

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KASICH, HOBSON, WALKER, KOLBE, SHAYS, HERGER, ALLARD, FRANKS of New Jersey, and LARGENT, Mrs. MYRICK, Messrs. PARKER, SABO, STENHOLM, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Messrs. COYNE, MOLLOHAN, COSTELLO, and JOHNSTON of Florida, and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the motion to instruct conferees on House Concurrent Resolution 67.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LA-TOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

AMERICAN OVERSEAS INTERESTS ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolutions 155 and 156 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1561.

□ 1238

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1561), to consolidate the foreign affairs agencies of the United States; to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal year 1996 and 1997; to responsibly reduce the authorizations of appropriations for United States foreign assistance programs for fiscal year 1996 and 1997, and for other purposes, with Mr. GOODLATTE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, June 7, 1995, amendment No. 23 offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN] had been disposed of and the bill was open for amendment at any point.

Pursuant to House Resolutions 155 and 156, 1 hour and 45 minutes remain for consideration of amendments under the 5-minute rule.

Are there further amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GILMAN

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to the rule, I offer an amendment that has not been printed in the RECORD. I have consulted through staff and the ranking minority member with regard to this amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GILMAN: In section 2644 (relating to further steps to pro-

mote United States security and political interests with respect to North Korea) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

(1) action by the Government of North Korea to engage in a North-South dialogue with the Government of the Republic of Korea to facilitate progress toward:

(A) holding a North Korea-South Korea Summit;

(B) resuming North-South joint military discussions regarding steps to reduce tensions between North and South Korea;

(C) expanding trade relations between North and South Korea;

(D) promoting freedom of travel between North and South Korea by citizens of both North and South Korea;

(E) cooperating in science and technology, education, the arts, health, sports, the environment, publishing, journalism, and other fields of mutual interest;

(F) establishing postal and telecommunications services between North and South Korea; and

(G) reconnecting railroads and roadways between North and South Korea;

At the end of division A insert the following new title:

TITLE VI—REORGANIZATION OF UNITED STATES EXPORT PROMOTION AND TRADE ACTIVITIES

SEC. 601. PLAN FOR REORGANIZATION OF UNITED STATES EXPORT PROMOTION AND TRADE ACTIVITIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Supporting American businesses overseas and assisting United States exporters to identify market opportunities is of increasing importance to America's economic health and competitiveness, and to the well-being of American workers.

(2) At least 18 different government-sponsored organizations or agencies spending over \$3,300,000,000 exist to provide support to American exporters and international businesses. In the past, poor coordination among these organizations and a lack of accessibility often hindered the effectiveness of the Government's trade promotion activities.

(3) Recent efforts to improve coordination between many of these organizations and to increase their availability to exporters around the country were begun through the Trade Promotion Coordination Council. These efforts appear to have generated some improvement in the Government's trade promotion capabilities.

(4) Broader governmentwide reform efforts and future funding questions currently being addressed in Congress may affect different trade promotion organizations to varying degrees.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—In order to fully assess the organizational structure, capability, and spending levels of United States Government trade promotion organizations, the Trade Promotion Coordination Council, not later than March 1, 1996, shall submit to the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and to other appropriate committees of jurisdiction, a report detailing what steps are being taken to improve accessibility and coordination among all trade promotion organizations and agencies, what additional measures should be taken to further improve the efficiency of and reduce duplication among these organizations and agencies, and any suggested legislative actions that would further improve the Government's export and trade promotion activities.

(c) CONTENT OF REPORT.—The report required by subsection (b) shall—

(1) identify the name, number, function, and budget of all Government organizations

or agencies with some responsibility for supporting, advancing, or promoting international trade or United States exports;

(2) assess the amount of exports directly generated by the activities of each organization or agency;

(3) describe the overall impact of the Government's trade and export promotion programs on increasing exports and overseas market share;

(4) identify areas where increased cooperation and interoperability would improve United States export promotion efforts;

(5) identify areas where greater efficiencies can be achieved through the elimination of duplication among the organizations and agencies included in paragraph (1);

(6) identify ways to improve the audit and accountability mechanisms for each organization or agency, with particular emphasis on ensuring independent oversight capabilities for each organization;

(7) assess the trade and export promotion activities of the major trade partners and competitors of the United States, including amounts of tied aid and export subsidization provided by the governments of those trade partners and competitors; and

(8) provide a plan to reorganize the United States trade and export promotion organizations and agencies, with legislative requirements if necessary, in order to more efficiently promote trade, increase organizational assessability, organize bureaucratic effort, and expend public resources in support of American exporters and international business.

In title XXV (relating to international organizations and commissions) insert the following new section at the end of chapter 1:

SEC. 2502. REPEAL OF AUTHORITY FOR PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION.

The Act entitled "An Act to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union", approved June 28, 1935 (22 U.S.C. 276-276a-4) is repealed.

Strike section 3412 of the bill (relating to prohibition on assistance to foreign governments engaged in espionage against the United States).

Page 289, add the following after line 26 and redesignate the succeeding chapter accordingly:

CHAPTER 8—OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

SEC. 3275. STUDY ON OPIC PRIVATIZATION.

The President or his designee shall conduct and, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, report to the Congress on the feasibility of transferring the activities of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation to the private sector.

SEC. 3276. PRIVATIZATION OF OPIC ACTIVITIES.

Upon completion of the report required under section 3275, the President is authorized to sell the stock of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation and to take other necessary steps so that all the evidences of ownership of the Corporation are transferred to the private sector, whether through the sale of the Corporation's contracts, leases, or other agreements or rights, or otherwise.

In section 2201, add the following at the end:

(c) USE OF EARNINGS FROM FROZEN ASSETS FOR PROGRAM.—

(1) AMOUNTS TO BE MADE AVAILABLE.—Up to 2 percent of the earnings accruing, during periods beginning October 1, 1995, on all assets of foreign countries blocked by the President pursuant to the International Emergency Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 and following) shall be available, subject to appropriations Acts, to carry out section 36 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act, as amended by this section, exception that the limitation contained in subsection (d)(2) of such

section shall not apply to amounts made available under this paragraph.

(2) CONTROL OF FUNDS BY THE PRESIDENT.—The President is authorized and directed to take possession and exercise full control of so much to the earnings described in paragraph (1) as are made available under such paragraph.

At the end of chapter 3 of title XXII (relating to refugees and migration) insert the following new sections:

SEC. 2256. VIETNAM POW/MIA ASYLUM PROGRAM.

(a) ASYLUM FOR ELIGIBLE ALIENS.—The Attorney General shall grant asylum in the United States to any alien described in subsection (b), upon the application of that alien.

(b) ELIGIBILITY.—Asylum shall be granted under subsection (a) to any alien (1) who is a national of Laos, Vietnam, Cambodia, or Burma, and (2) who, while acting other than in an official or unofficial capacity on behalf of any government or agency, personally delivers into the custody of the United States Government a living Vietnam POW/MIA (or participates in such a delivery).

(c) VIETNAM POW/MIA DEFINED.—

(1) For purposes of this section, the term "Vietnam POW/MIA" means an individual—

(A) who is a member of a uniformed service (within the meaning of section 101(3) of title 37, United States Code) in a missing status (as defined in section 551(2) of such title) as a result of the Vietnam conflict, unless it is official determined under section 552(c) of such title that such individual is officially absent from such individual's post of duty without authority; or

(B) who is an employee (as defined in section 5561(2) of title 5, United States Code) in a missing status (as defined in section 5561(5) of such title) as a result of the Vietnam conflict.

Such term does not include an individual who the Secretary of Defense determines remained in Vietnam, Laos, or Cambodia voluntarily.

(2) For purposes of paragraph (1)—

(A) the Vietnam conflict began on February 28, 1961, and ended on May 7, 1975; and

(B) an individual in a missing status shall be considered to be in a missing status as a result of the Vietnam conflict if immediately before that status began the individual—

(i) was performing service in Vietnam; or

(ii) was performing service in Southeast Asia in direct support of military operations in Vietnam.

SEC. 2257. KOREA POW/MIA ASYLUM PROGRAM.

(a) ASYLUM FOR ELIGIBLE ALIENS.—The Attorney shall grant asylum in the United States to any alien described in subsection (b), upon the application of that alien.

(b) ELIGIBILITY.—Asylum shall be granted under subsection (a) to any alien (1) who is a national of North Korea, South Korea, or China and (2) who, while acting other than in an official or unofficial capacity on behalf of any government or agency, personally delivers into the custody of the United States Government a living Korea POW/MIA (or participates in such a delivery).

(c) KOREA POW/MIA DEFINED.—

(1) For purposes of this section, the term "Korea POW/MIA" means an individual—

(A) who is a member of a uniformed service (within the meaning of section 101(3) of title 37, United States Code) in a missing status (as defined in section 551(2) of such title) as a result of the Korean conflict, unless it is officially determined under section 552(c) of such title that such individual is officially absent from such individual's post of duty without authority; or

(B) who is an employee (as defined in section 5561(2) of title 5, United States Code) in

a missing status (as defined in section 5561(5) of such title) as a result of the Korean conflict.

Such term does not include an individual who the Secretary of Defense determines remained in North Korea, South Korea, or China voluntarily.

(2) For purposes of paragraph (1)—

(A) the Korean conflict began on June 27, 1950, and ended on January 31, 1955; and

(B) an individual in a missing status shall be considered to be in a missing status as a result of the Korean conflict if immediately before that status began the individual—

(i) was performing service in the Korean peninsula; or

(ii) was performing service in Asia in direct support of military operations in the Korean peninsula.

Strike subsection (a) of section 3421 (relating to the repeal of section 537(h)(2) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1988).

In subsection (c) of section 3421 (relating to the repeal of the Special Foreign Assistance Act of 1986), strike "section 1 and section 204" and insert "section 1, section 204, and title III of such Act".

In section 3401 of the bill (in paragraph (1) of section 610(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as proposed to be amended by such section 3401), insert "or the Arms Export Control Act" after "of this Act".

Strike section 3402 of the bill and insert the following:

SEC. 3402. AUTHORITY TO MEET UNANTICIPATED CONTINGENCIES.

Paragraph (1) of section 451(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2261(a)(1)) is amended by striking "\$25,000,000" and inserting "\$50,000,000".

Strike section 3403 of the bill and insert the following:

SEC. 3403. SPECIAL WAIVER AUTHORITY.

(a) LAWS AFFECTED.—Section 614 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking subsections (a)(1) and (a)(2) and inserting the following:

"(a) AUTHORITY TO AUTHORIZE ASSISTANCE, SALES, AND OTHER ACTIONS; LIMITATIONS.—(1) The President may authorize assistance, sales, or other action under this Act, the Arms Export Control Act, or any annual (or periodic) foreign assistance authorization or appropriations legislation, without regard to any of the provisions described in subsection (b), if the President determines, and notifies in writing the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate—

"(A) with respect to assistance or other actions under chapter 2 or 5 of part II of this Act, or sales or other actions under the Arms Export Control Act, that to do so is vital to the national security interests of the United States; and

"(B) with respect to other assistance or actions that to do so is important to the national interests of the United States.

"(2) The President may waive any provision described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (b) that would otherwise prohibit or restrict assistance or other action under any provision of law not described in those paragraphs if the President determines, and notifies in writing the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, that to do so is important to the national interests of the United States."

(b) ANNUAL CEILING.—Section 614(a)(4)(C) of that Act is amended by striking "\$50,000,000" and inserting "\$75,000,000".

(c) LAWS WHICH MAY BE WAIVED.—Section 614 of that Act is amended by striking subsections (b) and (c) and inserting the following:

"(b) LAWS WHICH MAY BE WAIVED.—The provisions referred to in subsections (a)(1) and (a)(2) are—

"(1) the provisions of this Act;

"(2) the provisions of the Arms Export Control Act;

"(3) the provisions of any annual (or periodic) foreign assistance authorization or appropriations legislation, including any amendment made by any such Act;

"(4) any other provision of law that restricts assistance, sales or leases, or other action under the Acts referred to in paragraph (1), (2), or (3); and

"(5) any law relating to receipts and credits accruing to the United States."

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 614(a)(4) of that Act is amended—

(1) in subparagraphs (A)(ii), by striking "or the Arms Export Control Act"; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking "the Arms Export Control Act or under".

In section 3404 of the bill (in subsections (a)(1) and (c) of section 617 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as proposed to be amended by such section 3404), insert "or the Arms Export Control Act after "under this Act" each place it appears.

Strike section 2601(b) (relating to visits to the United States by officials of the Government of the Republic of China and Taiwan) and strike the subsection designation and heading for section 2601(a).

Strike section 505 (relating to voluntary separation incentives) and designate the subsequent sections and amend the table of contents accordingly).

At the end of chapter 1 of title XXVI (relating to foreign policy provisions) add the following new section:

SEC. 2604. VERIFICATION OF MISSILE TECHNOLOGY CONTROL REGIME.

Not later than February 1, 1996, the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency shall transmit to the Congress a report on the capability of the United States to verify the Missile Technology Control Regime, to include any applicable United States policy statements, pursuant to section 87 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act.

At the end of section 501 (relating to reorganization authority) insert the following new subsection:

(c) REDUCTION IN EXPENDITURES.—A reorganization plan pursuant to any title of this division shall provide for a twenty percent reduction to apply to each of the first two fiscal years after implementation of such plan in the total level of expenditures for the functions transferred to the Department of State from amounts appropriated for such transferred functions for fiscal year 1995.

At the end of the bill, add the following:

DIVISION D—ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS
TITLE XLI—UNITED STATES EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

SEC. 4001. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) FULBRIGHT ACADEMIC EXCHANGE PROGRAMS.—Notwithstanding section 2106(3)(A), there are authorized to be appropriated for "Fulbright Academic Exchange Programs", \$112,484,200 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$88,680,800 for the fiscal year 1997.

(b) OTHER PROGRAMS.—Notwithstanding section 2106(3)(F), there are authorized to be appropriated for "Other Programs", \$77,265,800 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$57,341,400 for the fiscal year 1997.

In section 3231 of the bill (in section 667(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as proposed to be amended by such section 3231; relating to operating expenses of the United States Agency for International Development), strike "\$465,774,000" and insert "\$396,770,250" and strike "\$419,196,000" and insert "\$396,770,250".

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, yesterday, with the cooperation of the minority, we were able to take care of the concerns of many Members by adopting an en bloc amendment. We added provisions to this bill that were supported on both sides, even provisions that were propounded by members who have no intention of voting for this bill. We tried to accommodate as many Members as we could.

There were several amendments that we could not get agreement on however, and some matters that have come to our attention since the time for printing amendments had expired.

Whereas yesterday we only shifted funds on one amendment, in this package we make even more spending reductions. Some of these are minor, such as the decision we have made to end U.S. participation in the Interparliamentary Union. The United States pays dues of nearly \$1 million per year for the IPU assessment, but participates only minimally. The IPU has, regrettably, taken a rather arrogant attitude toward our participation and on one relatively recent occasion increased our assessment at a meeting where we were not represented.

Other changes involve greater amounts of money. For example, the Manzullo amendment represents a considerable, additional cut in cultural and educational exchanges. Mr. MANZULLO has been one of the more active members of our committee and I commend his close attention to this program. I hope he will continue to look closely at the costs and benefits of this program, and welcome his willingness to meet me more than halfway in crafting a solution to the problems he sees in it. The amendment reduces funding for these exchanges by \$10 million in each of fiscal years 1996 and 1997.

Another senior member of our committee has reached a compromise with us. Mr. ROTH has made modifications to his amendment, offered in committee and preprinted in the RECORD, relating to a requirement that the President's reorganization plan show reductions in transferred functions. We have come to a compromise making that amendment acceptable on this side.

At the request of the Committee on Intelligence, which I understand was representing the concerns of the intelligence community of this administration, we are deleting a provision that cuts off aid to countries which conduct certain intelligence activities against this country. The intelligence community felt that having to make a cutoff could in certain cases expose its state of knowledge about the activities of other countries and, more generally,

expose intelligence sources and methods. We reluctantly went along but will work with the intelligence committee and the administration to see if we cannot find another way to achieve this general goal.

We also include the Mica export promotion study language, as modified, the McInnis language on Korea, a new Hoke amendment calling for a report on compliance with the Missile Technology Control Regime, a modification of the Hoke amendment on OPIC, a modification of the Upton amendment providing for special treatment for foreign nationals who find a live MIA from the Vietnam or Korean conflicts—something we would all wish for. In addition, we include the Solomon amendment providing that interest earned on certain blocked assets be used to fund a rewards program for the arrest and conviction of international terrorists.

In response to concerns expressed after the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight held its hearings on voluntary separation payments, essentially contemporaneously with our consideration of this bill in our committee, we have stricken language authorizing such payments in this bill. I do hope and expect that as the administration puts together its plan effectuate our reform of the foreign affairs agencies, it will consider if voluntary separation payments are appropriate, and if they are will work closely with our committee and the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and for my part I will sympathetically consider their views.

In terms of technical amendments, we strike a provision that inadvertently repealed provisions of laws under our jurisdiction relating to international environmental programs, and another provision that addresses administration concerns relating to the waiver and other special authorities provisions in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, in the time remaining, I would like to make a few more comments on the bill as a whole.

First, I want to thank my colleagues on the committee, and of the House, on both sides of the aisle, for their cooperation as we have moved this bill through its various stages, as well as the leadership, committee, and personal staffs who have worked on the bill. In addition, I would like to thank the chairman of the Committee of the Whole for the excellent manner in which he has presided over these extended deliberations.

Second, I want to point out that this bill has some things that everyone likes, and some things that some of us dislike intensely. We must look beyond to the details to the whole.

□ 1245

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, what we are doing in the overall bill is making fundamental needed reforms to the foreign policy establishment, reforms that this House voted for with a strong vote yesterday evening, in defeating the Ackerman amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we are cutting our budget for the international affairs function in line with today's budget realities. We are setting forth policies that address important foreign policy problems, from terrorism to nuclear proliferation to the situation in Cuba.

We are doing both of these things in an effort that has earned the backing of groups as diverse as Citizens Against Government Waste and Americans for Tax Reform, from the Irish National Caucus and the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations to the Family Research Council and Phyllis Schlafley's Eagle Forum.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

And just one added note. In addition, language has been offered by another senior member of our committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], which is included, that would cut AID's operating expenses by an additional 15 percent above the 10 percent reduction in the bill.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOYER TO THE
AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GILMAN

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOYER to the amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. GILMAN:

At the end of the amendment, add the following: In title XXVI (relating to foreign policy provisions) insert the following at the end of chapter 1:

SEC. 2604. BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA SELF-DEFENSE ACT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the "Bosnia and Herzegovina Self-Defense Act".

(b) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Serbian aggression against Bosnia and Herzegovina continues into its third year, the violence has escalated and become widespread, and ethnic cleansing by Serbs has been renewed.

