downsized in fact have failed? Their product, the quality of their product, has been reduced as well as their profits? I just mention that. The downsizing by itself is not necessarily the ultimate objective.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I am not sure about the gentleman's figures. It could be true. All I know is spending money for management is not the best thing at certain times. We here have cut our budgets for our committee staffs by one-third, and I would be willing to bet that in the end our Congress is going to be more effective because of that, and we have the same right to expect that same type of increase in productivity from the other Federal Government agencies and departments.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me speak very briefly to my colleague from California on the remarks that he made. There are human faces on these people that are working for the State Department, and there is a critical need in order that we maintain a continuum throughout the world in the various diplomatic and consulate missions that are ongoing. Therefore, the downsizing in my opinion should not be analogized to private downsizing.

I am not so certain, based on the lack of service that I receive in the various institutions that I do business with, that downsizing is good. In that sense, and to answer my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], who spoke earlier about us cutting one-third of the staff here, I think that that was a mistake, too, because it has not produced any greater efficiency. It has produced greater stresses and greater problems overall in terms of the overall product.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my very good friend from Florida.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment was proposed without having done the analysis necessary to determine the ramifications of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would shut down 160 overseas posts and radically reduce the presence at the remaining missions overseas. It would close half of the 14 domestic passport

agencies. It would eliminate 5,700 positions, including 3,500 Americans and 2,200 Foreign Service nationals, and it would stop the investments that have been made to restructure and streamline both the overseas and the headquarters operations.

□ 1715

The State Department tells us that this funding level, which is \$227 million below the President's request, which was already a cut, and it is \$625 million below the President's request for fiscal year 1997, would completely undermine the Department of State's ability to field a comprehensive overseas diplomatic platform for other Government agencies.

And anyone that has been overseas knows how many other Government agencies are dependent upon State Department funding and could only be viewed by our allies as well as our adversaries as signalling a dramatic retreat by the world's last remaining superpower.

Mr. Chairman, I know the direction that we have been going for the last few months, and I know that many times we do not let the facts stand in our way. But these are facts that we need to be aware of before we take such destructive action as is envisioned by this amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the maker of the amendment, as he has proposed it, has any analysis been done with reference to cutting the Fulbright scholarships and cutting funds for arms control verification? I just would be interested to know if the offeror of this amendment has any analysis on the Fulbright scholarships?

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman mean how this amendment would affect the Fulbright scholarships?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I know that it would cut \$20 million. But what about the good that the Fulbright scholarships have done? What about the good that arms verification has done? Is the gentleman saying that there is no good that has been done in these matters?

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, my amendment does not address that question.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. The gentleman cuts the money?

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Chairman, no. We are cutting salaries and operating expenses for the State Department.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. But the underlying amendment addresses the subject.

Mr. FUNDERBURK. The gentleman is referring to the Brownback amendment, yes, sir.

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

Mr. Chairman, if I could address the gentleman, the sponsor of this most recent amendment and assure him that I share his intent to downsize the overall scale of the foreign aid effort. But I would also like to point out to the gentleman that when we consider the Brownback amendment, which already brings us down to the budget levels, if we act in haste, we may be stepping beyond our ability to downsize our efforts in an organized fashion.

I would like to take a look at what the gentleman has proposed. I would like to examine it within the 1996 appropriations process as well as the 1997 appropriations process. I would like to work with the gentleman, if I could, towards effecting the changes that he might like to see accomplished. If we could do that, I would ask that the gentleman consider withdrawing his amendment at this time and work with me on the appropriations process and that ultimately we may be able to effect the changes that he seeks here today.

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Chairman, after consultation with the appropriations chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The amendment, as modified, to the amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I now address myself to the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK], and I will be very brief.

I would like to point out some rhetoric that preceded the voice of sanity of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] that came forth just then. The gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER], and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FUNDERBURK], were both in the Reagan administration. During those 8 years, I do not recall at any time that the request made by the Reagan administration for the State Department was reduced below what their requests were.

As the saying goes, foreign policy stops at the shores of the United States. I think that is being violated in its worst here.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] gets up and says, can the State Department take a 5-percent cut. And the rhetoric says, of course, it can. Why cannot the Defense Department take a 5-percent cut? Why cannot all the road projects that still remain in the budget take a 5-percent cut?

