

Volkmer	Watts (OK)	Wolf
Vucanovich	Weldon (FL)	Woolsey
Waldholtz	Weldon (PA)	Wynn
Walker	Weller	Yates
Walsh	White	Young (AK)
Wamp	Whitfield	Young (FL)
Ward	Wicker	Zeliff
Waters	Williams	Zimmer
Watt (NC)	Wise	

NOT VOTING—25

Barton	Fields (TX)	Rush
Bryant (TX)	Flake	Stockman
Chapman	Ford	Stokes
Chenoweth	Gallegly	Taylor (NC)
Christensen	Green	Tejeda
Collins (IL)	Johnson, Sam	Waxman
de la Garza	Laughlin	Wilson
DeLay	Lewis (KY)	
Durbin	Ortiz	

□ 1819

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and did not cast my vote on rollcall No. 58. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on House Concurrent Resolution 149.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1963

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1963.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1561, FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1996 AND 1997

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 375, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1561) to consolidate the foreign affairs agencies of the United States; to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1996 and 1997; to responsibly reduce the authorizations of appropriations for U.S. foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1996 and 1997, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution, 375, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Friday, March 8, 1996, at page H1987.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] will each be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I bring before the House, the conference agreement on H.R. 1561, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for fiscal years 1996 and 1997.

We bring to the floor a bill that eliminates at least one Federal agency, cuts spending \$500 million before FY 1995 levels, and achieves savings of \$1.7 billion over four years.

The conference agreement requires the abolition of at least one agency from among the four international affairs agencies—the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Agency for International Development, and the United States Information Agency and its consolidation into the Department of State.

This consolidation—and the President is certainly encouraged to consolidate more than one agency—together with other provisions of the bill, will result in a savings in fiscal years 1996 through 1999 of at least \$1.7 billion in the authorizations for programs under the control of the Committee on International Relations.

The bill reauthorizes the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1996 and 1997. Further, it authorizes, at reduced but manageable levels, the salary and expense accounts for the Departments of State, USIA, ACDA, and AID through 1999.

In this manner we are able to ensure that savings in these accounts are planned for and achieved, as will be seen in the accompanying spreadsheet.

Regrettably, the President already has stated his intention to veto this bill, which provides for the first measure of reform in our foreign affairs agencies in 50 years, including reforms his own administration proposed.

With regard to consolidation, Secretary of State Warren Christopher last year suggested consolidating three outdated foreign affairs agencies into the State Department. Our bill requires the consolidation of only one agency.

Our bill also provides for a number of foreign policy principles important to U.S. national interests.

Our bill puts the Taiwan Relations Act at the center of our relations, allowing the United States to fully support Taiwan. The President, siding with the Chinese Communist government, seeks to limit our support for Taiwan by asserting that an Executive Agreement takes precedence over legislation by the U.S. Congress.

On Vietnam, our bill conditions the expansion of United States relations with Vietnam on POW-MIA progress. The President, by disagreeing with this bill, stands with the Vietnamese Government and against the families of missing Americans.

On the international housing program, our bill follows the GAO's advice

and ends the AID Housing Guarantee Program, except in South Africa. By vetoing our bill, the President would continue this "international S&L," despite the GAO's warnings that the program will cost the taxpayers over \$1 billion in loan losses.

Our bill, for the first time, also provides that recipients of grants from the International Fund for Ireland abide by the MacBride Principles of fair employment in the North of Ireland.

Our bill condemns Turkey's misguided policy of obstructing aid to Armenia by prohibiting assistance to any country that bars or obstructs delivery of U.S. humanitarian aid.

Our bill contains a bipartisan provision requiring that foreign aid funds not spent after three years following their appropriation be returned to the U.S. Treasury.

Our bill also contains 20 provisions to improve management of the State Department that the administration requested.

They include authority to collect fees for visas and use the funds to improve our border security operations, and authority to collect from insurers for providing free health care to U.S. diplomats and their families at overseas posts, to name a few.

We also provide higher spending levels for a very few programs, such as the Peace Corps and International Narcotics Control programs.

H.R. 1561 also provides for reforms in the United Nations to refocus the U.N. on its traditional development and peacekeeping roles, preserves organizational flexibility for the agencies, provides for the humanitarian assistance and resettlement for refugees, promotes the rapid implementation of broadcasting into the non-democratic countries of Asia, and terminates United States participation in obsolete international organizations.

Mr. Speaker, this conference agreement reflects a number of compromises between the House and the Senate and accommodates many of the most serious concerns raised by the administration and the minority.