(2) It has been almost one year since the Bosnian Government unconditionally, and on time, accepted the "Contact Group" plan, which the Serb forces have rejected.

(3) The United Nations has failed to protect its declared safe havens from continuing and relentless Serbian aggression, and has failed to order North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) air strikes against Serb forces in retaliation for their attacks on Sarajevo, despite calls from its own field commander to do so.

(4) The United Nations Security Council has not considered a resolution providing for the multilateral termination of the arms embargo against Bosnia and Herzegovina, which would be the preferred course of action to allow that country to defend itself.

(5) The United Nations Security Council has not taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security in Bosnia and Herzegovina since the aggression against that country began in April 1992.

(6) For the reasons stated in section 520 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103-236), the Congress has found that continued application of an international arms embargo to the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina contravenes that Government's inherent right of individual or collective self-defense under Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, and therefore is inconsistent with international law.

(c) STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.—The Congress supports the efforts of the Government of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina—

(1) to defend its people and the territory of the Republic;

(2) to preserve the sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of the Republic; and

(3) to bring about a peaceful, just, fair, viable, and sustainable settlement of the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

(d) TERMINATION OF ARMS EMBARGO.—

(1) TERMINATION.—The President shall terminate the United States arms embargo of the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina upon receipt from that Government of a request for assistance in exercising its right of self-defense under Article 51 of the United States Charter.

(2) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term "United States arms embargo of the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina" means the application to the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina of—

(A) the policy adopted July 10, 1991, and published in the Federal Register of July 19, 1991 (58 FR 33322) under the heading "Suspension of Munitions Export Licensees to Yugoslavia"; and

(B) any similar policy applied by the United States Government as of the date of receipt of the request described in paragraph (1) pursuant to which approval is denied for transfers of defense articles and defense services to the former Yugoslavia.

(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be interpreted as authorization for deployment of United States forces in the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina for any purpose, including training, support, or delivery of military equipment.

Mr. HOYER (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 Maryland?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. As I indicated to the gentleman last night, with the short period of time left for debate on this measure, I would think it would be more appropriate that we take this as a freestanding bill, and I assure the gentleman we will put this measure on at the earliest possible date next week in our committee so that it can move to the floor as rapidly as possible.

I think to try to compress the debate in the short period of time we have remaining on the floor today does a disservice to this very critical issue, and I would hope that the gentleman would consider at this point taking the meas-

ure off the floor and taking it up in full committee and getting it as a freestanding bill on the floor when we would all have an opportunity to extensive debate.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. He and I have discussed this.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS], who wanted to be recognized initially on the en bloc amendment.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the manager's amendment.

I oppose this amendment for three basic reasons.

First, the amendment includes bad policy language. It folds together several amendments that were printed in the RECORD that individually are objectionable.

On North Korea, OPIC, the International Parliamentary Union, U.N. command and control—the list goes on and on—the amendment takes United States policy in a bad direction.

Second, this amendment enables the bill manager to delete provisions of the current bill without any debate.

These same provisions were put in the bill without discussion and over the minority's objection.

The bill manager should have to stand up and explain to the House why a provision like that on espionage was included in the chairman's mark and the committee-passed bill, and why it is now being dropped.

These are not just technical corrections. They are U-turns in the road. The bill manager should explain his driving.

Third, I oppose this amendment on process grounds.

It contains several provisions that we start to see until yesterday, and in three cases, provisions that we received only late last night or early this morning: provisions on the environment, special authorities, MTCR verification, USIA programs, and overall funding for fiscal year 1988.

These amendments were never even filed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We haven't had adequate time to study these provisions. We don't know what they do. We don't know their implications. We shouldn't vote for provisions that many on both sides of the aisle have had no opportunity to review.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment states that the arms embargo against Bosnia and Herzegovina shall be lifted upon receiving a request from the Bosnian Government to do so.

I suggest there is no more important issue that confronts this country and the international community at this moment in time, in this moment in history, than does this issue.

Last year, with bipartisan support the House voted overwhelmingly to lift the U.N. embargo, an action designed to uphold Bosnia and Herzegovina's in-

herent and recognizable right of self-defense, as provided under article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations.

Following the House vote on June 9 last year, Bosnia accepted the contact groups, that is, Britain, France, Germany, Russia, and ourselves, plan after the group assured Bosnia that if the Serbs refused the plan, international sanctions against Serbia would be tightened, more efforts would be made to afford greater protection of safe areas by the United Nations, and ultimately the arms embargo would be lifted.

Mr. Chairman, I was at a meeting with the Bosnian President, President Izetbegovic, and Prime Minister Haris Silajdzic, and others, in Sarajevo, when it was announced Bosnia would accept the plan unconditionally. That acceptance, Mr. Chairman, was met by Serbia's ultimate rejection.

And what did the international community do? First, sanctions against Serbia were eased and safe areas were left abandoned to the wanton aggression of the Bosnian Serbs and, of course, Bosnia continues to fall victim to the arms embargo.

Well, Mr. Chairman, here we are 1 year later. And what has time brought the Bosnians? Nothing other than more deaths.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we have a number of amendments that are pending, but I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will be concerned about the time disbursement and the time other people are going to need to discuss other parts of the bill. I will not object, but I hope we do not see that go on any further.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I am going to ask the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] if he would please consider other Members who want to debate other important issues and not take up a good portion of the remaining time of debate, and that is why I asked that you withdraw the amendment and give us a freestanding amendment, a freestanding measure later on next week, whenever we can get it to the floor.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my good friend.

There are a few Members on this floor for whom I have more respect. I want to tell the gentleman, with as much respect as I can, yesterday we

voted on an amendment. We had approximately 2½ hours, maybe longer, on the War Powers Act.

As the gentleman probably knows, I was one of the few Democrats who voted for the Hyde amendment. So I agreed with the proposition that the gentleman from Illinois raised. Nobody on this floor believes that if we consider the war powers amendment next week, the week after or 4 weeks from now, it would have made a whit of difference.

This amendment, for which time was not made available and which this Member had to go through a relatively strained parliamentary procedure to even get considered, at a time when people are dying in hostage, in a genocide, in a country that the international community has recognized, that the international community has said is subject to genocide and which this country, this country said is led by war criminals, Mr. Milosevic, Mr. Kradajic, Mr. Miladiz in Bosnian Serbia; our Secretary of State, Lawrence Eagleberger, under George Bush, leveled the charge and accusation they were war criminals.

I say with all due respect and affection to my good friend from New York, the chairman of the committee, I regret I have not had the opportunity even to present—

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection and just ask the sponsor of the measure to consider there are other Members who want to be heard.

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Maryland has only requested the time, as I understand it, in order to make up for the time that the gentleman yielded so graciously to other Members, especially the gentleman from Florida, so that he could present in timely fashion the opposition to the en bloc amendment and, therefore, his time was used up.

I do not understand why anyone would make an objection to the gentleman now taking the time to explain the reason for his amendment, and so, the gentleman from Maryland, I think you have an amendment here that is one of the most important that we have faced this whole bill, this issue. Like you say, it is a question of genocide.

You know, we had a holocaust at one time in this world. Many people at that time said, "Never again, never again." But we are witnessing it today. We witnessed it for 3 years, and we have stood back and we have done nothing.

We are saying we do not want to do anything. We want to let it go on, just let them be killed, because they are not Americans, they are way over there in Bosnia.

So I think that the gentleman has a very good amendment, and I hope that the House will adopt his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleagues for not objecting.

Mr. Chairman, here we are 1 year later, and what has time brought the Bosnians?

All of us know: Further deaths, further ethnic cleansing, further disruption to the democratically elected government.

□ 1300

For the aggressors however, Mr. Chairman, they just dug their trenches a little deeper. And the Bosnian Serbs upped the ante by taking more than 370 U.N. troops hostage. They released some, but they still hold others, and then, on last Friday they shot down a U.S. F-16 fighter. Thank God that he has now been retrieved. We thank the technology that allowed him to get out of that plane and to let us know where he was.

But, Mr. Chairman, let us be clear.

It is not just UNPROFOR that is being held hostage but the United Nations and NATO itself. A test of wills has been going on now for 3 years between the Bosnian Serbs, Milosevic, and the United Nations and NATO. The Serbs have won every time. And the world's most powerful collective institution is being rendered helpless.

On several occasions, we have witnessed Bosnia's aggressors stay their assaults at the prospect that Bosnia would be aided by the international community. But each time, Mr. Chairman, they have returned even more bold and resolute to try to finish their crime, the annihilation of an independent democratic, internationally recognized Bosnia, when the international community has failed to act decisively. The taking of UNPROFOR hostages is but the latest example of such boldness and of such contempt for the international community's lack of resolve.

Mr. Chairman, we in America have serious national interests in helping the people of Bosnia, which I think it very important to point out consists of Moslems, Croats, and Serbs.

First, this is a recognized member state of the United Nations. We have an interest as we did with Kuwait in seeing that it is not destroyed.

Second, we have an interest in stopping a genocide. Surely we do not want history to show that within years of one genocide we stood idly by while it was committed in Europe again?

Third, we have an interest in international norms and laws being upheld and ultimately respected. If not, why should any nation seek help from an international community that espouses rule by law yet acknowledges and ultimately respects rule by force.

Fourth, we have an interest in making sure that the carnage of Bosnia does not spread to other nations with

the real possibility of pitting NATO allies against each other.

I think it is also useful, Mr. Chairman, for us to take a moment to recall the actions that led up to the crisis with which we are now concerned. Those actions included:

First, the increasingly bold and unrelenting Serb violations of a heavy weapon exclusion zone;

Second, the shelling of Sarajevo;

Third, the carrying off with artillery pieces and a mortar out of a U.N.-NATO impoundment depot, and

Fourth, the ignoring of a U.N.-NATO ultimatum.

It was only then that NATO conducted an air raid. The Serbs retaliated by shelling 5 "safe-areas" in Bosnia killing 76 people. That triggered a second NATO strike on other pale ammunition dumps. The Serb response was to seize hundreds of members of U.N. peace-keeping forces and then to shoot down a United States fighter enforcing the no-fly zone.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that what we are encountering is similar to a scene dating back to the 1930's when another dictator sought to carve up a neighboring country in the name of ethnic unity. It occurred in Munich in 1938. It is appeasement.

At the outset of the crisis in Czechoslovakia one European leader remarked and I wish that everybody would listen to this, "How horrible, fantastic incredible it is that we should be digging trenches and tying on gas masks here because of a quarrel in a faraway country between people of whom we know nothing."

All of us, and particularly our fathers, and many who serve in this room, learned the lessons of that negligence.

Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful that this House will repeat its message of 1993-94 and say that we are going to allow the Bosnians to have the right and ability to defend themselves from terrorists.

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

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. First of all, Mr. Chairman, let me just say that I have a first degree amendment, and I ask for a division of the question on the last part of Mr. GILMAN's amendment regarding AID and O&E cuts.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will divide the question at the appropriate time.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. This is going to be a very confusing period as we discuss and debate the chairman's mark because we are going to be talking about several different issues, and I would just like to point out that the gentleman's amendment is likely to pass. I voted for it, I believe, the last time. I think it will pass this time. Unfortunately this issue was not brought before the committee. Otherwise it probably would have been a part of the

entire debate, and it probably would have passed anyhow, and so I am just a little disappointed that this could not have been brought up as a separate issue. I do not have the time to yield, but I just say, I wish this wasn't in the mix right now because it is going to confuse a lot of people who are paying attention to the debate.

I had an amendment which was a freestanding amendment which is now part of the chairman's mark which will be voted on separately, which is confusing, which would cut the AID operating expenses. And AID last year got \$517.5 million to run its operation. This year it was increased to \$529 million. The chairman's mark reduced that down to \$465 or \$466 million, and what my amendment does is reduce it further, down to about \$400 million.

Now the reason that I propose this amendment is because \$400 million is more than enough money for the operating expenses of AID. We cut our staff here in the Congress by a third. What we are asking with my amendment is for AID to cut their staffs and their operating expenses by less than a fourth, and we think that is reasonable thing to do. If we can do it by a third, they can sure do it by less than a fourth.

Now I would also like to point out that AID has adopted the practice in my view of wasting money. I want to quote to my colleagues, and I hope they will pay particular attention to this if I might have everybody's attention. This is a memo that was sent out by the leadership of AID to many of their offices around the world. And I quote, I want to quote from, this inter-office memo which went around the world to many AID offices, and this is a quote from Sally Shelton, senior staffer at AID. She said:

Larry Burn, assistant administrator from management at AID, announced that AID was 62 percent through the fiscal year and we have 38 percent of the dollar volume of procurement actions completed. We need to do, and that means spend, we need to do \$1.9 billion in the next 5 months.

Burn also said, "There are large pockets of money in the field, so let's get moving."

So here was AID two-thirds of the way through their year saying they had only spent one-third of their budget so let us get on with spending more money so we can ask for more in the coming year.

This is a perfect example of bureaucrats trying to spend money as fast as they possibly can, even more than they should, so they can ask for more money in the next fiscal year.

In addition to that, there are some other items of waste that I would like to point out where AID is concerned:

In El Salvador, AID-sponsored economists helped organize a socialistic land reform program in the early 1980s that nationalized land holdings, banks and private export companies. After the U.S. had spent billions in El Salvador, former President Alfredo Cristiani commented that millions more would be needed "just to correct the damage done by U.S. assistance in nationalizing the economy."

So what AID did, the President down there said, was something that hurt them rather than help, and they spent millions and millions of dollars to do that.

After the Sandinistas lost the 1990 election, more than \$1 billion in direct and indirect U.S. aid flooded Nicaragua. Hundreds of millions of U.S. tax dollars were lost bailing out a corrupt banking system largely controlled by Sandinista bureaucrats and loan officers. Even today, this fiasco threatens Nicaragua's democracy.

In Burundi they spent \$7 million to buy a 1,000-acre farm to raise improved corn seed variety. This farm cost the American taxpayer \$7,000 an acre, and I want to tell my colleagues, in Burundi you can get it for practically nothing, which is an outrageously expensive price to pay for an acre of farmland on which you are growing corn.

The project turned out to be a complete disaster because AID located the farm near the President of Burundi's home village even though this was an area of the country with the worst soil. They were simply trying to placate the President's whimsical desire to have a fancy foreign aid project in his home village. Then it turned out after this \$7 million investment that there were no improved varieties of corn seed to be grown in Burundi because the ag research had never been done and I can go on and on and on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has expired.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me just say that AID, like every agency of Government, needs to be fiscally responsible. We have a huge national debt, we have huge deficits, and this House and the Senate are trying our dead level best to get control of runaway Government spending.

Here is an agency that has wasted money. I was a senior Republican on Africa for 10 years. I can tell my colleagues they wasted money in many countries over there. Some of the projects were good, but much of the money was wasted, and here we have, as I said before, a memo going out by the leadership in that agency saying that we have to spend money as fast as we possibly can because we are two-thirds of the way through our fiscal year and we have only spent one-third of our budget.

We need to send a message to AID. We cut back Congress by a third as far as our staffs were concerned. They can stand a 20- to 25-percent cut.

This is a good amendment which will save the taxpayers \$65 million, and once again I would like to say I am very sorry that this was incorporated into this debate that is taking place right now on Bosnia. That should be a separate debate at a separate time. Unfortunately this is not the case.

So, I hope my colleagues, when we get to this first degree amendment

which will be voted on separately later on, will see fit to support it because it is going to save the taxpayers \$65 million, it is going to downsize one of the biggest bureaucracies in Washington, and it would not hurt our foreign aid program one whit, and with that I would like to add also that there have been all kinds of atrocities in India that AID has seen fit to continue to support through our developmental assistance over there even though the Congress in the past has voted to cut that money off. AID, 2 years ago we were going to cut \$4 million in developmental assistance to India. AID overruled the elected Members of Congress and went ahead and sent that money, and that is another reason they need to receive a very strong message.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman:

You argue that this amendment would save money. Am I correct that AID would have to lay off at least half of their employees, and would that not be very costly in terms of retirement and all of the buyout benefits that come along with that in addition to the number of agencies that would be—

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, let me just say when we downsize Government there are going to be short-range problems, but long-term, long-term major cash savings, and I believe this amendment long term will save a great deal, more than the \$65 million that it will save initially, and I think that this is something the American people want us to do. They want to see us economizing Government and not continue to see runaway costs which have bankrupted this Nation, and so I think this amendment is a good one, and I hope my colleagues will see fit to vote for it.

BURTON AMENDMENT CUTS AID TO INDIA

WASHINGTON, DC.—Rep. Dan Burton (R-IN), Chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, today won approval of an amendment to the foreign aid bill which would dramatically cut aid to India and other countries that consistently oppose U.S. interests at the U.N.

By including developmental assistance to the list of aid programs which would be denied these countries, Burton's amendment puts some real teeth into the foreign aid bill. The bill, as reported by the International Relations Committee, ties U.S. economic assistance directly to the voting patterns of other countries at the U.N. If a country votes against the U.S. more than 75% of the time, it would be ineligible for economic support funds, International Military and Education Training (IMET) funds, and Foreign Military Financing, three relatively modest programs. The Burton Amendment adds Development Assistance, which is a more substantial program, to the list. For example, India which has voted against the U.S. more than any other country, from 81% to 95% of the time would lose \$70.4 million in developmental assistance and \$364,000 in IMET funds next year alone.

"This is American taxpayers' money we are talking about here. There is no reason

for us to be giving American money to countries who do not support our policies. I don't think it's unreasonable to expect countries who receive our assistance to vote with us 25% of the time. Most countries who do not support the U.S. in the U.N. are noted human rights violators, such as Cuba, Sudan, North Korea, Iran, and India. We should not be supporting countries like this," said Burton after the debate.

Burton has been a consistent critic of India's human rights record, speaking frequently about torture and extrajudicial killings of Sikhs in Punjab, Muslims in Kashmir, and Christians in Nagaland. During debate today, he spoke passionately on the House floor about India's long record of abuses.

All major human rights groups have condemned India as one of the most notorious human rights violators in the world. It is no surprise that India almost always votes against the U.S. at the U.N. According to Asia Watch, "Virtually everyone detained in Punjab is tortured." Amnesty International says, "Torture (in Punjab and Kashmir) and ill treatment is widespread and in some cases systematic, resulting in scores of deaths in police custody." Even our own State Department reported, "Over 41,000 cash bounties were paid to police in Punjab for extrajudicial killings of Sikhs between 1991 and 1993." This month in Kashmir, Indian troops burned to the ground a centuries-old mosque and hundreds of Muslim homes in the neighborhoods surrounding it.