Do a little mathematics. Five percent of \$250 billion is \$12.5 billion. A 5-percent cut of the Defense Department would just about underwrite all the State Department's requirements. So I just say that there is a time in which we cannot continue to cut foreign pol-

icy here and remind my colleagues on the other side, Mr. Chairman, that there are four Senators down the hall that are running for President of the United States, all of whom think that they are going to be the next President. What you are doing to them, if for some strange reason, an aberration of the American public, they should win, any one of them would have to come back to this body and ask for supplemental appropriations in order to conduct foreign policy. You do not mind inflicting that upon a Democratic administration, but I ask you, in all good conscience, if you had, if President Bush had won reelection, whether you would be doing this to his administration? I seriously doubt it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 276, noes 134, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 348]

AYES—276

Allard	Cox	Gutknecht
Archer	Cramer	Hall (TX)
Armey	Crane	Hancock
Bachus	Crapo	Hastert
Baker (CA)	Cremeans	Hastings (WA)
Baker (LA)	Cunningham	Hayes
Ballenger	Danner	Hayworth
Barcia	Deal	Hefley
Barr	DeFazio	Heineman
Barrett (NE)	DeLay	Herger
Barrett (WI)	Diaz-Balart	Hilleary
Bartlett	Dickey	Hilliard
Barton	Doggett	Hobson
Bass	Doolittle	Hoekstra
Bateman	Dornan	Holden
Bentsen	Doyle	Hostettler
Bereuter	Dreier	Hunter
Bevill	Duncan	Hutchinson
Bilbray	Dunn	Hyde
Bilirakis	Durbin	Inglis
Bliley	Edwards	Istook
Blute	Ehrlich	Jacobs
Boehlert	Emerson	Johnson (CT)
Boehner	English	Johnson, Sam
Bonilla	Ensign	Jones
Bono	Everett	Kanjorski
Boucher	Ewing	Kaptur
Brewster	Fawell	Kasich
Browder	Fields (LA)	Kelly
Brownback	Fields (TX)	Kennedy (RI)
Bryant (TN)	Flanagan	Kim
Bryant (TX)	Foley	King
Bunn	Forbes	Kingston
Bunning	Fowler	Klink
Burr	Fox	Klug
Burton	Franks (CT)	Knollenberg
Buyer	Franks (NJ)	Kolbe
Callahan	Frelinghuysen	Largent
Camp	Frisa	Latham
Canady	Funderburk	LaTourrette
Castle	Gallegly	Laughlin
Chabot	Ganske	Lazio
Chambliss	Gekas	Leach
Chapman	Geren	Lewis (CA)
Chenoweth	Gilchrest	Lewis (KY)
Christensen	Gillmor	Lightfoot
Chrysler	Gilman	Lincoln
Clement	Goodlatte	Linder
Clinger	Goodling	Lipinski
Coble	Gordon	Livingston
Collins (GA)	Goss	LoBiondo
Combest	Graham	Longley
Condit	Green	Lucas
Cooley	Greenwood	Luther
Costello	Gunderson	Manzullo

Martini	Portman	Spence
Mascara	Poshard	Spratt
McCollum	Pryce	Stearns
McCrery	Quillen	Stenholm
McDade	Quinn	Stockman
McHale	Radanovich	Stump
McHugh	Rahall	Stupak
McInnis	Ramstad	Talent
McIntosh	Reed	Tanner
McKeon	Regula	Tate
Metcalf	Riggs	Tauzin
Mica	Roberts	Taylor (MS)
Miller (FL)	Roemer	Taylor (NC)
Minge	Rohrabacher	Thomas
Molinari	Ros-Lehtinen	Thornberry
Montgomery	Roth	Thurman
Moorhead	Roukema	Tiahrt
Morella	Royce	Traficant
Myers	Salmon	Upton
Myrick	Sanford	Volkmer
Nethercutt	Scarborough	Vucanovich
Neumann	Schaefer	Waldholtz
Ney	Schiff	Walker
Norwood	Seastrand	Walsh
Nussle	Sensenbrenner	Wamp
Obey	Shadegg	Watts (OK)
Orton	Shaw	Weldon (FL)
Oxley	Shays	Weldon (PA)
Packard	Shuster	Weller
Parker	Skeen	White
Paxon	Skelton	Whitfield
Payne (VA)	Smith (MI)	Wicker
Peterson (MN)	Smith (NJ)	Williams
Petri	Smith (TX)	Wilson
Pickett	Smith (WA)	Young (AK)
Pombo	Solomon	Zeliff
Pomeroy	Souder	Zimmer