While the minority chose not to participate in the process, we made a sincere effort to meet their concerns.

It was disappointing that we could not build within the administration and among many of our colleagues a consensus to organize the foreign affairs functions to meet the coming century.

While we are bringing a solid Department of State and related agencies bill to the floor, many of us are disappointed that we could not build a consensus within the administration and among our democratic colleagues to organize the foreign affairs functions to meet the coming century.

Because of bureaucratic inertia and a lack of vision, the Clinton administration has engaged in an all-out assault on any effort to revitalize, reinvigorate, reorganize, reform, restructure, or reconsider the foreign affairs programs of our Nation.

The tragedy is that this bill reflects the failure of the Clinton administration to provide the foreign policy leadership in the early years of the post-cold-war era that was once provided by another Democratic administration—Harry Truman’s—in the early years of the cold war era.

Truman’s administration—including the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and hundreds of other competent and courageous public servants—were concerned with building institutions and about the quality and effectiveness of the institutions of government entrusted to them.

The Truman years were years of an openness to new ideas and a willingness to experiment.

Faced with a world situation and an American role in the world radically different from those that existed before the Second World War, President Truman, Secretary Marshall, Secretary Forrestal, Secretary Acheson, and others did what was necessary to adapt to the new era.

This was the era in which the State Department was reformed from top to bottom, in which new agencies like USIA and the foreign aid agency were created, in which the Air Force was created, and authority over the Army, Navy, and Air Force was consolidated into one new Department of Defense. Intelligence matters were consolidated and placed in a newly created Central Intelligence Agency. The National Security Council was created.

I could go on.

The point is that in the years after the Second World War, our country was

fortunate enough to have as the leaders of its foreign policy institutions great public servants who were concerned not only with creating a new policy for the new era, but in building the institutions to carry out the new policy.

Today, the institutions of foreign policy built for the cold war era demand serious attention and will require hard work if the institutions are to serve our policy objectives in this post-cold-war era.

The end of the cold war is not the only reason why these institutions need attention. Massive changes in the external environment in which these agencies operate also demand that these institutions be reformed and revitalized.

The revitalization of the foreign policy institutions does not have to be an adversarial process with Congress imposing upon a reluctant bureaucracy reforms that the bureaucracy itself is unable to adopt.

We were prepared, as the new Republican majority in Congress, to work collaboratively with the President and his Secretary of State to develop and carry out a program of reform and revitalization of these institutions.

We in Congress were prepared to work in that great spirit of bipartisanship and executive-legislative collaboration that characterized the post-World War II era.

Regretably our offers of cooperation were spurned.

But the day will surely come—in less than a year, I believe—in which the leadership will be there to engage in a program of revitalizing the foreign af-

fairs functions of our Government. There will eventually be leadership in foreign affairs who have the vision to create the foreign policy for the post-cold-war era and the courage to implement such a vision through institutional changes. Those whose vision is too unfocused and whose courage is too uncertain must give way to those who can provide the leadership that is so desperately lacking today.

Those who oppose the reform and revitalization of the foreign affairs programs are the real isolationists because they have allowed themselves and their thinking to become isolated from the great changes that have taken place.

They recognize the change in the world, but want to isolate themselves from the serious, hard work of adapting public institutions to the changes in the world.

In a now-infamous memo, the A.I.D. Agency said its aim was to—and I quote—“delay, obfuscate and derail” this bill.

This conference report is a downpayment on our pledge to streamline and consolidate our foreign affairs apparatus for the first time in 50 years to make them more effective and efficient.

In his State of the Union speech 7 weeks ago, the President stated that, in his words, “the era of big government is over.” When Congress sends this bill to his desk in the Oval Office, we will see if the President truly meant what he said.

FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 1996 AND 1997

[In fiscal years]