"It is absolutely grotesque and inhumane to torture human beings in any way, but the government of India makes it a routine practice. There are certain standards to which we should hold countries who receive U.S. aid, and India is no exception. I believe we should cut ALL aid to India until they quit their murderous reign of terror in Punjab and Kashmir, and start supporting U.S. policies at the U.N.," said a determined Burton.

The foreign aid bill does not cut money from humanitarian food aid, international narcotics control, or antiterrorism programs, even in countries which are effected by the substantial cuts.

HUMAN RIGHTS IN INDIA AT A GLANCE

Disregard for Religious Sites and Figures

May 1995—Indian troops in Kashmir burn to the ground the centuries-old walnut wood mosque in Charar-e-Sharies, along with hundreds of homes around it.

December 1992—Hindu mobs destroy the historic Babri Mosque in Ayodhya as Indian troops stand by and watch.

December 1992—Gurdev Singh Kaonke, one of the most revered leaders of the Sikh religion, is arrested, tortured and killed in police custody.

June 1984—Indian soldiers launch an all out attack on the Golden Temple in Amritsar, the holiest shrine of the Sikh religion. 38 other temples throughout Punjab are attacked, killing thousands of Sikhs.

What Human Rights Groups Say

Asia Watch: "Virtually everyone detained in Punjab is tortured."

Amnesty International: "Torture (in Punjab and Kashmir) and illtreatment is widespread and in some cases systematic, resulting in scores of deaths in police custody."

State Department Human Rights Report (1994): Over 41,000 cash bounties were paid to police in Punjab for extrajudicial killings of Sikhs between 1991 and 1993.

Graphic Examples of Torture and Murder, Punjab and Kashmir

Extrajudicial murders of Sikh youth are a common occurrence. Between 1986 and 1994, 6,017 unidentified Sikh victims of Indian police were cremated in the District of Amritsar alone. There are 13 districts in Punjab. It has been estimated that security forces have had over 25,000 unidentified Sikhs cremated or dumped in rivers during this period.

In January 1995, the water level of the Sirhind Canal was lowered for repair work. One dozen bodies of young Sikh torture victims were found at the bottom of just one short section of the canal with their hands and feet bound. There are hundreds of miles of canals throughout the province.

In January 1993, Indian paramilitary forces in Kashmir burnt to death at least 65 Kashmiri civilians in the town of Sopore. Soldiers deliberately set fire to five separate areas of the town. They also dragged shopkeepers out of their shops and shot them in the streets. The torching of entire Kashmiri villages by Indian forces is a common tactic.

In 1994, Sikh activist Kanwar Singh Dhama was imprisoned along with his pregnant wife and son. He and his wife were tortured in front of each other. When the police were unable to extract an untrue confession from Mr. Dhama, they hung his wife up by her heels (she was six months pregnant) forcing her to have a miscarriage.

In Amritsar district in 1993, Indian police brought a Sikh youth they had tortured and thought was dead to the hospital for an autopsy. After the police left, the doctors discovered that the young man was miraculously still alive and revived him. The police returned several hours later after hearing that the man was alive. They took him out of the hospital, killed him again, and brought him back to the same hospital for his autopsy.

DON'T SUPPORT INDIAN TYRANNY WITH AMERICAN TAX DOLLARS—VOTE FOR THE BURTON AMENDMENT TO CUT AID TO INDIA

Here are some relevant facts about India and Indian-occupied Khalistan:

India votes against the United States at the United Nations 84 percent of the time, more than any other U.S. aid recipient.

India is helping Iran build up its military arsenal.

Human Rights Violations

Indian newspapers recently reported that 25,000 Sikhs were either cremated as "unclaimed bodies" or thrown in canals and rivers.

The White Paper on State Terrorism in Punjab cites S.S. Ray, Indian Ambassador to the U.S., as the "butcher of Bengal" and the "butcher of Punjab."

Over 41,000 cash bounties were paid to police officers for killing Sikhs, according to the US State Dept.

Over 120,000 Sikhs killed since 1984.
Over 150,000 Christians killed since 1947.
Over 43,000 Kashmiri Muslims killed since 1988.

Tens of thousands more languish in Indian prisons without charge or trial.

Amnesty International reports hundreds of Sikhs have disappeared.

Asia Watch reports "virtually everyone detained in Punjab is tortured."

Police operate over 200 torture centers (police stations) in Punjab, Khalistan.

Police routinely pick up Sikh youths and demand ransom of tens of thousands of rupees for their safe release. Otherwise, the youths are tortured and killed.

Sikhs who die of torture are listed as being killed in an "encounter" with the police.

Despite the recent repeal of TADA, the other "Black Laws", giving the regime sweeping powers to detain anyone for any reason and kill Sikhs without fear of persecution, remain on the books.

India has not allowed Amnesty International to conduct an independent human-rights investigation in Punjab, Khalistan, since 1978.

India recently attacked an ancient mosque in Kashmir which houses the mausoleum of the venerated Sheik Nooruddin Wali. In December 1992, Hindus destroyed the Babri mosque in Ayodhya.

In June 1984, India attacked the Golden Temple in Amritsar, the holiest shrine of the Sikh Nation.

The *Chicago Tribune* reports that a nun was stabbed 36 times by right-wing Hindu fundamentalists. By these actions, India displays its religious intolerance.

The Indian newspaper *Hitavada* reported in November that the late Governor of Punjab, Surendra Nath, was paid \$1.5 billion by the Indian regime to foment terrorism in Punjab, Khalistan, and in Kashmir.

The State Department says that the human-rights situation is getting worse.

India's Nuclear Threat to World Peace

India has recently announced successful tests of the Akash antiballistic missile, India's equivalent of the Patriot.

India has deployed Prithvi missiles, which have a range of 250 kilometers, on the Pakistani border and has successfully tested other missiles like Agni, Trishul, etc.

Last year, India launched the Polar Satellite Launch Vehicle, which can be made to carry nuclear warheads.

India spends over 20% of its research and development budget on the development of nuclear weapons. Only 2% goes to education and health.

Khalistan's Right to Self-Determination

No Sikh has ever signed the Indian constitution.

The Sikh leadership declared Khalistan independent on October 7, 1987.

The movement to liberate Khalistan is peaceful, democratic, and nonviolent.

Former Member of Parliament Simranjit Singh Mann has been held in a windowless cell for four months for the "crime" of *speaking out* for Khalistan.

The Supreme Court of India ruled that asking for Khalistan is not a crime.

According to *India Abroad*, 96 percent of the Sikhs in Punjab, Khalistan did not vote in India's February 1992 elections there.

India has 500,000 troops in Punjab, occupied Khalistan, alone—more than Britain had in the entire subcontinent during its rule.

Khalistan, Kashmir, and Nagaland continue to be denied their right to self-determination.

India has 18 official languages. It is a polyglot like the former Soviet Union. It is not one country.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me first of all say that I oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]. I think it is very shortsighted, but I want to address the issue that my friend, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], mentioned with respect to Bosnia.

Mr. Chairman, after 3 years of all out war in Bosnia, and more than 200,000 people killed and 16,000 children slaughtered, and after 2 million people have been left homeless, and countless tens of thousands of women and girls have been raped, we are once again on this floor today debating whether or not the United States of America should take action in Bosnia.

□ 1315

Once again, Mr. Chairman, there are those who say we cannot lift the arms

embargo because it will involve us directly in the war. But let us be honest, Mr. Chairman. We are already involved in this war. By keeping this embargo in place for so long, not only have we denied the Bosnian people the very weapons they need to personally defend themselves, we have helped tilt the balance of the war in favor of Serbian aggression. In doing so, we have become unwitting accomplices to a mass genocide of more than 200,000 people.

Mr. Chairman, there can be no more excuses, there can be no more second guessing. It is time that we lift this embargo once and for all.

Now, over the past 3 years we have seen two dozen cease-fires come and go. We have seen the peace process start, stall, countless times. We have watched Serbs break agreement after agreement after agreement. We have seen NATO warnings issued and ignored. And the one constant through it all has been the absolute unwillingness of the West to take meaningful steps to stop the slaughter in Bosnia.

The greatest sin, Mr. Chairman, is not that we simply turned our backs. The greatest sin in Bosnia is that time and time again we have raised the hopes of the Bosnian people that the cavalry was on its way, and time and again we have not delivered.

Mr. Chairman, the people of Bosnia deserve better than this. If we are not going to stop the slaughter, if we are not going to strike back at the Serbs, if we are not going to defend Bosnia, then we should keep United States troops out and we should lift the arms embargo right away. If we are not going to defend Bosnia, then we have no right to continue to deny them the right to defend themselves.

By passing this amendment today, we will simply extend to the Bosnian people the right which is guaranteed to every other sovereign nation under the U.N. charter, and that is the right of self-defense, and even the more fundamental right to self-determination.

To those who would argue and say that lifting the embargo will disrupt the peace process. I say what peace process? There is no peace process to keep in Bosnia right now. Lifting the arms embargo will not weaken the peace process, it will strengthen it. The reason peace talks have failed the past 3 years is because the Serbs have no reason to negotiate. They faced no real opposition on the battlefield, although the Bosnian Moslems are waging a heroic battle with limited means. But they face no real opposition and they have no incentive to stay at the negotiating table as a result of that.

Only when the Serbs are certain that the Bosnians can defend themselves will they realize that further aggression will really get them nowhere, and only then, Mr. Chairman, will we have a real chance for peace in Bosnia.

Mr. Chairman, if we had been courageous in our approach on this most difficult issue from the very beginning at the beginning of this decade, we would

not be in this situation we are in today. The very least we can do today is to lift the arms embargo, because if we do not lift this embargo and at least let the people of Bosnia defend themselves, then the blood of Bosnia is not just on the hands of the Serbs, but is on all of us.

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

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I would like to real briefly ask one question: If the Bosnia amendment passes, as I believe it will, will the gentleman from Michigan vote for the bill?

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, there are too many other things in the bill I will not support.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. What is the purpose of the debate?

Mr. BONIOR. The purpose is to get out to the American people that what we are doing in Bosnia is not in the best interests of peace in Europe, Bosnia, or international relations with the United States. It seems to me that we cannot stand by and watch as 200,000 people be made homeless, as 16,000 children are slaughtered, and tens of thousands of countless women are raped.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] has expired.

(At the request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and by unanimous consent, Mr. BONIOR was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BONIOR. We have an obligation, and the purpose seems to me, as my friend from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] has stated, is to let these people defend themselves.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I want to make the point that we on the Committee on International Operations agreed to give the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] a free-standing hearing next week on his bill, which probably would have passed and been brought to the floor and passed.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I have heard that argument three times on the floor. The problem with that argument, I say to my friend from Indiana, is this: That while the committee may do that, while the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] may be in favor of doing that, the majority leader on the other side of the aisle is opposed to what we are going here. It is my opinion that would not see the light of day.

Mr. BURTON. If the gentleman will yield further, the fact of the matter is if you vote against it after the amendment passes, you have not accomplished a thing, whereas if you waited and brought the bill up as a freestanding bill, it would pass.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. I could not

live with myself and continue to serve in the Congress if I did not speak on this amendment. I would not deserve to have the right to serve in this body.

I have visited Yugoslavia three times. The first time with the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. CHRIS SMITH, who will speak in support of it. We were in Vukovar when the Serbs were bombing Vukovar, and we went down in the cellars and saw the people who told us that their families had been slaughtered. Slaughtered. They had no weapons to defend themselves. Now Vukovar will go down in the history of Yugoslavia as a place that will be like somewhere unbelievable in their history.

Second, we went back one other time on a CSCE trip. We went into Mostar. In east Mostar the Croats and then the Serbs have been bombing and bombing. Here is a picture of a young lady, if the cameras and Members can pick it up, that will show that she was in a hospital, with no medicine, nothing at all to take care of her.

We were in a prison camp run by the Serbs. The Moslems used to go around like this with their heads down, and they could not come up and look you in the eye. If they did, they hollered at them, they shouted at them. That will stick in my mind forever.

I have seen these things. It is not something I read about in the Washington Post or the Times. This is not something that I saw on Peter Jennings. This is something I saw with my own eyes.

Now, the close is this: We do not want to send American troops there. I do not want to send American troops there. I do not believe there are many people here who want to send American troops there. So if you are not going to send American troops, should you not give the Bosnians, the Moslems, and also the Croats the opportunity to defend themselves? Their moms and dads are being killed.

Imagine, put yourself in their role. There you are in a little village of east Mostar. The murderers are coming in. Your wife is in the basement, your children are down in the basement, maybe your mom is, and you cannot defend yourself. You know NATO is not coming in. You do not want the United States to send troops in. All you want is for the arms embargo to be lifted, whereby you can defend yourself.

I have been in the Holocaust Museum over Christmas. I took my family. We saw the letters where during World War II people said no, these things were not happening. Believe me slaughter and genocide are occurring.

The gentleman from Michigan mentioned rape. We had hearings in the Helsinki Commission that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] can talk about, 20,000 women have been raped.

This is a good amendment. It is a good amendment on this bill. It is a good amendment on any bill. It is an amendment that will send a message,

so when they listen on their little crystal radio sets tonight or tomorrow, they will hear that the U.S. Congress has voted to lift the arms embargo, to stand with them. If this amendment passes, believe me, I do not know how I am going to vote on this bill. I am going back and forth. But if this amendment passes, boy, I will support this bill with greater vigor.

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

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I wanted the gentleman to yield to compliment him on his statement and associate myself with the comments that he has made. I enjoyed my service on the CSCE with him. We had been to Yugoslavia and seen firsthand. It is interesting to point out as we are debating the issue here, the Prime Minister of Bosnia is testifying before the Helsinki Commission as to the necessity to remove the arms embargo now. By enforcing the arms embargo, we are violating international law. We must give the people the right to defend themselves. I compliment the gentleman on his statement.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to say first of all that I appreciate the frustration that lives at the basis of the comments of many of my colleagues who favor the Hoyer amendment. I do not favor it and am going to state the case against it. But I fully understand the frustrations involved. Let me give you several reasons why I think lifting this embargo at this time is a very dangerous move.

First of all, we are at an extremely delicate time. We have 150 hostages being held, the war is intensifying in Bosnia, the war is threatened to be broadened in Croatia, and it is at an extremely delicate point. This vote in this House is going to be construed as a vote to intensify the war. I think the proponents of the war do not really deny that. 150 hostages' lives are on the line, and we vote in this House to intensify the war. Think of that for a moment.

Now, second, there is no doubt what follows after we vote to lift, if we did lift unilaterally. And what follows is an Americanization of the war. A unilateral lifting of the embargo will put 25,000 American troops into Bosnia. There is not any doubt about that. Our allies, who are now conducting UNPROFOR, have made it very clear to use they are pulling out, and the President of the United States has said when UNPROFOR pulls out, we are going to go in. And we are going to go in. We have the commitment. There is no doubt about that commitment.

So the impact of lifting the embargo is 25,000 American troops go into Bosnia. We then will become responsible for humanitarian services. We will become responsible for protecting

the Bosnian civilians. That is the result, and it is not in doubt. Lift the embargo unilaterally and we are committed to go in. The British and the French and all the others pull out. We are sitting there, we have got to protect the Bosnian civilians, we have got to deliver the humanitarian services.

Next: Nobody addresses the financial consequences of this. The Defense Department has said that if you are going to level the playing field it is going to take \$1 billion by conservation estimates. People just ignore that. We are going to have to supply those arms. The Bosnian Government cannot pay for it. Nobody is talking about stepping up here to the bar and putting \$1 billion on the line, but that is the consequence of a unilateral lift.

Nobody talks about the problems of delivery. How do you get these arms in? In order for the arms to go in, they have got to go, if they go by land or sea, through Croatia or through Serbia. How does that happen? They are going to have something to say about it, and they are probably going to take a good many of the arms. If you do it by air, all the airfields are in range of the Serbian gunners. So the problem of delivery is a serious one.

Likewise, the problems of training. These are big guns. That is what the Bosnians need. They do not know how to use these weapons. Who is going to teach them? We are going to have to teach them. Where are you going to teach them? You are going to teach them on the ground, in Bosnia. American troops in Bosnia on the ground training them.

Now, another problem with this is the impact on our allies. None of our allies support a unilateral lift of the embargo so far as I know, save one, Turkey. The United Kingdom is against it, France is against it, Canada is against it, the Netherlands is against it, Germany is against it, Spain is against it, Belgium is against it, Denmark is against it. They are all against it, and they are the ones that have troops on the ground whose lives will be at risk when we unilaterally lift the embargo.

We see the unilateral lifting of the embargo as a kind of risk-free solution. It will solve the war. We will not injure any Americans. But, my friends, that is not what is going to be what happens. We are going to have troops on the ground, and enormous strains will develop between the United States and its allies in NATO. I do not know of any expert, military or diplomatic, who favors a unilateral lift of the embargo.

□ 1330

I have listened to testimony on this and briefings over and over again. Talk to our Pentagon people; talk to our diplomats. They will tell you that the result of lifting this embargo unilaterally is to put Americans right in the hottest war in the world today. It is a very, very unwise move.

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

To say that the debate on the floor is somewhat discombobulated on this particular amendment I think would be an understatement. We have three amendments here. We have the Hoyer amendment, the Burton amendment and the manager's amendment.

Let me just say that I think the Hoyer amendment is a good amendment. I do not agree that if we lift the embargo we are putting in American troops. I think that is really stretching the argument. I think the reason that we have to lift the embargo is because we have to allow people to defend themselves and basically that is what I see this amendment doing.

But there is another provision here that we are debating. That is the Burton amendment. I want to look at the facts of that amendment, because it is extremely important to this House. But before I do, my friend here has been waiting to say a word.

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

Mr. ROTH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CREMEANS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the foreign aid package we have before us today. This is a good bill, and I congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and his committee for their hard work on this legislation.

We have made and we are going to make a lot of tough choices on the road to balancing the Federal budget. I could not go home to southern Ohio and explain budget reductions that affect the people there without first cutting the funds we have sent abroad. This is a good bill.

I support the foreign aid package we have before us today. This is a good bill and I congratulate Chairman GILMAN and his committee for their hard work on this legislation.

We have made, and are going to make, a lot of tough choices on the road to balancing the Federal budget. I could not go home to southern Ohio and explain budget reductions that effect the people there, without first cutting the funds we send abroad. This is a good bill.

I would however like to say that I understand that in a post-cold-war era, Radio Free Europe should and must be cut back. But I strongly oppose its outright elimination. The committee bill cuts the program from \$230 million a year to \$75 million a year. That's a 70-percent cut. It's worth saving, and \$75 million will keep it alive.

I've been to Eastern Europe and I've heard the broadcasts. In some countries its still the only independent, uncensored news available.

Former Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick said, "I think it is an important mistake to eliminate U.S. support for the freedom radios. They are the best purveyors of the message of freedom, the cheapest, safest, and most effective instrument of foreign policy." I could not agree with her more.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and reclaim the balance of my time.