NOES—134

Abercrombie	Hall (OH)	Pallone
Ackerman	Hamilton	Pastor
Baesler	Harman	Payne (NJ)
Baldacci	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Beilenson	Hefner	Porter
Berman	Hinchey	Rangel
Bishop	Houghton	Richardson
Bonior	Hoyer	Rivers
Borski	Jackson-Lee	Rose
Brown (CA)	Johnson (SD)	Roybal-Allard
Brown (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Brown (OH)	Johnston	Sabo
Cardin	Kennedy (MA)	Sanders
Clayton	Kennelly	Sawyer
Clyburn	Kildee	Schroeder
Coleman	LaFalce	Schumer
Collins (IL)	Levin	Scott
Collins (MI)	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
Conyers	Lofgren	Sisisky
Coyne	Lowey	Skaggs
Davis	Maloney	Slaughter
DeLauro	Manton	Stark
Dellums	Markey	Stokes
Deutsch	Martinez	Studds
Dicks	Matsui	Tejeda
Dingell	McCarthy	Thompson
Dixon	McDermott	Thornton
Ehlers	McKinney	Torres
Engel	McNulty	Torricelli
Eshoo	Meehan	Towns
Evans	Meek	Tucker
Farr	Menendez	Velazquez
Fattah	Mfume	Vento
Filner	Miller (CA)	Visclosky
Flake	Mineta	Ward
Foglietta	Mink	Waters
Ford	Moakley	Watt (NC)
Frank (MA)	Mollohan	Waxman
Frost	Moran	Wise
Furse	Murtha	Wolf
Gejdenson	Nadler	Woolsey
Gephardt	Neal	Wyden
Gibbons	Oberstar	Wynn
Gonzalez	Olver	Yates
Gutierrez	Ortiz	

NOT VOTING—24

Andrews	Fazio	Meyers
Becerra	Hansen	Owens
Calvert	Hoke	Peterson (FL)
Clay	Horn	Reynolds
Coburn	Jefferson	Rogers
Cubin	Kleccka	Saxton
de la Garza	LaHood	Torkildsen
Dooley	Lantos	Young (FL)

□ 1742

Messrs. KLINK, POMEROY, RA-HALL, SPRATT, and GORDON changed their vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 10.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana: In paragraph (3) of section 3417(d) (relating to prohibition on assistance to countries that consistently oppose the United States position in the United Nations General Assembly), insert after the matter preceding subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph (and redesignate subsequent subparagraphs accordingly):

(A) chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (relating to development assistance).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana (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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment, as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment, as modified, offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana: In lieu of the matter proposed in the amendment, insert the following: In paragraph (3) of section 3417(d) (relating to prohibition on assistance to countries that consistently opposed the United States position in the United Nations General Assembly), insert after the matter after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

(D) chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (relating to development assistance), except that such term shall not include assistance under chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 in the case of countries that voted in the United Nations General Assembly on less than 50 percent of the recorded plenary votes.

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

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we have had a chance to look at the perfecting language, and we have no objection, so I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be considered modified.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, this amendment just brings into accord with the rest of the bill the requirement that countries getting developmental assistance from the United States should vote with the United States in the United Nations at least 25 percent of the time. We think it is a

good amendment, it is consistent with the bill, and we urge everyone to vote for it.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, we have had a chance to take a look at the bill, and have had discussions with the gentleman from Indiana. We think he is on the right track, and we have no objections to the amendment.

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

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

□ 1745

Mr. GILMAN. 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. HERGER) having assumed the chair, Mr. GOODLATTE, 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. 1561) to consolidate the foreign affairs agencies of the United States; to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1996 and 1997; to responsibly reduce the authorizations of appropriations for United States foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1996 and 1997, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT CONCERNING EMIGRATION LAWS AND POLICIES OF THE REPUBLIC OF ROMANIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104-78)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby transmit a report concerning emigration laws and policies of the Republic of Romania as required by subsections 402(b) and 409(b) of Title IV of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended ("the Act"). I have determined that Romania is in full compliance with the criteria in subsections 402(a) and 409(a) of the Act. As required by Title IV, I will provide the Congress with periodic reports regarding Romania's compliance with these emigration standards.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 19, 1995.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a precious order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.