International Affairs, Budget Function 150, Account	1995	1996	1996	1996	1996	1996	1997	1997	1997
	Actual authority	Request authority	H.R. 1561 authority	Approps. conferences	S. 908 authority	Final conference	H.R. 1561 authority	S. 908 authority	Final conference
Administration of Foreign Affairs:									
Transition Fund					125,000			100,000	
Diplomatic and Consular Programs	1,748,000	1,758,438	1,728,797	1,719,220	1,688,500	1,719,220	1,656,903	1,612,000	1,710,000
Salaries and Expenses	383,972	374,350	366,276	365,146	368,000	365,146	335,287	373,000	357,000
Capital Investment Fund		32,800	20,000	16,400	32,800	16,400	20,000	32,800	16,400
Protection of Foreign Missions and Officials	9,579	8,579	9,579	8,579	8,579	8,579	9,579	8,579	10,000
Emergencies in the Diplomatic and Consular Services	6,500	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
Payment to the American Institute in Taiwan	15,465	15,465	15,165	15,165	15,400	15,165	13,710	15,400	14,165
Buying Power Maintenance	(5,223)	0	0	0			0		0
Office of the Inspector General	23,850	24,250	23,469	27,369	23,350	27,369	21,469	23,000	27,000
Security & Maintenance of U.S. Missions	391,760	421,760	391,760	385,760	401,760	385,760	369,860	401,760	380,000
Representation Allowances	4,780	4,800	4,780	4,500	4,500	4,500	4,780	4,500	4,500
Repatriation Loans Program Account	776	776	776	776	776	776	776	776	776
Subtotal	2,579,459	2,647,218	2,566,602	2,548,915	2,674,665	2,548,915	2,438,364	2,577,809	2,525,841
Assessed Contributions for Peacekeeping									
.....	518,687	445,000	445,000	225,000	445,000	445,000	300,000	375,000	375,000
Subtotal	518,687	445,000	445,000	225,000	445,000	445,000	300,000	375,000	375,000
International Conferences and Contingencies									
.....	6,000	6,000	6,000	3,000	7,000	3,000	5,000	5,000	3,000
Subtotal	6,000	6,000	6,000	3,000	7,000	3,000	5,000	5,000	3,000
Assessed Contributions to International Orgs									
.....	872,661	923,057	873,505	700,000	777,000	850,000	828,388	777,000	840,000
Subtotal	872,661	923,057	873,505	700,000	777,000	850,000	828,388	777,000	840,000
Payment to the Asia Foundation									
.....	15,000	10,000	10,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	9,000	3,000	10,000
Subtotal	15,000	10,000	10,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	9,000	3,000	10,000
Migration and Refugee Assistance:									
Refugee Assistance	591,000	591,000	590,000	671,000	591,000	590,000	590,000	671,000	590,000
Refugees to Israel	80,000	80,000	80,000		80,000	80,000	80,000		80,000
Burmese Refugees			1,500			1,500	1,500		1,500
Subtotal	671,000	671,000	671,500	671,000	671,000	671,500	671,500	671,000	671,000
International Narcotics Control									
.....	105,000	213,000	213,000	115,000		115,000	213,000		213,000
Peace Corps	231,345	234,000	219,745	205,000		210,000	215,000		234,000
Subtotal	336,345	447,000	432,745	320,000	0	325,000	428,000	0	447,000

FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 1996 AND 1997—Continued

[In fiscal years]