Let us look at the facts behind the Burton amendment, because this is a

key amendment to this bill. Over the past 10 years, AID has become a bloated bureaucracy by anyone's estimation, including GAO and every other agency that has ever looked at what goes on in AID, including this Congress. In 1985, their programs cost \$9.8 billion. That was 10 years ago. Today these programs are down to \$7.5 billion. That is a \$2.3 billion drop. That is a 23 percent reduction in what AID's programs are costing.

But look at what is happening to administrative costs. That is what the Burton amendment is addressing. The AID bureaucracy has received an increase in salary, travel, office supplies by some 41 percent. In 1985, we were spending \$393 million in administrative costs. Now they are receiving \$556 million. That is an increase of 41 percent in their administrative costs. That is what we mean by bloated bureaucracy. The programs go down but the agency's costs for salaries and travel go up by 41 percent.

What the Burton amendment does is cut it down, not by 41 percent, but by 25 percent. And that is certainly going in the right direction.

AID is a smaller agency in programs but costs 40 percent more to run. That is why this is such an important amendment. I am asking Members to vote for it.

This is the right amendment. This issue of what it costs to run this agency is a classic picture of an inefficient bureaucracy, or a bureaucracy run amok. The AID bureaucracy is asking this year, with all the increases they got in administrative costs, they are asking for \$11.5 million more so they can all fly first class around the country and around the world.

It is time that we cut back on the administrative costs. This committee bill that we have before us makes a modest cut of 10 percent for the next 2 years. What the Burton amendment is saying is to cut it back by 25 percent. Remember, they have a 41-percent operating cost increase, while the programs have dropped by 23 percent. So it is a huge increase, even with the Burton amendment.

There is a huge amount, \$556 million. If you cut it by \$90 million, you are still at \$466 million. In 1985, when this agency was spending \$2 billion more and had many more programs, they were spending on administration costs \$393 million. So we still see increases for administration, while we have seen cutbacks in the programs by \$2 billion.

It does not make sense, does it? That is why this particular amendment is a good amendment. This amendment is only a modest reduction. If you are interested in putting the taxpayers first, if you want to cut waste and if you believe in shrinking the bureaucracy, then this vote on the Burton amendment is a "yes" vote.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman know of any State Department employee who flies first class, who has flown first class in a commercial airline in this administration?

Mr. ROTH. I will not name any by name. I am more responsible than that. But call down at the State Department. They will probably give you an entire list.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, no one flies first class.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, the manager's amendment incorporates a provision which I had filed as a separate amendment. Let me commend Chairman GILMAN for including this provision.

My amendment injects some real savings into the reorganization plan. It requires that a 20-percent reduction be made in the functions that are folded into the State Department.

This reduction would be in effect for at least 2 fiscal years.

This provision insures that we will get savings from this reorganization, when it occurs in 1998 and 1999.

Without this provision, we are not assured of any savings.

This provision rectifies that problem and improves the bill.

Let me also take this opportunity to describe a provision which was incorporated in the en bloc amendment, adopted last night. This provision, which I had filed as a separate amendment, requires an annual assessment of the impact of U.S. foreign policy on our trade posture and our competitive position in global markets. In 1988, Congress enacted a similar requirement, as part of the Trade Act, however the provision "sunsetting" last year and is no longer in effect.

My amendment expands on that 1988 law, by requiring that we look at our overall competitive position.

This amendment is important because we in the Congress must begin considering how our foreign policy affects our ability to compete.

In today's world, our national security depends as much on our economic strength as on our military might. In our Subcommittee on International Economic Policy, we will use this report as the basis for increased oversight on how foreign policy affects trade.

Finally, let me register my concern over another provision—which authorizes the President to sell off the Overseas Private Investment Corporation.

My understanding is that this does not in any way require the sale—it merely authorizes it.

Last year, Congress reauthorized OPIC for 2 years. Our Subcommittee on Economic Policy is scheduled to consider OPIC next year. OPIC has \$10 billion outstanding in loans, guarantees and insurance policies. Most of these commitments are for 20 years, and the Government cannot cancel them without jeopardizing the full faith and credit of the United States.

Against these liabilities, OPIC has \$2.3 billion in reserves—on deposit in the U.S. Treasury.

OPIC pays for itself, and it even makes money—last year earning \$161 million. Even though OPIC is subject to annual appropriations, it does not use any taxpayer money.

In effect, the Appropriations Committee controls how OPIC uses its own money. The

Reagan administration studied whether OPIC could be privatized—most recently in 1987—and the conclusion at the time was that no one in the private sector would buy it.

It may be time to study this again, but we must not pre-judge the feasibility of making this sale.

This provision should not be taken by anyone as a congressional policy. The truth is, we simply do not know yet what the impact would be of selling OPIC. Therefore, this provision is included in the manager's amendment with this understanding.

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

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, we are actually debating three amendments, and I would like to speak on all three.

First of all, with regard to the Burton amendment to cut AID, I strongly, strongly oppose it. Cutting AID any further, and we are cutting it enough in this bill, would in my opinion render AID much less effective. It would be simply a matter of being penny wise and pound foolish. If we are going to lead in the world, then we have to have a strong AID program. So I oppose the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The chairman's amendment, the manager's amendment, I oppose that as well, primarily because in the amendment we are withdrawing from the Inter-Parliamentary Union. Let me tell Members what that means.

I want to read the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] with regard to the Inter-Parliamentary Union. It says the act entitled An Act to Authorize Participation by the United States in the Inter-Parliamentary Union approved June 28, 1935 is repealed.

Now, we have participated in the Inter-Parliamentary Union for 60 years. The Inter-Parliamentary Union is a group of parliaments from all over the world, 135 countries, which get together to discuss parliamentary democracy and other concerns around the world.

Is this the time that we ought to be withdrawing from such an organization? To me, as so much else in this bill, this amendment is yet another indication of the dangerous and growing isolationist wave engulfing the Republican Party. The United States is the leader of the Free World and we ought to lead.

The IPU is the only global international parliamentary organization to which the U.S. Congress belongs. We have forums who meet on NATO and CSCE, colleagues, but the IPU is the only parliamentary organization in which we have a chance to meet with members of the Middle East, including Israel, Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

And like most international parliamentary organizations, the great utility of the IPU lies not in its resolutions or debates but in the forum it provides for Members of Congress to interact and make direct contacts with

prominent parliamentarians from around the world. From personal experience, I have been to IPU meetings, and what we get in interchange of ideas and talking is certainly an enhancement of democracy.

This summer the United Nations is celebrating its 50th anniversary, and in New York City there will be commemorations and celebrations, and the IPU is taking the lead. Is this the year the United States ought to withdraw from the Inter-Parliamentary Union when we are celebrating our own country, the establishment of the United Nations and the establishment of the victory in World War II over fascism and the establishment of democracy, when countries are knocking down the door to try to be more democratic and emulate the United States? We are going to withdraw from the world. We are going to pull away. I can think of nothing that is really more ridiculous.

One hundred thirty-five countries participate. The United States is now going to join Upper Volta or some other country in not participating. We really ought to wake up. It may sound good but it is not something that is in the best interests of this country. So I am opposed to the chairman's, the manager's amendment.

I want to speak briefly on the Hoyer amendment and Bosnia. There are some of us who for the past 3 years have been arguing for a lifting of the arms embargo. Every time we get to the floor and we are able to bring forward some kind of resolution, we are always hearing the argument that we should not get involved. What has happened every time we plead? A year passes by, months pass by, more people are killed, more people are raped, more injustice has been heaped upon genocide, heaped upon a people. And yet the world wrings its hands.

In my opinion, we ought to get the British and the French and everybody else out of there and let the Bosnians defend themselves. That is all they are asking. They are asking not for American troops. They are asking for the arms to defend themselves. How can we just sit by and allow genocide to happen again on the continent of Europe? I do not understand it.

Diplomatic niceties are passed; 3 years ago, they passed. We said this 3 years, 2 years ago, last year and now, and nothing has happened. And if the events of the past several weeks have taught us nothing, I do not know how we ever learned from history.

The Serbs are arrogant. They thumb their nose; they care not about what the international community thinks. They have made a shambles out of NATO. They have made us look like fools. They have made our allies look like fools. Yet we stand by and say, no, no, no, we do not want to give the Bosnian Moslems a chance to defend themselves. Is it because they are Moslems? They are people. Give them the chance to defend themselves. That is all they are asking, and I commend the

gentleman from Maryland for his amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]. He is a valued member of our committee.

He is the chair of our Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere and has been performing an important function in that area. I regret that I cannot support his amendment. The bill before us already cuts AID operating expenses by \$52 million in fiscal year 1996 and another \$98 million in fiscal year 1997.

The cuts in the bill already forces reductions in over 1,000 AID employees. This amendment is somewhat like firing the assembly line workers when the cars are only half built. Personnel reductions, if they are to improve efficiency, must be done in a deliberate and a planned manner.

While I strongly am in favor of reducing the budget and did so in the bill, the cuts outlined here would devastate our programs while saving only a small amount.

The amendment does not make exceptions for staff supporting Russian disarmament programs, disaster relief or aid to starving people. Accordingly, I urge a "no" vote on the Burton amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. First of all, I would like to say that I support the Hoyer Amendment. I applaud the gentleman for offering it, and I support it wholeheartedly.

As much as I would like to support my friend from Indiana, and I appreciate his intent to downsize our foreign aid programs, and I share that intent. His amendment unfortunately is just too extreme. The Burton amendment would cut 25 percent from the operating expenses of AID. A cut of that magnitude would almost certainly result in a shutdown of the agency by next summer or perhaps earlier. That means the child survival programs, disaster assistance and food aid program would be halted before the end of the year.

Shutting down operations would not allow AID to oversee and implement the \$8 billion in funds obligated but not yet expended. It could lead to tremendous waste and abuse, which is exactly what the gentleman from Indiana does not want to happen.

The agency has already made major cuts in its staffing. The 8,750 on-board work force level planned for October 1, 1996 is 18 percent below the level at the end of fiscal year 1993.

More personnel cuts can and will be made, but such cuts need to be made and they will be made.

Whatever one thinks of foreign aid, it would be irresponsible to force such a draconian cut in the personnel account of this agency. We have a responsibility to the taxpayers to ensure that the funds we appropriate for the government programs are properly disbursed and that adequate oversight is provided. I believe no matter how well-intentioned, this amendment is short-sighted and counterproductive and I urge the defeat of the Burton amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on the Burton amendment.

□ 1345

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my opposition to the Burton amendment. While I have the utmost respect for my colleague on the International Relations Committee, and I believe that his amendment is truly well-intentioned, I think the amendment is short-sighted and counter-productive. Rather than streamline AID, the Burton amendment will undermine its ability to implement the activities that we in Congress have authorized. It will also destroy the reforms that AID has already implemented toward cost-cutting and program effectiveness.

In 1992, President George Bush appointed George Ferris to head a Commission on the Management of AID. It was Ferris, a Republican appointee, who said, "We know of no other agency that has increased its effectiveness to the degree that Brian Atwood has brought change and reform in AID. * * * What has been accomplished at AID should serve as an example for other departments and agencies of the Federal Government."

If I understand my colleague from Indiana, these cuts will save the taxpayers money without harming our foreign policy and development goals. I disagree. To accommodate such drastic cuts, AID would have to lay off almost one-half of its direct-hire staff in the next year, which would force the agency to spend most of its remaining resources in contract termination costs, lease buyouts, transportation home for personnel, and on mandatory retirement and separation benefits which would have to be paid under the Foreign Service and Civil Service Acts.

By mandating such drastic cuts in such a short time frame, this amendment would actually add millions of dollars to the cost of streamlining and downsizing our foreign aid programs. These cuts would force the agency to close down more than 20 overseas missions in addition to the 25 that they have already begun to close. This would force us to make impossible choices. Will we support new democracies or child survival programs? Foreign aid used to be writing checks to governments. But in recent years we have weaned ourselves off of direct payments, and have focused on helping

nations develop from the grassroots up. This policy shift was, correctly, mandated by Congress. I believe that most AID programs are an effective use of a very small amount of our taxpayers dollars. AID-backed training programs can stabilize new democracies in Latin America, and prevent famines in Africa. These are honorable goals which we must support. Therefore, I oppose the Burton amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in my remaining time I wish to make an admission. That is that, No. 1, I supported the measure by my friend, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], last year, and I feel that it has great currency this year. However, the ranking member of this committee has very carefully pinpointed those areas of vital concern that all of us here should have. It is not that we do not recognize the horror and destruction that is going on in Bosnia. It is that there is at this time an increase in the UNPROFOR troops in that area. In addition thereto, the United Nations has ongoing discussions with all of our allies in that locale.

The day before yesterday the Prime Minister of Hungary visited this august body, and some of us who met with him are mindful of his entreaty that we not do anything to exacerbate conditions there.

Mr. Chairman, I understand where the gentleman from Maryland is coming from, and all of my colleagues and I stand with him and take no back seat to any Member in this House in being diametrically opposed to the continuing slaughter going on in Bosnia. However, we need a careful and reasoned approach, and not just something thrown together in just a few minutes in order for us to be able to arrive at such conclusions as we help our administration, that we help our allies, and that we help ourselves come to an understanding.

There are no good solutions in Bosnia. I defy any man or woman of this House to come forward and say that they have the answer, and anyone that did have the answer would want to utilize it most immediately.

Mr. Chairman, I urge defeat of the manager's bill, I urge defeat of the foreign aid bill, I urge the defeat of the bill of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], and the defeat of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the American Overseas Interest Act and the manager's amendment to this bill. In the midst of the dire fiscal situation in which our Nation now exists, this bill, and in particular, this amendment that I helped craft, begin to set a course in the right direction—to cut back spending and address the problems that come with a \$200 billion deficit and steadily expanding national debt.

This Nation is drowning in a sea of red ink. Each day we are passing on to

the next generation a growing \$4.8 trillion national debt. Last November, the American people spoke in clear terms that passing on massive bills to our children and grandchildren is simply not acceptable. This new Congress heard their voices and during the first 100 days we passed legislation that represented a change from business as usual—an end to the tax-and-spend policies of the past.

The American Overseas Interest Act continues this trend to cut back on Government spending. This bill eliminates three agencies and consolidates their operations into the State Department, eliminating 4,000 positions over 2 years. This bill saves the American taxpayer \$21 billion over 7 years—a cut of between 15 and 20 percent from current levels—and conforms to the budget requirement that balances the Federal budget in 7 years. This is the first authorization bill we have had of this nature in 10 years. This bill cuts \$2.1 billion over fiscal year 1996 and fiscal year 1997, and continues to reduce spending in subsequent years.

Clearly we are on the right track to reduce spending.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to support the manager's amendment, because it goes further and explores areas where additional cuts have to be made. My amendment, which is part of the manager's amendment, says "Let us take a look at all programs," including the cultural and educational exchange programs, the vast majority of which are worthwhile.

However, Mr. Chairman, the issue is not one of merit but of cost. Can we afford current spending levels, given the massive debt this Nation has incurred?

As a part of this amendment, I have proposed additional reductions in the U.S. Information Agency cultural and educational programs. Specifically, we would save the American taxpayer an additional \$10 million in fiscal year 1996 and another \$10—half coming from Fulbright scholarships and half from the other exchanges. The effects of these savings would be to reduce spending on these accounts by 27 percent in fiscal year 1996 and 44 percent in fiscal year 1997 from the fiscal year 1995 levels.

Mr. Chairman, these are reasonable reductions and ones arrived at with the cooperation of the distinguished chairman of the committee, Mr. GILMAN, whose assistance I greatly appreciate. I am pleased to see that this Congress takes seriously its mandate from the American people that massive debt is unacceptable, that passing the buck on to future generations must stop and that Government spending must be brought under control and reduced. This bill and this amendment contribute to this effort, and I urge my colleagues to support passage of both.

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

Mr. Chairman, the manager's amendment has a number of serious defects,

and it would take more time than remains in this debate to address all of them.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to address what is referred to as the Hoke amendment, which would end OPIC. OPIC, which is an organization, is not the one associated with oil control but the one that helps American companies take advantage of opportunities overseas. OMB has found that the transfer of OPIC reserves would be substantially affecting our budget situation. There is an \$2.4 billion outlay that would be at risk. There is \$146 million in income from the reserves that are presently used in the 150 activities. The Federal budget would also lose future cash flows from insurance premiums of \$40 billion a year.

What would that do, Mr. Chairman? What it would do is endanger what has been \$40 billion of American exports. Not only does OPIC make money for the American taxpayer, but it helps produce thousands of jobs here in the United States. It seems to me unbelievable that someone would want to cripple an agency that produces revenue for the taxpayers and produces jobs for Americans and business opportunity for American companies.

In 1994 alone, Mr. Chairman, OPIC supported investments in projects that will result in over \$5.5 billion in the first 5 years of the projects' operation, and will generate approximately 18,000 American jobs. OPIC generates overseas investments, which in turn generate trade and opportunity for American companies.

When we see the Japanese restricting American trade, we understand why they are doing it. They are doing it because it is to their advantage, so when they stop American agricultural products from going to Japan, they are going to protect Japanese agriculture.

When they stop American auto parts from going to Japan, they are doing it to stop Americans from making the auto parts that go into Japanese cars, because they want to make them in Japan.

Why on Earth, Mr. Chairman, would anybody in this institution want to cripple an agency that makes profit for the taxpayers and creates jobs at home and business opportunities for American companies? If Members vote for the manager's amendment, they are endangering thousands of American jobs and the budget, because nowhere in the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE], which is now part of the manager's amendment, do they explain how they will replace the millions of dollars that OPIC now generates for the Treasury.

Once again, Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleagues, for a host of reasons, to vote against the manager's amendment. When other countries do us harm in trade and take away American trading opportunities, we know why they are doing it. They are doing it to help themselves. Why somebody would take an American agency that

helps American jobs and American workers and the American taxpayers and try to destroy it is counter-intuitive to our own self-interest, and I would hope that people would recognize this and will vote against the manager's amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me bring up a few facts. I would like to speak to the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER]. It has been stated that the former Yugoslavia is a European problem, and that the Europeans cannot handle it; that in the estimation of many, Europe has not been willing to commit either the resources economically or militarily to solve it.

I spoke recently with Dr. Kissinger. He said, and I quote, "The only way for the war to expand to Greece and to other countries is if the major powers would have direct involvement to lift the embargo." Two weeks ago I had dinner with Dick Cheney, Colin Powell, "Cap" Weinberger, and John Sununu. They said that the President's lack of foreign policy in this particular area makes it even more dangerous for us to get involved in risky amendments. I look at Russia's involvement or willingness to become involved in this conflict. I look why Greece supports the Serbians; because they were in World War II, and it was the Croats who fought with Nazi Germany. The head of the Moslems trained with Qadhafi in Libya with Moslem terrorists. Yet, on the other side, the Serbians and the Croats both have former, and I quote, used loosely, former Communist leaders. Therefore, the whole area is awry. For us to get involved in that civil war and possibly jump in is dangerous, I think, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I voted yesterday against my own leadership on the War Powers Act, because I did not think we had enough time to look at it. I thought it was not responsible. I do not think the War Powers Act works, but we need to adjust it. I voted against my own leadership on that principle.

□ 1400

I would say to my friend from Maryland, on the same principle, I oppose the gentleman's amendment.

If we give arms to the other side, I think we invite direct input from the Russians and their intervention. I look at the Pentagon, and I know most of the generals and the admirals by first names, and I talk to them. It is wrong, in their opinion, for us to get involved and lift the arms embargo.

No one wants to raise the embargoes other than those that generally have not been directly involved in combat. For us to decrease our own military size, to put and risk our own troops in harm's way, our men and women, and then to lift an embargo, would further throw kerosene on that fire.

My job in the Seventh Fleet was to employ war-fighting both Allied and

U.S. troops in and out of countries. Seventeen weeks ago in the Christian Science Monitor I published an article that said if you bomb, the Serbs are going to retaliate. They are going to bomb Moslems and they are going to bomb Croats and they are going to kill a lot of civilians. They are going to capture our peacekeepers, tie them to the primary targets, and then move their weapons.

Yet yesterday I heard Secretary Perry say we knew that; we knew the risk, and we consider it a success. Well, after that when they chained them, they shut down, the Serbians are still bombing, they are still gunning, but yet 70 are dead.

I would ask my friend from Maryland, if you want to sit in on hearings, I will bring in those admirals and those generals, and I would just ask the gentlemen from Maryland to sit down and listen to the dangers involved in this particular amendment. I understand the good intentions of the gentleman from Maryland, but in my humble opinion, it is wrong, and I oppose the gentleman's amendment.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, speaking of behaving responsibly, would the gentleman explain what he is talking about, about a Moslem leader training with Qaddafi? I know that not to be the case. I do not know who it is you could possibly be referring to.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to provide the entire dossier on the gentleman, and I will provide it to him immediately.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the manager's amendment. Is it really too much to expect the largest economic and military power in the world to spend almost 1 percent of its budget on developing market opportunities overseas, in promoting democracy, in protecting human rights? The vast majority of the American people have no idea how little we spend on foreign aid.

Now we have a manager's amendment that picked up all these little piles of amendments that were rejected by a committee that reported out a very extreme bill, they were rejected in committee, and now to get enough votes we throw them all into one package. Talk about a package that stinks, and that is entirely counter to the direction in which this country has gone from the days of Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, Dwight Eisenhower and all the way up through Ronald Reagan and President Bush.

You look at the Burton amendment. The Bush and Baker administration established these overseas missions in the New Independent States. The Burton amendment requires that we gut them. In fact, you have heard from the chairman of the Committee on Appro-

priations and the chairman of the Committee on International Relations on how bad the Burton amendment is.

I trust that people will recognize that that Burton amendment actually prevents us from accomplishing any of the programs we are talking about, eliminates the Micro Enterprise Program for all intents and purposes, eliminates our child survival programs, eliminates the ability to do anything more than simply write checks to foreign nations.

That is not what this Congress has voted to do in the past. They voted to give more responsibility to our international executive establishment so that we could be audited and we would be accountable for what we spend. The Burton amendment prevents us from being able to do that.

The Manzullo amendment, gutting the exchange programs. Anwar Sadat, F.W. DeKlerk, can you put a price tag on the value of leaders like that? And they were major participants in our USIA exchange programs.

I could go down the list of these amendments. Most Members have no idea what they do. We were only just shown what they did a couple of hours ago. They are wrong, they are bad, they are inconsistent with foreign policy that has been established decades ago by both Republican and Democratic administrations.

Now I would like to address the Hoyer amendment. The reason why this amendment is appropriate is that the arms embargo was never intended to apply to Bosnia. It was intended to apply when there was conflict between Serbia and Slovenia and then Croatia, and Slovenia and Croatia had the capacity, the access to arms. Bosnia never did. They never had the arms, they never had the capability for manufacturing weapons, so they have had to sit back while an aggressor came in and slaughtered them.

People who would suggest that this is a civil war are simply wrong. This is not any civil war. The reality is that it is a war that was directed, conducted, initiated by Serbia to create a greater Serbia.

No Bosnians have ever bent a blade of grass in Serbia, and we have a multiethnic democracy. It is not just a Moslem state as many would suggest. The head right now happens to be Moslem. The Ambassador to the United States is Jewish. The leadership of the Government is a combination of Croats and Serbians and Moslems.

They want to live together. That is why they are a threat to fascists like Milosevic and others. They do not want that to happen. They do not want a country like Bosnia to survive.

The United Nations comes in, the United Nations has a mission. Not to do right, not to ensure justice is done, but to sit back and essentially observe. We created safe areas. How safe is anyone living in those safe areas? We have deserted them. They have been shelled. People have been killed.

We have more than 2 million refugees throughout Europe. We have had about 40,000 women deliberately raped as a strategy, a tactic of war. We have over 100,000 people who have been slaughtered, defenseless to defend themselves.

I think we ought to lift the arms embargo, but I think we ought to do more than that. I think we ought to protect a sovereign nation. We ought to stand up for the integrity of territorial borders. That is the problem.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 further minute, because the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] asked for 3 minutes, we gave him the 3 minutes out of deference, I think maybe a third of that time. We would ask that we have that extra time.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would have to object. We only have 15 minutes left for the full debate. We have a number of Members who wish to speak. As much as I admire the gentleman, I am going to ask him to please refrain.

Mr. MORAN. I defer to the judgment and leadership of the chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the Burton amendment and rise to also support the Mica amendment which is part of this package.

Let me tell my colleagues, I have seen AID firsthand in dozens of countries around the world and AID is a wasteful and ineffective bureaucracy. It should be abolished as it exists or dramatically modified.

AID represents a post-World War II mentality. It has become an international welfare system that creates dependency and fails to help our U.S. trade activities. It often does very little to assist countries in need to help themselves.

Let me tell Members some examples. After spending billions of dollars to free Haiti with a military force and having spent over \$1 billion in United States economic assistance, including \$600,000 in AID grants, what has happened?

Here is the AID plan for Haiti. The cornerstone of this AID plan is 25,000 Haitians collecting garbage, 2,400 feeding stations, millions for election supervision, millions for judicial training, and almost nothing, a couple of pages, for creating permanent jobs.

Even teenagers with whom I met just recently in Port-au-Prince who serve in our military, these are teenage soldiers of our force. This is what one of them handed me, this note. He did not sign it but he says, "Port-au-Prince is secured. There is no need for United States presence in Haiti. I believe a lot of the money spent here should go to problems in the United States. This is a waste of taxpayers' money."

This is what our teenaged soldiers who observe the process there say.

Last summer I went to Bratislava in Slovakia and found that we only had one part-time commercial officer from Vienna coming once a week to help our United States trade agencies in this emerging nation. On the other hand, the AID office in Bratislava—now get this—has more employees than our Embassy.

We spend millions of taxpayer dollars in this country, for example, to set up a banking system and provide enterprise funds. Then we let other countries get the contracts for this business.

The President, an American citizen, of the Slovak American Chamber of Commerce told me, and let me quote what he said. He said, "We spend \$200 to give away \$1."

My colleagues, we are the laughing-stock of the emerging nations.

When I visited recently our Embassy in Moscow, we had only four full-time commercial officers. In contrast, AID had an entire building with hundreds of employees.

I took in the private sector one of the first trade missions to Lithuania and every Lithuanian from the lowest official to the highest said, "Trade, not aid." Then I returned to the United States, turned on the TV and saw our transport delivering humanitarian aid to the Soviet Union, the former Soviet Union, Russia. A couple of nights later I turned on the same newscast and there was the largest trade show in the history of Moscow, sponsored by the Japanese. Counting full-time employees and individuals serving under personal service contracts, AID has over 9,000 employees, more than our Embassies.

This amendment only cuts 25 percent from their funds. The entire U.S. foreign commercial service office only has 896 people working abroad. We have spent hundreds of billions of dollars with few positive results.

AID is an outdated, overrated give-away program. We should be focusing our efforts on increasing and improving trade activities as I have in my amendment. Trade rather than temporary aid will raise the fortune and opportunities and jobs for all people.

I do not oppose all foreign aid and I resent President Clinton's statement that we are isolationists.

Let me tell Members, there are still billions in this bill for aid. Americans are the most compassionate people in the world. But let me tell you, ladies and gentlemen, they are not the dumbest. If the Clinton administration were around when they had outhouses, they would be opposed to bringing the plumbing inside.

I do not oppose again all aid. Look at Japan. They tie trade to aid. Look at our successes where we provide trade and business opportunities rather than a temporary handout. Finally, look at even the earliest Biblical lessons that teach a man how to fish.

People in Grenada may need sidewalks. I need sidewalks for the people

in my district. People in Port-au-Prince may need their garbage collected, but, my colleagues, in my district, I only have the people in my district and the taxpayers to pay for their trash collections.

Quite frankly, both I and my constituents believe there can be a better way. Let us revise AID.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, there is such limited time, I ask unanimous consent that additional speakers be limited to 3 minutes.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, may I ask how much time is left?

The CHAIRMAN. Approximately 10 minutes, until 2:25.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Then I would object, Mr. Chairman, because we have two additional speakers.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, we have more than two additional speakers. I am trying to give everyone the opportunity to speak. That is why I am asking consent to agree to a limitation of time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. 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 New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that we have 10 additional minutes for this debate. I think it is important that Members who want to speak get an opportunity to speak.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the rule calls for a 2:25 limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would point out that the rule does not provide for a unanimous-consent request to extend the time beyond that provided in the rule.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I object to the unanimous-consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Burton amendment to cut the operating expenses of the U.S. Agency for International Development, the implementing arm of our Nation's concern for children around the world.

It is really ironic that a Member who has seen with his own eyes the suffering of African children would propose such a cruel amendment.

This amendment will gut programs of child survival and feeding programs for young children, because there will be insufficient staff to carry out the very programs for which we are authorizing funds. What kind of a business are we running when we commit products to save lives, but do not have the cooks and truck drivers to get the food to the needy consumers?

I know from past discussions of this subject in the International Relations Committee that Mr. BURTON somehow feels that our overseas staff is too large. Yet, in the last 2 years under the effective leadership of AID Administrator Brian Atwood we have already reduced total staff while at the same time have added 24 AID missions in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. AID has even responded to assisting in the peace process by implementing new programs in the West Bank and Gaza, bringing the results of peace to the people there.

Amazingly, Mr. BURTON seems to have a problem with an agency that is trying to turn around the management mistakes of the past administration when 87 percent of the money was spent in the last quarter.

How can any business operate this way and provide timely service to the people America wants to help? This is why we need to keep the AID budget for staff and operations on a sufficient level.

I further find this amendment ironic on the month of the African child, which we celebrate on June 16 in commemoration of the South African children that lost their lives in Soweto.

Let us save the children.

Vote against the Burton amendment.

□ 1415

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

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

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

I rise to support the amendment of my colleague and good friend from Maryland, Mr. HOYER. I believe we are debating a simple proposition today. There have to be consequences of aggression. There have to be consequences of aggression. It is not enough to stand on this floor and bemoan the rapes and bemoan the genocide and then not do anything.

I think we all agree we do not want to see U.S. troops actively engaged, but it seems to me that we do have to level the playing field, we do have to allow the victims of aggression the opportunity to protect themselves.

When there are consequences of aggression, when the victim has an opportunity to respond, you have a climate in which peace negotiations can take place because now the aggressor has a reason to negotiate for peace because he suffers some casualties and he suffers some hardships. In the absence of these consequences, in the absence of weapons to defend oneself, there are no consequences, and the aggression continues.

I believe that people should be cautious and I am not unmindful of the caution cited by the ranking member. But it is clear to me that this lifting of the arms embargo need not be immediate. We can have an orderly withdrawal of U.N. peacekeepers. There is no peace to keep. We can protect them,

have them move out, and then lift the arms embargo and enable the people who are the victims of the genocide we bemoan and the victims of the rapes we bemoan to defend themselves in the only way they can, and that is with weapons.

If we truly believe that we should exert leadership in the world, if we truly believe as the only superpower we have a responsibility not to allow another Holocaust, it seems to me that we ought to take the only logical step remaining, and that is to lift the embargo following the withdrawal of U.N. peacekeepers and allow the victims of this savagery to defend themselves.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hoyer amendment. Through vacillation, indecision, incoherence, and incompetence, the Clinton administration has allowed the situation in Bosnia to go from bad to worse. And let us not forget that the previous administration was in office when the arms embargo was imposed. During those years I was equally vociferous in my opposition to the imposition of the arms embargo.

Beyond the deepening humanitarian disaster, 200,000 civilian killed while half of the population have been forced to become refugees—the worst humanitarian crisis in Europe since World War II. There have been over 20,000 rapes. The United Nations and NATO have found themselves very much undermined through this process. But the loss of life obviously is our overriding concern.

As Chairman of the Helsinki Commission, I just left a hearing where Bosnian Prime Minister Haris Silajdzic made a very, very convincing and compelling case to lift the arms embargo. He has done this before with equal eloquence, but some of his comments today should be heard by every Member of this Chamber and every American. He said, "We face extinction; our people are dying, each and every day," while the United Nations and NATO, but especially the United Nations, talks about more talks with people like Milosevic and others who are war criminals, and frankly thugs.

Developments on the ground in Bosnia underscore the utter failure of the international community to come to terms with the armed aggression and genocide that has been perpetrated by the Bosnian Serbs against the people of Bosnia.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, we hear over and over again that we do not want to see escalation of the fighting in Bosnia. Nobody wants to see that, but there are an estimated 200,000 Bosnian government forces who want to take up arms, but there is only one rifle for every three soldiers. They cannot defend themselves. Mr. Speaker, everybody should remember and be mindful of the fact that when the breakup of the former Yugoslavia oc-

curred, the military capability and the might of Yugoslavia fell into hands of the Serbs, placing the Bosnians and the Croats at a great disadvantage. When an arms embargo was imposed, one side had all the guns, all the MiG's, all the heavy artillery and the tanks; the other side had nothing but broom handles and sticks. Again, that is why the continued imposition of the arms embargo is so immoral.

Dr. Silajdzic said, and I thought it was very well taken, that the arms embargo is illegal, immoral, and after 3 years it is inhumane. The policy of containment has done nothing to stop armed aggression and genocide. The arms embargo has rewarded aggression.

And let me make another point that I think is very important. The Prime Minister said again today as he has said before, as President Iztetbegovic has stressed, the Bosnians do not want American troops, they do not want British troops, they do not want French troops. They want to exercise their right to defend themselves, as any sovereign nation would want, especially in the face of aggression and genocide.

On the U.N. rapid reaction force, he said it is a more robust status quo. The U.N. peacekeepers are not even safe and they have the modest ability to defend themselves, but certainly the civilians who are killed each and every day by sniper fire and shelling are anything but safe.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] mentioned earlier, that he and I have been to that part of the world—we have seen the devastation. We were in Vukovar together. Shortly thereafter, we met with Milosevic, who denied that attacks in the city had resumed. We saw Serb MiG's fly over Vukovar with our own eyes, yet he denied it. We saw the tanks and devastation and that has continued year in and year out, and we have done nothing to stop it. There is bipartisan support for this effort to lift the arms embargo. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] and I and others have had hearings, we have looked in the eyes of the women raped as a part of this genocide, and we were absolutely moved to tears. It is unconscionable that we will not allow Bosnia—a sovereign state—to defend itself. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the Hoyer amendment in keeping with Bosnia's inherent right to self defense under the U.N. Charter.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Nebraska.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Burton amendment to make further cuts in AID.

If we adopt this amendment, we should forget about child survival programs,

microenterprise support and democracy promotion programs that are authorized in this bill.

This amendment will make it almost impossible for AID to implement these and other activities that don't simply involve writing checks to foreign governments, but involve serious work of program design implementation and oversight.

To accommodate such drastic cuts, AID would have to lay off nearly one-third of its direct-hire staff in the next year, throwing its operations into chaos.

In addition, the costs associated with the mandatory retirement and separation benefits which would have to be paid to those employees under the Foreign Service and Civil Service Acts would be enormous.

The Burton rapid cutback would entail termination costs in excess of \$100 million in fiscal year 1996, which could not be borne by the reduced operating expenses account. These costs include severance for U.S. and foreign national direct-hire and PSC employees, contract termination costs, lease buyouts and transportation for American employees returning from overseas.

AID would also have to close down between 15 and 20 overseas missions in addition to the 25 it is already closing down.

This would compel the United States to make impossible choices about ending support for countries in which we have real interests and which are going through tough democratic and market reforms.

While there may be some merit to streamlining the AID presence overseas, this kind of draconian cut would merely ensure that the assistance we are authorizing in this bill is not spent wisely or effectively.

This cut would also mean that AID would have to stop its development and acquisition of new technologies that are designed to make the delivery of assistance more efficient and cost-effective—technologies which we in Congress have been pushing them to develop and use over many years.

Shutting down all overseas operations and terminating all of the Agency's employees would leave no capacity to oversee the implementation of the \$8 billion in funds obligated but not yet expended in the Agency's pipeline.

The fiscal year 1996 budget request for operating expenses represents less than 7 percent of the Agency's overall appropriation request of \$7.56 billion for fiscal year 1996, an extremely low overhead rate by any standard.

Mr. Chairman, the bill already meets the category of AIP funding of \$25 million in fiscal year 1996 and \$55 million in fiscal year 1997. The Burton amendment would approximately cut a further \$70 million in fiscal year 1996 and \$25 million in fiscal year 1997. The distinguished chairman and ranking minority member of the International Relations Committee have already spoken against this amendment, as has the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. LIVINGSTON. I strongly urge Members to approve the Burton amendment.

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

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to correct the mischaracterization of the OPIC amendment that I have. It calls for a privatization feasibility study. It

was mischaracterized by the gentleman from Connecticut as being the elimination of OPIC. It is not. It does authorize the President to sell OPIC's stock. It does not direct him to do so. It calls for a feasibility study and its adoption will assist the International Relations Committee in its upcoming review.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] is recognized for the 2 remaining minutes under the rule.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hoyer amendment and in deep opposition to the Burton amendment and in opposition to the manager's amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. He is very gentlemanly to do that.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to use my time to say that this is a bad amendment, referring to the Hoyer amendment, to an already terrible bill. It is going to waste \$16 billion American dollars, money we have to borrow in order to give away to rich countries like Israel and Egypt.