International Affairs, Budget Function 150, Account	1995	1996	1996	1996	1996	1996	1997	1997	1997
	Actual authority	Request authority	H.R. 1561 authority	Approps. conferences	S. 908 authority	Final conference	H.R. 1561 authority	S. 908 authority	Final conference
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency:									
Core programs	40,878	45,300	44,000	35,700	22,700	35,700	39,500	0	30,000
Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC)	9,500	17,000	0						
Cobra Dane Radar		14,000	0						
Subtotal	50,378	76,300	44,000	35,700	22,700	35,700	39,500	0	30,000
U.S. Information Agency:									
Board for International Broadcasting	229,735	0	0				0		
BIB—Grants and Expenses	7,290	0	0				0		
Salaries and Expenses	475,645	496,002	445,645	445,645	429,000	445,645	402,080	387,000	440,000
Technology Fund		10,100	5,050	5,050	10,100	5,050	5,050	9,500	5,050
East-West Center	24,500	20,000	15,000	11,750	20,000	11,750	8,000	8,000	11,750
North-South Center	4,000	1,000	4,000	2,000		2,000	3,000		3,000
Radio Construction	69,314	85,919	70,164	40,000	83,000	40,000	52,647	79,500	35,000
International Broadcasting Operations	238,338	395,340	311,191	325,191	310,000	325,191	246,191	300,000	330,000
Broadcasting to Cuba	24,809	0	24,809	24,809		24,809	24,809		24,809
RFE/RL					75,000			75,000	
Israeli Relay Station	(2,000)								
Subtotal	1,071,631	1,008,361	875,859	854,445	927,100	854,445	741,777	859,000	849,609
Educational & Cultural Exchange Programs:									
Fulbright	135,753	130,799	112,484	200,000	109,500	102,500	88,681	101,000	98,000
S. Pacific Exchanges	900	0	900				900		
East Timorese Scholarships	0	0	800				800		
Cambodian Scholarships	0	0	141				141		
Tibetan Exchanges	0	0	500				500		
Other Programs	177,352	121,877	77,266		118,322	97,500	57,341	107,300	85,000
Unspecified cuts	(40,726)								
Subtotal	273,279	252,676	192,091	200,000	227,822	200,000	148,363	208,300	183,000
National Endowment for Democracy									
Radio Free Asia	34,000	34,000	34,000	30,000	32,000	32,000	32,000	29,000	30,000
Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Prog. Trust Fund	5,000	0	10,000	(5,000)		10,000	10,000		10,000
Office of the Inspector General	2,800	300		300			0		
Subtotal	43,800	4,593	4,300	State IG	4,100	State IG	3,870	3,900	State IG
	46,100	38,393	48,300	25,300	36,100	42,000	45,870	32,900	40,000
Agency for International Development:									
USAID Operating Expenses	515,500	529,000	465,774	465,750	432,000	465,000	419,196	389,000	465,000
Operating Expenses—USAID Inspector General	39,118	39,118	35,206	30,200	35,000	30,200	30,685	31,500	27,000
Subtotal	554,618	568,118	500,980	495,950	467,000	495,200	449,881	420,500	492,000
Housing Guarantee Program Account:									
Subsidy Appropriation	19,300	16,760	0	4,000		4,000	0		0
Operating Expenses	8,000	7,240	7,000	7,000		7,000	6,000		6,000
Subtotal	27,300	24,000	7,000	11,000	0	11,000	6,000	0	6,000
Internat'l Relations Committee total	7,022,458	7,117,623	6,673,582	6,095,310	6,260,387	6,486,760	6,111,643	5,929,509	6,472,950
Function 300 HIRC Jurisdiction State Department									
International Commissions:									
International Boundary Waters Comm. (S&E)	12,858	13,858	13,858	12,058	12,500	12,058	19,372	12,300	19,372
International Boundary Waters Comm. (Constr)	6,644	10,398	10,393	6,644	10,000	6,644	9,353	10,000	9,000
American Sections: IBC	740	740	740	640	740	640	666	720	666
American Sections: IJC	3,550	3,550	3,500	3,360	3,500	3,360	3,195	3,500	3,195
International Fisheries Commissions	14,669	14,669	14,669	14,669	14,669	14,669	13,202	14,400	13,202
Subtotal	38,461	43,215	43,160	37,371	41,409	37,371	45,788	40,920	45,435
HIRC bill total	7,060,919	7,160,838	6,716,742	6,132,681	6,301,796	6,524,131	6,157,431	5,970,429	6,518,385

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

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS].

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my opposition to the conference report on H.R. 1561.

Before I point out what I believe to be mistaken undertakings on behalf of our committee, I would like to point out that my friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], who happens not to be on the floor at this time, made a statement earlier regarding this bill which is not correct.

He stated that this would be the first State Department authorization bill since 1985. Our research shows that that simply is not accurate. There has been a State Department authorization bill every year for the last 15 years authorized in 2-year increments.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think what the gentleman meant, if we adopt this, it would be the first State authorization bill to be adopted, foreign aid authorization bill to be adopted since 1985.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Reclaiming my time, that is not what he said. I want it clearly understood there has not been an authorization bill for foreign aid since 1985, but that does not relate to this bill since the foreign aid authorization has been deleted from this measure.

□ 1830

I just wanted to point that out. I think that that will reflect accurately, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] needs to be mindful of that.

This report has a myriad of problems, as illustrated by the fact that not one Democrat on the conference committee supported the final product. The President, as the chairman a moment ago has pointed out, has promised to veto it and correctly so. It reorganizes and eliminates foreign policy agencies because of political concerns, not because

the changes will make operations more efficient.

The report also cuts spending on our foreign aid programs too deeply. The minimal amounts that we spend in the first place reap benefits for us in expanded trade, better relations, a greater sphere of influence, just to mention a few things. But to cut back on our meager assistance is just plain shortsighted.