But worse than that, the Hoyer amendment would call for the wasting of American lives. Testimony before the Committee on Armed Services coming from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Colin Powell, says you cannot just give people surface-to-air missiles. You cannot just give people heavy artillery. You have to send people over there first to deliver it and then to train them to use it, and that means putting American service personnel on the ground in the Bosnia, which is going to lead to the loss of American lives in a 700-year-old war.

Those who think that the Moslems from the Middle East are going to stand by once we lift the embargo or the Russians are going to stand by once we lift the embargo and not help the Croats are absolutely crazy.

Where is the rush to squander American lives?

Yesterday this Congress did the right thing in voting not to get rid of the War Powers Act and voting not to give President Clinton more power to send American kids off to get killed. If you are so anxious to go help the Moslems

or the Croats or the Serbs, put down your briefcase, pick up a gun, and go have a lot of fun. But do not send American troops off to do what you will not do. Do you squander their lives for a hopeless war in a part of the world where we do not belong.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I will vote for the Gilman amendment for one reason and one reason only: The Gilman amendment includes the Hoyer amendment which would lift the U.N. arms embargo against Bosnia and Herzegovina and allow that nation to defend itself.

There are several provisions of the Gilman amendment that are troubling to me. I support the continuation of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, which the Gilman amendment would privatize. I support the work of the Agency for International Development and strongly disagree with the Gilman amendment's reductions in personnel at AID.

But I have been to Bosnia. I have seen the slaughter of the people there. I have been huddled with those people in basements which were their only sanctuary after their city was shelled. The Bosnian Serbs are maiming and killing innocent people and the arms embargo continues to tie the hands of the people of Bosnia in their efforts at self-defense.

The Hoyer amendment, I believe, can help to bring the war in Bosnia more quickly to an end. The Hoyer amendment will let the people of Bosnia know that the United States Congress stands with them.

For that reason and that reason alone, I vote today for the Gilman amendment which includes the Hoyer amendment to give the people of Bosnia their right to self-defense.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by Mr. MANZULLO because further reductions in funding for cultural exchange programs would cripple the country's ability to build a meaningful dialog with new democracies around the world.

As the United States scales back abroad, USIA-supported exchange programs have become vital to our national security. In the past, the exchange programs encouraged greatness in the lives of modern, global leaders like F.W. DeKlerk and Anwar Sadat. Today, in a fractured world, these programs are a beacon to young leaders searching for practical policies that have been tested over time.

We must make long-term efforts to promote, first, civil societies, second, open economies, third, respect for human rights and fourth, peaceful resolution of conflict.

Let me tell you about an exchange program that works. In Jacksonville, FL, the chamber of commerce with its 5,000 members, has jointly developed a leadership program with the Czech Ministry of Industry and Trade. The program has become national in scope as Czech future leaders come to America to learn about democracy and trade. This successful hands on program involves local participation and should be replicated rather than destroyed. Many Czech participants have written letters telling how their internship changed their life by opening doors they did not know existed.

This is a win/win situation for Jacksonville and other cities that have entered into USIA-supported exchange programs. Today Jacksonville is reaching out to the world because it knows it must in order to grow and not stagnate in the 21st century.

I support USIA-supported exchange programs because I know that our Nation must not stagnate in the 21st century.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to unilaterally lift the arms embargo on the Bosnian Government.

I take this position very reluctantly. But I have to say that I believe that voting for this action today would be a grave mistake. Some of our most important allies have put their forces in harm's way to try to bring about a halt in the fighting and to safeguard the civilian population in Bosnia. True, they have not been completely successful. But compared to the carnage and atrocities that occurred in Bosnia prior to the deployment of U.N. forces, the situation is more than a modest improvement. And our allies have just taken further action to introduce additional forces for a rapid deployment force to enhance the prospects of peace enforcement and to open supply lines to civilian populations.

If we lift the arms embargo we will pull the rug out from under our allies and invite the Serbian forces, which have been the aggressors in this conflict and have been responsible for utterly abhorrent atrocities and human rights violations, to renew completely unbridled hostilities. We will endanger the lives of UNPROFOR troops who today remain in illegal Serbian custody. And we will put the forces of our allies who are on the ground today in even greater danger than they currently find themselves.

Our allies with troops on the ground have said they will withdraw from Bosnia if we lift the embargo. Our President has already pledged that he would support this withdrawal with the deployment of U.S. ground troops. So make no mistake about it—if we lift the embargo now we will absolutely compel the introduction of U.S. ground forces to extricate UNPROFOR troops.

I might add that if anyone here thinks the Serbs will wait until the embargo is lifted, the Bosnian Moslems rearm, and the Bosnian Moslems train in the effective use of the new weapons they receive before the Serbs resume further offensive actions, including the full-scale shelling of civilian populations, they are sadly mistaken. The Serbs will initiate mass shelling immediately. Thousands more civilians will be killed or wounded.

We should wait to see how the latest European initiative introducing troops into Bosnia fares before we ruin its chances for success. I know the situation in Bosnia is tragic. Last year some 3,000 people were killed in Bosnia as a consequence of the fighting there. But this is nothing compared to the number that would die if the fighting proceeds without check.

If our allies give up on this situation, if they conclude that there is no further utility in trying to intervene on the side of peace and they choose to withdraw their forces, then we should indeed lift the embargo. But doing so before that time would be premature. It will result in further terrible loss of life. And it surely will suck U.S. ground troops into this conflict and involve our Nation in a war it does not want to be in.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the amendment being offered by Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would further cut funding for one of the most successful

programs our Nation operates—the Sister Cities Program, as well as other important cultural exchange programs.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower founded the Sister Cities Program almost 40 years ago, and now Sister Cities is the largest citizen exchange organization in the world. There are more than 1,000 U.S. cities in partnership with over 1,900 international cities in 120 countries.

As a former member of the board of directors of Sister Cities, I have seen first hand the benefits that the program brings.

My own city of San Jose, CA, has built strong relationships with such cities as Okayama, Japan, and Dublin, Ireland.

When the San Francisco Bay Area suffered the Loma Prieta earthquake in 1989, the citizens of San Jose, Costa Rica, another of our Sister Cities, generously sent supplies and aid for the relief centers.

The Sister Cities Program, Mr. Chairman, brings people of different nations together in friendship and understanding. It builds relationships that strengthen the bonds between the United States and the other nations of the world.

Mr. Chairman, as we seek to reduce the Federal budget deficit, we must do so responsibly. In cutting funding for cultural exchange programs like Sister Cities, this amendment goes far beyond what is reasonable and will cripple programs that are of very great importance.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Gilman amendment.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, today, we have the welcome news of Capt. Scott O'Grady's rescue by U.S. Marines in northern Bosnia. Having survived the trauma of being shot down by hostile forces is testimony to Captain O'Grady's courage and determination. This mission was a combination of Semper Fidelis and the luck of the Irish.

As a Member of this body and because of my own Croatian heritage, Bosnia is a major concern. I continue to pray for the quickest possible—and least bloody—resolution to the crisis in the Balkans.

Let me make firm by belief that there must be no large-scale commitment of American troops in Bosnia.

The need, Mr. Chairman is to lift the arms embargo immediately. What many fail to see is that by not lifting the embargo, the internationally recognized state of Bosnia cannot effectively defend itself. We must not be a party to preventing fearless people from resisting naked aggression. The aggressive conduct of the Bosnian Serbs can and will be met—and punished—by those who want to defend themselves.

If the international community will not help, it must not hinder.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of a provision in the fiscal year 1996 American Overseas Act [H.R. 1561], related to unresolved commercial claims between United States nationals and the Government of Saudi Arabia.

This section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export and Control Act to require congressional oversight and scrutiny of all arms sales to the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia until such time as the Secretary of State certifies and reports to Congress that the unpaid claims of American companies described in the June 30, 1993 report by the Secretary of

Defense pursuant to section 9140(c) of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1993, Public Law 102–396; 106 Stat. 1939, including the additional claims noticed by the Department of Commerce on page 2 of the report, have been resolved satisfactorily.

For more than 2 years now, Gibbs & Hill, Inc., has been waiting for the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to honor commitments to it and to our Government to favorably resolve its \$43.4 million debt owed to it by the Saudi Arabian Government. The claim is one of the long outstanding claims designated for resolution by the Saudi Arabian Government, by its Embassy here in Washington, under the special claims process which was originated by this body following hearings on May 9, 1992 on the commercial abuses of American companies by the Kingdom.

As recently as 3 weeks ago, United States Ambassador to Saudi Arabia, Raymond Mabus, advised Members of Congress and the company that he had been assured by a member of the Saudi Royal Court, on the authority of the King, that the Kingdom was soon to pay the claim. Despite this assurance, the Saudi Arabian Embassy here in Washington continues its efforts to delay, obfuscate, and avoid payment of the debt. This outrageous situation cannot be allowed to continue. This section will show the Congress intends to stress upon the Saudi Arabian Government that the claims issue must be successfully concluded through the payment of this last remaining claim.

The claim of Gibbs & Hill dates back more than a decade. In 1978, Gibbs & Hill went to Saudi Arabia to provide its engineering expertise to the Royal Commission for Jubail and Yanbu in connection with the design and construction of the Yanbu industrial city. Gibbs & Hill was hired by the Royal Commission to help design the desalination and related facilities which are a major component of this industrial complex. The Royal Commission required significant additional services of Gibbs & Hill to perform the work, committing to compensate Gibbs & Hill for the added services, benefiting from the work performed, and highly praising Gibbs & Hill's work product, but the Royal Commission refused to pay. Gibbs & Hill's attempts to seek redress through the Kingdom's court system was useless, as the court merely upheld the wrongful acts of another agency of the Kingdom. Gibbs & Hill was decimated by the financial losses suffered on this project as a result of the commercial abuses of the Kingdom.

We have an opportunity now to bring the special claims process to a successful conclusion through the full and prompt resolution of the Gibbs & Hill claim. This is a stated policy objective of our Nation, which is currently supported by some 50 Members of Congress and Senators from both sides of the aisle. This section will ensure that in the future, American companies are protected from the type of commercial abuses suffered by Gibbs & Hill at the hands of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for consideration of amendments under this rule has expired.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. To understand the parliamentary situation at this point in time, am I correct that the Gilman en bloc amendment will be voted on after the Hoyer amendment as a secondary amendment which will be voted upon first; then is it my understanding that the Burton amendment will be then split out of the en bloc amendment for the purposes of a vote, and then the Gilman amendment as amended?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. For the information of the Members, the Chair will announce that the order of voting will proceed as follows: first on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN]; next on separate votes on any divisible portion of this Gilman amendment; and finally on the remainder of the Gilman amendment, as amended or not.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I have a further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, does that mean that Members could ask for a division on any of the manager's amendments that are in there?

The CHAIRMAN. Any divisible portion of the amendment can be subjected to a separate vote.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 2(c) of rule XXIII, the Chair announced that he may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the period of time within which a rollcall vote by electronic device may be taken without intervening business on the divisible portions of the Gilman amendment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 318, noes 99, not voting 17, as follows

[Roll No. 362]

AYES—318

Ackerman	Bishop	Calvert
Allard	Blute	Camp
Andrews	Boehlert	Cardin
Archer	Boehner	Castle
Bachus	Bonior	Chabot
Baker (LA)	Bono	Chambliss
Ballenger	Boucher	Chenoweth
Barcia	Brewster	Christensen
Barr	Brown (FL)	Chrysler
Barrett (NE)	Brown (OH)	Clayton
Bartlett	Brownback	Clement
Barton	Bryant (TN)	Clyburn
Bass	Bryant (TX)	Coble
Becerra	Bunn	Coburn
Beilenson	Bunning	Collins (GA)
Bentsen	Burr	Collins (MI)
Berman	Burton	Condit
Bevill	Buyer	Cooley
Bilbray	Callahan	Costello

Cox	Johnson, Sam
Crapo	Jones
Cremeans	Kaptur
Cubin	Kasich
Danner	Kelly
Davis	Kennelly
DeFazio	Kildee
DeLauro	Kim
DeLay	King
Deutsch	Kingston
Diaz-Balart	Klink
Dickey	Klug
Dingell	Kolbe
Doggett	LaFalce
Dooley	LaHood
Doolittle	Lantos
Dornan	Largent
Doyle	Latham
Dreier	LaTourette
Duncan	Lazio
Dunn	Leach
Durbin	Levin
Ehrlich	Lewis (CA)
Emerson	Lewis (KY)
Engel	Lightfoot
English	Lincoln
Ensign	Linder
Everett	Lipinski
Ewing	Livingston
Fattah	LoBiondo
Fawell	Lowe
Fields (TX)	Lucas
Flake	Luther
Flanagan	Maloney
Forbes	Manton
Ford	Manzullo
Fox	Markey
Frank (MA)	Martinez
Franks (CT)	Martini
Franks (NJ)	Mascara
Frelinghuysen	McCarthy
Frisa	McCrery
Frost	McHale
Funderburk	McHugh
Furse	McInnis
Galleghy	McIntosh
Ganske	McKeon
Gekas	McNulty
Geren	Meehan
Gilchrest	Menendez
Gillmor	Metcalf
Gilman	Meyers
Gonzalez	Mfume
Goodlatte	Mica
Goss	Miller (FL)
Graham	Mink
Green	Molinar
Greenwood	Mollohan
Gunderson	Moorhead
Gutiérrez	Moran
Gutknecht	Morella
Hall (OH)	Myers
Hall (TX)	Myrick
Hancock	Nadler
Hansen	Neal
Hastings (WA)	Nethercutt
Hayes	Neumann
Hayworth	Ney
Hefley	Norwood
Heineman	Nussle
Heger	Obey
Hilleary	Olver
Hilliard	Ortiz
Hinche	Orton
Hobson	Owens
Hoekstra	Oxley
Hoke	Packard
Holden	Pallone
Horn	Parker
Hoyer	Pastor
Hunter	Paxon
Hutchinson	Payne (NJ)
Hyde	Pelosi
Inglis	Peterson (MN)
Istook	Pickett
Jackson-Lee	Pombo
Jefferson	Pomeroy

NOES—99

Abercrombie	Borski
Armedy	Browder
Baessler	Brown (CA)
Baker (CA)	Canady
Baldacci	Clay
Barrett (WI)	Clinger
Bateman	Coleman
Bereuter	Collins (IL)
Billirakis	Combest
Bliley	Conyers

Porter	Evans
Portman	Farr
Poshard	Fazio
Pryce	Fields (LA)
Quillen	Filner
Quinn	Foglietta
Radanovich	Foley
Rahall	Fowler
Ramstad	Gejdenson
Rangel	Gephardt
Regula	Gibbons
Riggs	Goodling
Rivers	Gordon
Roberts	Hamilton
Rogers	Hastert
Rohrabacher	Hastings (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen	Hefner
Roth	Hostettler
Roybal-Allard	Houghton
Royce	Jacobs
Rush	Johnson (SD)
Salmon	Johnson, E.B.
Sanford	Johnston
Sawyer	
Saxton	
Scarborough	
Schaefer	
Schiff	
Schumer	
Scott	
Seastrand	
Sensenbrenner	
Serrano	
Shadegg	
Shaw	
Shays	
Shuster	
Skeen	
Slaughter	
Smith (MI)	
Smith (NJ)	
Smith (TX)	
Smith (WA)	
Solomon	
Stearns	
Stenholm	
Stockman	
Stump	
Stupak	
Talent	
Tanner	
Tate	
Tauzin	
Taylor (NC)	
Tejeda	
Thomas	
Thornberry	
Thurman	
Tiahrt	
Torricelli	
Towns	
Traficant	
Tucker	
Upton	
Velazquez	
Vento	
Volkmer	
Waldholtz	
Walker	
Walsh	
Wamp	
Waters	
Watts (OK)	
Weldon (FL)	
Weldon (PA)	
Weller	
White	
Whitfield	
Wilson	
Wise	
Wolf	
Wyden	
Wynn	
Young (AK)	
Young (FL)	
Zeliff	
Zimmer	

Kanjorski	Roukema
Kennedy (MA)	Sabo
Kennedy (RI)	Sanders
Knollenberg	Schroeder
Lewis (GA)	Sisisky
Longley	Skaggs
Matsui	Skelton
McCullum	Souder
McDermott	Spence
McKinney	Stark
Meek	Stokes
Miller (CA)	Studds
Mineta	Taylor (MS)
Minge	Thompson
Moakley	Torkildsen
Murtha	Torres
Lewis (VA)	Visclosky
Petri	Vucanovich
Reed	Ward
Reynolds	Watt (NC)
Richardson	Waxman
Roemer	Williams
Rose	Woolsey

NOT VOTING—17

Bonilla	Klecza	Peterson (FL)
Chapman	Laughlin	Spratt
de la Garza	Lofgren	Thornton
Dicks	McDade	Wicker
Harman	Montgomery	Yates
Johnson (CT)	Oberstar	

□ 1448

Mrs. MEEK of Florida and Messrs. CRANE, BROWDER, LEWIS of Georgia, and CLINGER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. BUYER, Mrs. CLAYTON, and Messrs. CALLAHAN, NADLER, SERRANO, BLUTE, and RUSH changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the last divisible portion of the amendment as originally offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], as amended, demanded by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The Clerk will report the divided portion of the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In section 3231 of the bill (in section 667(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as proposed to be amended by such section 3231; relating to operating expenses of the United States Agency for International Development), strike "\$465,774,000" and insert "\$396,770,250" and strike "\$419,196,000" and insert "\$396,770,250".

Mr. BURTON of Indiana (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this portion of 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.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the last divisible portion of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], as amended.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 236, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No 363]

AYES—182

Allard Funderburk Paxon
 Archer Gallegly Peterson (MN)
 Army Gekas Petri
 Bachus Geren Pickett
 Baker (CA) Goodlatte Pombo
 Barcia Graham Poshard
 Barr Gutknecht Quillen
 Barrett (NE) Hall (TX)
 Bartlett Hancock
 Barton Hansen
 Bass Hastert
 Beville Hastings (WA)
 Boehner Hayes
 Bono Hayworth
 Browder Hefley
 Brownback Heineman
 Bryant (TN) Herger
 Bunning Hilleary
 Burr Hoekstra
 Burton Hoke
 Buyer Horn
 Camp Hostettler
 Canady Hunter
 Chabot Hutchinson
 Chambliss Inglis
 Chenoweth Istook
 Christensen Jacobs
 Chrysler Johnson, Sam
 Coble Jones
 Coburn Kasich
 Collins (GA) Kennedy (RI)
 Combest Kim
 Condit Kingston
 Cooley Klug
 Costello Largent
 Cox Latham
 Cramer Lewis (KY)
 Crane Lincoln
 Crapo Linder
 Cremeans LoBiondo
 Cubin Lucas
 Cunningham Luther
 Deal Manzullo
 DeLay Martini
 Diaz-Balart McCollum
 Dickey McCrery
 Doolittle McHugh
 Dornan McInnis
 Dreier McIntosh
 Duncan McKeon
 English Metcalf
 Ensign Mica
 Ewing Minge
 Fields (LA) Moorhead
 Fields (TX) Myers
 Flanagan Myrick
 Forbes Nethercutt
 Fowler Neumann
 Fox Ney
 Franks (NJ) Norwood
 Frisa Parker

NOES—236

Abercrombie Clay
 Ackerman Clayton
 Andrews Clement
 Baesler Clinger
 Baker (LA) Clyburn
 Baldacci Coleman
 Ballenger Collins (IL)
 Barrett (WI) Collins (MI)
 Bateman Conyers
 Becerra Coyne
 Beilenson Danner
 Bentsen Davis
 Bereuter DeFazio
 Berman DeLauro
 Bilbray Dellums
 Bilirakis Deutsch
 Bishop Dingell
 Bliley Dixon
 Blute Doggett
 Boehlert Dooley
 Bonior Doyle
 Borski Dunn
 Boucher Durbin
 Brewster Edwards
 Brown (CA) Ehlers
 Brown (FL) Ehrlich
 Brown (OH) Emerson
 Bryant (TX) Engel
 Bunn Eshoo
 Callahan Evans
 Calvert Everett
 Cardin Farr
 Castle Fattah

Fawell
 Fazio
 Filner
 Flake
 Foglietta
 Foley
 Ford
 Frank (MA)
 Franks (CT)
 Frelinghuysen
 Frost
 Furse
 Ganske
 Gejdenson
 Gephardt
 Gibbons
 Gilchrest
 Gillmor
 Gilman
 Gonzalez
 Goodling
 Gordon
 Goss
 Green
 Greenwood
 Gunderson
 Gutierrez
 Hall (OH)
 Hamilton
 Hastings (FL)
 Hefner
 Hilliard
 Hinchey

Hobson
 Holden
 Houghton
 Hoyer
 Hyde
 Jackson-Lee
 Jefferson
 Johnson (SD)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnston
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Kelly
 Kennedy (MA)
 Kennelly
 Kildee
 King
 Klink
 Knollenberg
 Roth
 Kolbe
 LaFalce
 LaHood
 Lantos
 LaTourette
 Lazio
 Leach
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lightfoot
 Lipinski
 Livingston
 Longley
 Lowey
 Maloney
 Manton
 Markey
 Martinez
 Mascara
 Matsui
 McCarthy
 McDermott
 McHale
 McKinney
 McNulty
 Meehan

Meek
 Menendez
 Meyers
 Mfume
 Miller (CA)
 Miller (FL)
 Mineta
 Mink
 Moakley
 Molinari
 Mollohan
 Moran
 Morella
 Murtha
 Nadler
 Neal
 Nussle
 Obey
 Olver
 Ortiz
 Orton
 Owens
 Oxley
 Packard
 Pallone
 Pastor
 Payne (NJ)
 Payne (VA)
 Pelosi
 Pomeroy
 Porter
 Portman
 Pryce
 Quinn
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Reed
 Regula
 Reynolds
 Richardson
 Rivers
 Rose
 Roukema
 Roybal-Allard
 Rush
 Sabo

NOT VOTING—16

Bonilla
 Chapman
 de la Garza
 Dicks
 Harman
 Johnson (CT)
 Kleczka
 Laughlin
 Lofgren
 McDade
 Montgomery
 Oberstar

□ 1459

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Wicker for, with Mr. Yates against.

Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. QUINN changed their vote from "aye" to "no." Messrs. KASICH, KIM, and MCCOLLUM changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the last divisible portion of the amendment, as amended, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1500

The question is on the remaining portion of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], as amended.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 117, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No 364]

AYES—239

Andrews
 Archer
 Army
 Bachus
 Baker (CA)
 Baker (LA)
 Ballenger
 Barcia
 Barr
 Barrett (NE)
 Bartlett
 Barton
 Bass
 Bereuter
 Beville
 Bilbray
 Bilirakis
 Bliley
 Blute
 Boehlert
 Boehner
 Bono
 Brewster
 Browder
 Brownback
 Bryant (TN)
 Bunn
 Bunning
 Burr
 Burton
 Buyer
 Callahan
 Calvert
 Camp
 Canady
 Castle
 Chabot
 Chambliss
 Chenoweth
 Christensen
 Chrysler
 Clement
 Clinger
 Coble
 Coburn
 Collins (GA)
 Combest
 Condit
 Cooley
 Cox
 Cramer
 Crane
 Crapo
 Cremeans
 Cubin
 Cunningham
 Davis
 Deal
 DeLay
 Diaz-Balart
 Dickey
 Doolittle
 Dornan
 Dreier
 Duncan
 Dunn
 Ehlers
 Ehrlich
 Emerson
 English
 Ensign
 Everett
 Fawell
 Fields (LA)
 Fields (TX)
 Flanagan
 Forbes
 Fox
 Franks (CT)
 Franks (NJ)

NOES—177

Frelinghuysen
 Frisa
 Funderburk
 Gallegly
 Ganske
 Gekas
 Geren
 Gilchrest
 Gillmor
 Gilman
 Goodlatte
 Goodling
 Goss
 Graham
 Greenwood
 Gunderson
 Gutknecht
 Hall (TX)
 Hancock
 Hansen
 Hastert
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayes
 Hayworth
 Hefley
 Heineman
 Herger
 Hilleary
 Hobson
 Hoekstra
 Hoke
 Horn
 Sanford
 Sanft
 Scarborough
 Schaefer
 Schiff
 Seastrand
 Sensenbrenner
 Shadegg
 Shaw
 Shays
 Shuster
 Skeen
 Smith (MI)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Solomon
 Souder
 Spence
 Stearns
 Stenholm
 Stockman
 Stump
 Talent
 Tate
 Tauzin
 Taylor (MS)
 Taylor (NC)
 Thomas
 Thornberry
 LoBiondo
 Longley
 Lucas
 Luther
 Manzullo
 Martini
 McCrery
 McHugh
 McInnis
 McIntosh
 McKeon
 McNulty
 Metcalf
 Meyers
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Minge
 Molinari
 Moorhead

Myers
 Myrick
 Nethercutt
 Neumann
 Ney
 Norwood
 Nussle
 Oxley
 Packard
 Parker
 Paxon
 Peterson (MN)
 Petri
 Pombo
 Porter
 Portman
 Pryce
 Quinn
 Radanovich
 Ramstad
 Regula
 Riggs
 Roberts
 Rogers
 Rohrabacher
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roth
 Roukema
 Royce
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Saxton
 Scarborough
 Schaefer
 Schiff
 Seastrand
 Sensenbrenner
 Shadegg
 Shaw
 Shays
 Shuster
 Skeen
 Smith (MI)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Solomon
 Souder
 Spence
 Stearns
 Stenholm
 Stockman
 Stump
 Talent
 Tate
 Tauzin
 Taylor (MS)
 Taylor (NC)
 Thomas
 Thornberry
 LoBiondo
 Longley
 Lucas
 Luther
 Manzullo
 Martini
 McCrery
 McHugh
 McInnis
 McIntosh
 McKeon
 McNulty
 Metcalf
 Meyers
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Minge
 Molinari
 Moorhead

Evans	Levin	Richardson
Ewing	Lewis (GA)	Rivers
Farr	Lowey	Roemer
Fattah	Maloney	Rose
Fazio	Manton	Roybal-Allard
Filner	Markey	Rush
Flake	Martinez	Sabo
Foglietta	Mascara	Sanders
Foley	Matsui	Sawyer
Ford	McCarthy	Schroeder
Fowler	McCollum	Schumer
Frank (MA)	McDermott	Scott
Frost	McHale	Serrano
Furse	McKinney	Sisisky
Gejdenson	Meehan	Skaggs
Gephardt	Meek	Skelton
Gibbons	Menendez	Slaughter
Gonzalez	Mfume	Stark
Gordon	Miller (CA)	Stokes
Green	Mineta	Studds
Gutierrez	Mink	Stupak
Hall (OH)	Moakley	Tanner
Hamilton	Mollohan	Tejeda
Hastings (FL)	Moran	Thompson
Hefner	Morella	Thornton
Hilliard	Murtha	Thurman
Hinchee	Nadler	Torkildsen
Holden	Neal	Torres
Hoyer	Obey	Torricelli
Jackson-Lee	Olver	Towns
Jacobs	Ortiz	Tucker
Jefferson	Orton	Velazquez
Johnson (SD)	Owens	Vento
Johnson, E. B.	Pallone	Viscosky
Johnston	Pastor	Volkmer
Kanjorski	Payne (NJ)	Ward
Kaptur	Payne (VA)	Waters
Kennedy (MA)	Pelosi	Watt (NC)
Kennelly	Pickett	Waxman
Kildee	Pomeroy	Williams
Klink	Poshard	Wilson
Knollenberg	Rahall	Wise
LaFalce	Rangel	Woolsey
LaHood	Reed	Wyden
Lantos	Reynolds	Wynn

NOT VOTING—18

Allard	Johnson (CT)	Oberstar
Bonilla	Kleccka	Peterson (FL)
Chapman	Laughlin	Spratt
de la Garza	Lofgren	Walsh
Dicks	McDade	Wicker
Harman	Montgomery	Yates

□ 1509

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Wicker for, with Mr. Yates against.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to reiterate my strong support for the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act, of which I am an original co-sponsor.

Those who support this portion of H.R. 1561 believe in the integrity of the United States, and are sensitive to preserving America's credibility abroad. That credibility is linked to effectively carrying-out policies of humanitarian assistance. U.S. humanitarian assistance must be allowed to be delivered to those countries in need all over the world.

Specifically, this legislation will address situations such as that found in Armenia, where a Turkish blockade is preventing our aid from being delivered. It is essential that United States aid be allowed to flow unhindered into Armenia.

I urge my colleagues to support the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1561, the so-called American Overseas Interests Act. Despite several good provisions, this bill will severely restrict the ability of the United States to exercise leadership in the post-cold war world. By

micromanaging foreign policy and slashing valuable foreign aid resources, this legislation unilaterally disarms America and relegates the world's sole remaining superpower to a second-class status.

H.R. 1561 includes a number of provisions that tie the hands of the President and reduce the leverage he needs to solve complex foreign policy problems in countries such as Russia, North Korea, and China. It also undermines our effective participation in international organizations and our efforts to encourage other nations to share the burden of global responsibilities.

It is ironic that many of my colleagues who criticized Democrats for curtailing and micromanaging the foreign policies of Presidents Reagan and Bush will vote for this measure today. They would be wise to heed the words of Lawrence Eagleburger, former Secretary of State under President George Bush, who recently stated on the bill, "all of these various restrictions and demands on the President * * * are an absolute attack on the separation of powers. Foreign policy is now and always should be in the hands of the executive branch with the advice and consent of the Congress. * * * You can't put in prescriptions that may apply today and don't apply tomorrow."

Moreover, despite promises by its sponsors that it will reduce bureaucracy, H.R. 1561 will create a megabureaucratic State Department that is unwieldy, costly and ineffective. By contrast, the Clinton administration is already proceeding vigorously with its efforts to streamline the State Department foreign policies agencies, reducing staffing by 4,700 positions, cutting bureaucratic layers and duplication.

H.R. 1561 also cuts our foreign aid programs by \$1 billion, including a 30 percent cut in development assistance. These cuts will restrict the ability of our President to fight for our interests through diplomacy, protect our global security interests, and open markets to U.S.-produced goods and services.

Mr. Chairman, it is with some reservations that I oppose final passage on this measure today. I support the provisions in H.R. 1561 that include the administration's full request for foreign assistance to Israel and Egypt. This aid is absolutely critical to keeping the Middle East peace process moving forward.

While aid to Israel is protected in the short term in this legislation, the long-term future of Israel's security is jeopardized by the isolationist policies implicit in this legislation.

By slashing America's foreign policy resources, H.R. 1561 will hollow out our first line of defense against future threats to the United States and Israel. It will impede our ability to bar the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction that threaten both the United States and Israel. It will slash the resources we need to combat international terrorism that threatens both the United States and Israel. And it will diminish our influence and leadership in efforts to peacefully resolve potential conflicts in the Middle East before they flair into military conflicts.

H.R. 1561 will set foreign aid spending on a downward spiral that will ultimately increase political pressure to cut into the aid accounts for Israel and Egypt. Under this legislation, aid to Israel and Egypt will comprise almost half of the overall foreign aid budget. Under this trend, there will soon be nothing left to cut in these accounts.

Without foreign aid, our country will lose its ability to exercise leadership to confront the challenges of the post-cold-war world. It is a small but very important investment, representing less than 1 percent of our overall budget, in our ability to safeguard America's political and economic interests abroad.

Mr. Chairman, despite the end of the cold war, the world remains a dangerous and uncertain place. We will be confronted with new challenges abroad every day. H.R. 1561 will inhibit the ability of the executive branch to meet those challenges. For this and many other reasons, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1561 should be defeated, and the House should instead approve an authorization bill that gives the President the tools he needs to exercise leadership in the postcold-war world.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1561, the American Overseas Interest Act. I believe that the bill before us represents a responsible foreign aid approach that clearly defines America's overseas interests. It is a departure from the past and a vision into the future.

An important provision of H.R. 1561 is the inclusion of the MacBride Fair Employment Principles, that serve as a corporate code of conduct for U.S. companies doing business in Northern Ireland. The MacBride Principles, named for the late Sean MacBride, co-founder of Amnesty International and Nobel Peace Prize winner, were initiated, proposed and launched by the Irish National Caucus in November 1984. Since their inception, the MacBride Principles have provided Irish-Americans with a direct, meaningful and non-violent means of addressing injustice in Northern Ireland. H.R. 1561 codifies these principles and for the first time ever, any U.S. company accepting funds from the International Fund for Ireland must comply with the MacBride Fair Employment Principles. Importantly, these principles do not call for quotas, reverse discrimination, divestment—the withdrawal of United States companies from Northern Ireland—or disinvestment—the withdrawal of funds now invested in firms with operations in Northern Ireland.

The MacBride Principles have been widely endorsed by many states, companies, and individuals. For the record I would like itemize the principles as follows:

First, increase the representation of individuals from under-represented religious groups in the work force including managerial, supervisory, administrative, clerical, and technical jobs.

Second, ensure adequate security for the protection of minority employees at the work place and while traveling to and from work.

Third, ban provocative religious or political emblems from the work place.

Fourth, advertise all job openings publicly and making special recruitment efforts to attract applicants from under-represented religious groups.

Fifth, lay off, recall, and termination procedures should not favor a particular religious group.

Sixth, abolish job reservations, apprenticeship restrictions and differential employment criteria which discriminate on the basis of religion.

Seventh, develop training programs that will prepare substantial numbers of current minority employees for skilled jobs, including the expansion of existing programs and the creation

of new programs to train, upgrade and improve the skills of minority employees.

Eighth, establish procedures to assess, identify and actively recruit minority employees with potential for further advancement.

Ninth, appoint a senior management staff member to oversee the company's affirmative action efforts and the setting up of timetables to carry out affirmative action principles.

It is important that the United States take a strong moral stand against unfair employment practices. As the largest contributor to the International Fund for Ireland, we should lead by example and not tolerate those who exclude any group because of their religion.

It is my hope that someday employment practices in Northern Ireland will be fair so that the MacBride Principles will no longer be necessary. However, at this stage in the Northern Ireland peace process, the voice of the United States on the topic of fair employment practices is more critical than ever. I strongly endorse this legislation and urge its passage.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to first praise the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] on his fine leadership in producing a bill that reduces our foreign aid spending in a responsible manner.

The collapse of the Soviet empire has eradicated the threat of Communist aggression worldwide leaving only one superpower, the United States. With this end to the cold war, in turn, came radical changes in the political and social landscape of the world and therefore, strategies to keep stability in the world need drastic reforms. We can no longer depend on the "for us or against us" formula of foreign aid. With the rise of new regional conflicts posing new threats to world peace and leaving us with new challenges for our foreign policy, we must develop new strategies to meet the demands of the new world order. Unfortunately, many of the antiquated foreign aid programs that existed during the cold war are still in use, and paid for by American taxpayers. While I understand that foreign aid cannot and should not be cut out completely, it must be reformed and reduced to meet the demands of the post-cold-war world.

H.R. 1561, the American Overseas Interests Act of 1995, does just that. The House is currently considering H.R. 1561, which will further reduce Federal spending, and take yet another step toward balancing the budget by streamlining overall spending on foreign aid programs and redefining U.S. foreign aid policy for the future. Specifically it would consolidate three agencies in the State Department and reduce their budgets, forcing them to streamline and become more efficient. The agencies to be consolidated are the Agency for International Development, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the U.S. Information Agency. The bill authorizes \$32.3 billion over the next 2 years, saving the taxpayers \$2 billion in fiscal year 1996 and \$1 billion in 1997. The overall savings to the American taxpayer by the year 2002 is projected to be nearly \$21 billion.

I rise in support of the American Overseas Interests Act passed by the International Relations Committee, not only because of the reductions, eliminations and consolidations of bureaucracy, but because of the reasonable funding for valuable programs that are in our best interests. As I have always stated in the past, foreign aid programs are an integral part of the President's efforts to protect and ad-

vance U.S. interests at home and abroad. But, I strongly support foreign aid reform. The U.S. aid program must be constantly evaluated and held accountable to high standards of performance and results. Clearly measurable and achievable goals should be established. Tough standards should be applied to our aid program, as well as to those international organizations and financial institutions to which we contribute funding. Where our aid has no lasting impact, it should be terminated. Redundancy must be eliminated, and this will require major program changes. I would like to comment on two programs, in particular, that I believe are worthy aid recipients: FUSADES and FUNDESA.

Almost everyone knows of my interests in Central America. As a member of the International Relations Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, and an active participant in the affairs of Central America, I am quite concerned with the political, economic, and social climate in this region. Over the years, I have had the unique opportunity to meet and forge great relationships with leaders throughout Central America. Today, we are witnessing all across Latin America that those countries who emerged from the disasters of civil war with a commitment to improve human rights have been able to foster a stronger foundation for social and economic development. The movement to democracy in Latin America is no longer the great dream of this century. Victories in the Western Hemisphere, from Argentina, Chile, Nicaragua to El Salvador, are just a few examples of democracy in action.

These organizations have helped people realize this dream and have received U.S. funding indirectly. FUSADES in El Salvador and FUNDESA in Guatemala have successfully helped the people of these developing countries progress economically and democratically. FUSADES and FUNDESA were created to promote economic and social development improving the precarious situation of many of our neighbors to the South. They promote equitable, responsive development by awarding grants to small entrepreneurs throughout the region. More importantly, these organizations provide small loans to local individuals who start small businesses and later repay their debts, at repayment rates of approximately 95 percent. For example, only a \$100 loan for the purchase of a sewing machine can be the driving force to help an individual start his or her own business. These small entrepreneurs create jobs, assist the emerging middle-class, and in turn help stabilize the region's economy. A small amount of U.S. aid goes a very long way.

While recognizing the need to rein in federal spending, we have also witnessed the positive side of foreign aid. With this in mind, I urge Members to support H.R. 1561, the American Overseas Interests Act. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1561, the American Overseas Interests Act. In an era of rising global interdependence, this bill sends the message that America is turning inward, away from its allies and the areas that need it the most. Instead of maintaining and strengthening the leadership and vision expected from a great superpower, this bill cuts and weakens the powers of the executive branch and distorts the priorities of foreign policy. More specifically, H.R. 1561 creates a vacuum of lead-

ership and support for the nations in our own hemisphere at the time when they need it the most.

As a former member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and as a representative of a district heavily populated by Hispanic-Americans from throughout Latin America and the Caribbean, I have a strong interest in issues affecting this area. This bill would reduce assistance to the region by \$213 million. Mr. Chairman, where is the logic in this reduction when it is clear that our closest neighbors are in dire need of our leadership and support? In the last few years, this region has borne the brunt of the reductions necessary to accommodate preserving or increasing assistance to other regions of the world and any reduction only further jeopardizes the process toward peace, prosperity, and democracy currently underway in Latin America and the Caribbean.

Developmental assistance and economic support funds further our own national security interests by encouraging fledgling democracies, emerging economies, and public health initiatives. Not long ago, the Western Hemisphere was ruled largely by military dictatorships. Now it is overwhelmingly represented by emerging democracies. We should not turn our back on the nations of this hemisphere while they struggle to establish the structures which support strong democracies.

In addition, foreign aid to Latin America and the Caribbean makes economic sense. It strengthens the ties forged by NAFTA, GATT, and the Summit of the Americas and supports the President as he seeks to further U.S. trade and economic interests in our hemisphere. The United States should not reduce its commitment to our fastest growing market, which accounts for \$178 billion in two-way trade, \$91 billion in U.S. exports, and 2 million in American jobs.

Finally, public health initiatives for the hemisphere should be supported. The Western Hemisphere has been declared polio-free thanks in part to the decade-long investment by the United States in polio prevention programs. Significant progress has also been made in the areas of immunization, family planning, oral rehydration therapy, and AIDS. Cutting aid for these programs could affect the lives of millions of children and cause a public health crisis in the region.

Aid to Latin America and the Caribbean furthers the interests of the United States with respect to national security, trade, and public health. It is in our own best interest to live in a neighborhood of nations which are stable and prosperous.

While this bill seeks to cripple our own Nation's ability to forge ties with our closest friends and allies, it also works to dictate the foreign policy objectives of the rest of the world by prohibiting assistance to any foreign government that the President determines has provided economic assistance to or engaged in no-market-based trade with the Government of Cuba or any entity controlled by such government in the preceding fiscal year. Mr. Chairman, is assistance to Russia or Israel in jeopardy as they move ahead with their trade initiatives in the Caribbean island? Do we expect hundreds of other sovereign and independent nations to, in effect, support an embargo which they have consistently voted against in the United Nations for 3 consecutive years? Are we asking the nations of the world

to submit to our punitive and vindictive Cuba policy and our obsession with its leader?

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1561's short-sighted objectives with regard to Latin America and the Caribbean reflect the short-sightedness of the bill in general. Foreign assistance only represents 1 percent of the total Federal budget, but it is a crucial part of our role in world leadership. At a time when the world looks to the United States for leadership and vision, this bill sends the message that the United States prefers a narrow, arrogant, isolationist policy. As the world changes, it is logical that our foreign policy priorities also change, but this does not imply a need for withdrawal from our responsibilities. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

So the remaining portion of the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RIGGS) 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 authorization of appropriations for U.S. foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1996 and 1997, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 155, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. HAMILTON

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill in its current form?

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HAMILTON moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1561 to the Committee on International

Relations, with instructions to report it back forthwith with the following amendments:

On page 11, strike line 1 and all that follows through page 82, line 9 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

DIVISION A—STREAMLINING OF
FOREIGN AFFAIRS AGENCIES
TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

"This division may be cited as the Foreign Affairs Agencies Streamlining Act of 1995.

"SEC. 102. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.

"The Congress makes the following findings:

"(1) With the end of the Cold War, the international challenges facing the United States have changed, but the fundamental national interests of the United States have not. The security, economic, and humanitarian interests of the United States require continued American engagement in international affairs. The leading role of the United States in world affairs will be as important in the twenty first century as it has been in the twentieth.

"(2) The United States budget deficit requires that the foreign as well as the domestic programs and activities of the United States be carefully reviewed for potential savings. Wherever possible, foreign programs and activities must be streamlined, managed more efficiently, and adapted to the requirements of the post-Cold War era.

"(3) As part of an overall review to foster efficiencies in the executive branch, the President has had under review the organization and functions of those departments and agencies responsible for administering the international affairs (150) budget function.

"(4) The President deserves commendation for the results of such review to date, including significant numbers of foreign posts closed and personnel reductions made by some foreign affairs agencies.

"(5) In order to achieve further budgetary savings and eliminate overlapping responsibilities and duplication of efforts in the foreign programs and activities of the United States without jeopardizing United States interests, continued careful review and strong effective leadership will be required.

"(6) A streamlined foreign affairs structure under the leadership of the President can more effectively promote the international interests of the United States in the next century.

"TITLE II—ONGOING REVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS MANAGEMENT

"SEC. 201. REVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AGENCIES.

"(a) REVIEW.—The President shall review, as part of an overall effort to foster efficiencies in the executive branch, the programs described in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act, as well as other initiatives within the administration of international affairs programs, to determine how best to achieve the cost savings and streamlining.

"(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—The review conducted pursuant to subsection (a) shall include a review of—

"(1) any additional costs or cost savings that would result from reorganizing the agencies administering programs under the international affairs (150) budget function;

"(2) the management implications of any agency reorganization;

"(3) the optimal organizational structure for the foreign affairs agencies;

"(4) the implications for the conduct of United States foreign policy and United States foreign assistance programs of any agency reorganization;

"(5) the justification for staffing levels of non-foreign affairs agencies overseas, includ-

ing the Departments of Commerce, Defense, Justice, Treasury, and any intelligence agencies;

"(6) the extent to which the activities of such non-foreign affairs agencies contribute to United States foreign policy and national security interests;

"(7) the implications for United States foreign operations of recent developments in communications technology;

"(8) the feasibility of centralizing worldwide financial services of all foreign affairs agencies in the United States, including the feasibility of moving all such services to a location outside of the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area;

"(9) the feasibility and cost-effectiveness of contracting with private companies or other United States Government agencies for certain services, including payroll, vendor payments, and Foreign Service pension payments systems, medical examination programs, and certain training programs; and

"(10) efforts to consolidate management of all U.S. international exchange programs to eliminate duplication and overlap.

"(c) REPORT.—Not later than six months after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate a report on the results of the comprehensive review required by subsection (a).

"SEC. 202. REORGANIZATION AUTHORITY.

"(a) AUTHORITY.—The President is authorized to submit to the Congress a reorganization plan, if he determines such reorganization is necessary, to enhance the coordination, effectiveness, and efficiency of programs within the international affairs (150) budget function.

"(b) EXCEPTION.—Any plan submitted pursuant to the authority of subsection (a) may be submitted pursuant to chapter 9 of title 5 (relating to executive reorganization) of the United States Code, notwithstanding section 905(b) of that chapter.

On page 84, beginning on line 21 strike "\$1,728,797,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$1,676,903,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,748,438,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 85, beginning on line 11 strike "\$366,276,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$355,287,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$372,480,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 86, beginning on line 1 strike "\$391,760,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$391,760,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$421,760,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 86, beginning on line 11, strike "\$23,469,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$23,469,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$24,250,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 86, beginning on line 16, strike "\$15,165,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$14,710,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$15,465,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 86, beginning on line 20, strike "\$9,579,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$9,579,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$8,579,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 87, beginning on line 6, strike "\$873,505,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$867,050,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$934,057,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 87, beginning on line 17, strike "\$309,375,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and

\$302,902,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$425,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 94, beginning on line 15, strike "\$445,000,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$345,000,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$533,304,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 96, beginning on line 10, strike "\$68,260,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$68,260,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$100,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 100, beginning on line 9, strike "\$13,858,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$12,472,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$13,858,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 100, beginning on line 11, strike "\$10,393,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$9,353,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$10,393,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 100, line 17, strike "\$666,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$740,000".

On page 100, beginning on line 20, strike "\$3,500,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$3,195,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,550,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 101, line 1, strike "\$13,202,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$14,669,000".

On page 104, beginning on line 11, strike "\$10,000,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$9,000,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$15,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 105, beginning on line 4, strike "\$450,645,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$428,080,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$496,002,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 105, beginning on line 14, strike "\$117,484,200 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$113,680,800 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$130,799,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 106, beginning on line 19, strike "\$87,625,800 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$87,341,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$119,536,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 107, beginning on line 1, strike "\$321,191,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$286,191,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$395,340,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 107, beginning on line 17, strike "\$75,164,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$67,647,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$85,919,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 108, beginning on line 2, strike "\$4,300,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$3,870,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,300,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 108, beginning on line 8, strike "\$15,000,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$20,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 108, beginning on line 23, strike "\$44,000,000 for fiscal year 1996 and \$40,050,000 for the fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$76,300,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 197, on line 19, strike "\$3,284,440,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,351,910,000".

On page 197, on line 20, strike "\$3,240,020,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,351,910,000".

On page 200, line 18, strike "\$22,620,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$37,000,000".

On page 200, line 22, strike "\$37,800,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$52,890,000".

On page 218, beginning on line 5, strike "\$20,000,000 for fiscal year 1996 and \$25,000,000

for fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$15,244,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 248, beginning on line 16, strike "\$2,356,378,000 for fiscal year 1996 and \$2,283,478,000 for fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,504,300,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 264, line 9, strike "\$858,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,300,000,000".

On page 264, line 14, strike "\$629,214,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$802,000,000".

On page 264, beginning on line 18, strike "\$643,000,000 for fiscal year 1996 and \$650,000,000 for fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$788,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 264, beginning on line 24, strike "\$325,000,000 for fiscal year 1996 and \$275,000,000 for fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$480,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 265, beginning on line 5, strike "\$20,000,000 for fiscal year 1996 and \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$31,760,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 265, beginning on line 10, strike "\$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1996 and \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$17,405,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 283, beginning on line 11, strike "\$456,774,000 for fiscal year 1996 and \$419,196,000 for fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$529,027,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 284, beginning on line 3, strike "\$35,206,000 for fiscal year 1996 and \$31,685,000 for fiscal year 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "\$39,118,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997".

On page 284, strike line 20 and all that follows through line 24 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"There is authorized to be appropriated \$50,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for the provision of agricultural commodities under title III of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1727 et seq.)."

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

"TITLE XXXVI—AGGREGATE AUTHORIZATION

"SEC. 3601. AGGREGATE AUTHORIZATION.

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the maximum aggregate amount authorized to be appropriated by this Act shall not exceed \$16,505,843,000 for fiscal year 1996 and \$15,395,362,000 for fiscal year 1997.

Mr. HAMILTON (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to recommit be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1515

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RIGGS). The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The motion to recommit is rather simple and straightforward. The motion to recommit has two components to it. First of all, it deletes that portion of the bill that requires the abolition of AID, USIA, and ACDA. In its place it replaces those portions with a

requirement that the President review the management and operations of the foreign policy agencies. It is a requirement that the President review those agencies and report to the Congress efforts to streamline those operations. That is the first part.

The second part of the motion authorizes the same level of funding for each of the line items in this bill that the President requested, but then it cuts the overall authorization funding to the level that is now in the bill.

The effect of the motion to recommit, then, is to accept the funding levels that the committee and this House have already voted on. We accept those cuts. What we do is permit the President of the United States, however, to have flexibility as to how those funds are spent. We earmark Egypt and Israel, but in other respects he has flexibility. So the motion to recommit accepts the funding levels that this House has voted on.

Second, with regard to reorganization, it lets the President take the initiative; after all, it is his administration. He should be able to reorganize that executive branch as he sees fit. We tell him he has to do it, no discretion at that time on that point. But there is no micromanagement on our part. We do not force him to reorganize in a particular way, but we do require him to reorganize.

So the motion to recommit accepts the funding levels that we now have as voted on in this House but gives the President flexibility to spend those funds, and it requires a reorganization. It does not try to micromanage. It does not tell the President how to organize his own executive branch, but it does permit the Congress to set the policy parameters and give the President the flexibility with regard to reorganization.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to ask Members to vote for this motion to recommit. I do it in a bipartisan way. We have always had a bipartisan foreign policy for this country. We have always tried to stop partisanship at the water's edge. And we have always tried to write these authorization bills for foreign policy together. And we have always tried to balance the power of the President with the power of the Congress in reaching our foreign policy.

In all humility, I suggest to all of my colleagues that this bill does not carry on that tradition. I was proud of the House last night when in a bipartisan way we refused to give up powers that I think it was important for the Congress to keep with regard to how we declare and make war. And I ask tonight that we pass this motion to recommit; we leave more of the power in reordering the structure of our foreign policy

to the President, that as we make these cuts we give the President more authority in exactly where the cuts ought to be made.

Let me finish with this simple thought: Foreign aid and foreign policy are not popular and never have been in any district in these United States. But it is vitally important to every one of our citizens that we have a good foreign policy that is in the deep self-interest of every American citizen and in our great country.

The best way to do that is to make it bipartisan and keep it that way. I urge Members to send this bill back to the committee along the lines the distinguished ranking member has made and let us return to the successful tradition of foreign policy that we have had in this country, which has served this country very well.

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

I rise in strong opposition to the motion to recommit. Our bill consolidates three major agencies. It cuts \$3 billion in spending and changes the status quo. The motion to recommit keeps the status quo. It tries to add over \$4 billion in spending. The recommit motion also calls for yet another study. We have studied the issue long enough. The cold war ended half a decade ago.

I say it is time now to reform foreign affairs agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the distinguished chairman of our Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I know there is a lot of concern about the bill. America has a responsibility to practice smart strategic foreign aid, which I believe the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] is delivering us in this bill. The motion to recommit takes us back to the status quo.

I am told that this morning the Heritage Foundation released a study saying that the Agency for International Development hired a group to study their studies. And we do not need to study anybody's studies anymore.

The simple fact of the matter is under the Gilman bill, which is the most successful effort at reform in foreign aid since I have been in the House, will consolidate the Agency for International Development, ACDA, the [Arms Control Disarmament Agency], the United States Information Agency, in some sense a relic, and also makes cuts in foreign aid.

The bill is endorsed by the Americans for Tax Reform by the Citizens Against Government Waste. Why? Because they recognize the fact that the United States has a role to play in the world. But they also recognize the fact that the gentleman from New York has made changes.

Furthermore, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, one of the best examples of big corporate pork, is now authorized to be sold and to be phased out and to be privatized. This bill deserves and merits our support.

I would argue to the Members that if you believe America has a role in the world, that you want that role to be narrowed and focused, this is not perfect, but this is the biggest step that we have made in the House in a dozen years to try to bring improvement to foreign aid and to satisfy some of the frustrations that our hard-working, tax-paying constituents have wanted.

Mr. GILMAN deserves a vote in favor of this bill and against the motion to recommit. I would urge Members, as the leader of the world, to adopt this bill. I think it makes good sense. It is fiscally prudent and moves us in the right direction on foreign aid reform.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his support.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Let me take a moment to thank the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], and the members of the committee for the hard work they put into this bill.

My colleagues, we have just finished celebrating the 50th anniversary of D-day. I do not know about you, but I spent a good deal of my past weekend watching old film clips of that 50th anniversary. I was reminded, as I watched those brave men all too often falling on the shores of some remote beach, that this is a great Nation and in one very, very special regard, it is the greatest Nation in the history of the world. Because in America, in the history of the world, no nation has ever so much loved freedom that their nation's people have been willing to risk their own peace to secure freedom for other nations.

We have all too many times seen our Nation's children on the field of battle, fighting for freedom and dreaming about peace. When we think of those terribly horrible, frightful times when men and women were willing to put their life and their limb on the line for the double dream of freedom and peace, we then should reflect upon the times when we can put some part of our national treasure on the line for freedom and peace.

What can we do, where can we do it in the world, to help protect the freedoms of people, help ensure the peace of people, help to see to it that starving children perhaps have hope, help where we can to breathe hope and life into this world.

We do not spend so awfully much but we have always been a frugal Nation. We always have insisted that we spend our treasure with care, with discretion, with compassion that is mixed with understanding and where in fact it will make the difference we hope and dream for in the lives of people.

This committee has done this. This committee has repaired American foreign aid efforts, maybe not enough to suit everybody, but enough to tell the world that, yes, indeed, we are willing

to look at the needs in the world. We are willing to be discrete. Yet we are willing to be generous, and we are willing to be organized and we are willing to be systematic. And we are willing to put some part of our treasury behind the dream of freedom and peace for all the world's people. This is a good bill. This is a good dream. It deserves our support.

I implore Members, vote "yes" for the dream of freedom and peace in the lives of all the world as sponsored by the generosity of this greatest Nation in the history of the world.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 179, nays 237, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 365]

YEAS—179

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

Waxman
Williams
Wilson

Wise
Wolf
Woolsey

Wyden
Wynn

NOES—237

Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bono
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa

NOT VOTING—18

Baker (LA)
Bonilla
Chapman
de la Garza
Dicks
Foglietta

□ 1545

The Clerk announced the following pair:
On this vote:
Mr. Oberstar for, with Mr. Wicker against.

Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

Harman
Johnson (CT)
Kleccka
Laughlin
Lofgren
McDade
Montgomery
Oberstar
Peterson (FL)
Spratt
Wicker
Yates

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RIGGS). The question is on the final passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 192, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 366]

AYES—222

Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Ballenger
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bono
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Bunning
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Duncan
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren

Baker (LA)
Bonilla
Brown (CA)
Chapman
de la Garza
Dicks
Furse

Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchee
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kildee
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lowey
Maloney
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Obey
Olver
Ortiz

NOT VOTING—21

Harman
Johnson (CT)
Kleccka
Laughlin
Lofgren
McDade
McKinney
Montgomery
Oberstar
Peterson (FL)
Spratt
Waters
Wicker
Yates

□ 1603

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:
Mr. Wicker for, with Mr. Montgomery against.

Mr. Bonilla for, with Mr. Oberstar against.
Mr. TEJEDA changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the bill was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call 366, I was unavoidably detained