This conference report is just another example of this Congress micromanaging foreign policy and preventing the President from doing his job. Foreign policy obviously is important. We cannot wish the world's problems away. Instead of retreating, we must have the flexibility to get involved so that we can help those in trouble and promote our own interests. The two goals are not incompatible, but they will be unachievable if this report is passed.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out one more thing, and that is the provision dealing with Taiwan. This simply is not the right time to bring this kind of provocative measure to the floor. The fact of the matter is, Taiwan is getting

ready to have an election and China is rumbling all over the place. For us to deal with this kind of measure stops us from being able to take the kinds of measures that are vitally necessary.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman what in the Taiwan Relations Act does he object to? In the language passed duly by the Congress, it is the law of our land. What does the gentleman object to?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the repudiation at this time would destabilize what we have done, I would remind my friend. We have a long-standing policy that this United States has, both Republican and Democrat, toward China. What we will be doing is increasing the risk at the time of heightened tensions. I am not opposed to us talking about this, but I am talking about the timing.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report to H.R. 1561, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act.

I would like to express my thanks to Chairman BEN GILMAN and his staff for guiding this bill through rough waters and rocky terrain. It has not been easy, and he and his staff have done an admirable job.

I would also like to thank Chairman CHRIS SMITH for all of his work concerning a provision I will discuss in a moment concerning coercive population control policies.

Before I do so, however, I would like to address some of the criticisms I have heard about this bill. We have before us today a bill that represents a genuine compromise on some very difficult issues.

I certainly did not get everything I wanted in this bill. I thought my provision concerning U.N. voting coincidental was worthy of support and inclusion in the conference report. Dozens of Members could say the same thing about many of their provisions that have been left behind. Chairman GILMAN went so far to leave his provisions concerning microenterprise projects out of the bill.

But we all agreed to compromise in order to move the bill forward. That is called governing. It is a product of the democratic process. So when I hear people complain we have been unwilling to give in, and when I learn the President has pledged a veto of this bill despite all of our efforts, I begin to wonder who is serious about governing.

This "my way or the highway" approach to Government is not going to

cut it. The other side must be willing to give in on some issues. We have given in on the population issue. We have given in on foreign assistance provisions. We have given in on eliminating three agencies to only one. In contrast, I do not recall one single issue where the minority has compromised.

I say this not out of malice but simply as a point of reference. I would hope we could move forward.

This conference report contains a provision of particular significance which I alluded to earlier. It addresses the coercive population control policies employed by the Chinese Government.

For over 1,000 days, a group of Chinese men have been held in the York County jail, which happens to be in my district. Their crime? These men fled China in fear of China's coercive abortion and sterilization policies.

Had these individuals fled China for the United States during the years President Reagan and President Bush were in office, they would likely have been granted asylum in the United States years ago. Under Presidents Reagan and Bush, fear of repressive, coercive population control policies, which China clearly employs, was grounds for asylum. Under Reagan-Bush, these individuals would likely have been set free, and the Federal Government is paying over \$1 million in taxpayer money each year to keep them locked up.

Unfortunately, President Clinton changed the policy when he took office in the belief that fear of forced abortion or sterilization does not merit asylum in this country.

H.R. 1561 would change U.S. law back to the Reagan-Bush policy that was the law of the land for years and which hardly resulted in our Nation being overrun by hordes of asylum seekers.

The House will next week consider legislation to crack down on illegal immigrants. I am the first to say that illegal immigrants who have no grounds for asylum must be sent away. But it is wrong to make an example of these Chinese men and women who fear coercive population policies.

This provision is supported by the Family Research Council, and various churches. This provision is humane, and most of all, it speaks well of America and Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank Chairman GILMAN and Chairman SMITH for their work on this bill and I urge all Members to support this conference report.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to strongly oppose this piece of legislation, the conference report. This is a bad bill. It is a bad bill for several reasons.

First, we have to understand this is not foreign aid. This is a budget for the State Department, USAID, our own agencies.

Under the Constitution, the President is empowered to conduct the U.S. foreign policy. This bill hamstringing the President in the exercise of that responsibility.

First, it abolishes an agency indiscriminately. They do not tell us which agency. They do not say why. They do not indict the agency for malfeasance or any other problems. They just say abolish an agency. It is not real reform. It is reform purely for the sake of saying we had reform. It does not make any sense.

We cannot manage a foreign policy by these kinds of arbitrary changes, moving boxes around without any meaningful purpose.

Second, is deep and unreasonable cuts. This budget, this program, will hamstring the President in terms of his ability to retain qualified people. This budget and the cuts they propose will result in RIF's, layoffs, and the loss of highly talented people. We cannot run a foreign policy without qualified people. We have international responsibilities as a world leader.

A couple of final very important points: This bill discourages burden sharing. We found out through Desert Storm that we need multilateral action. But by discouraging and inhibiting U.S. participation in the United Nations and other multilateral organizations, we discourage burden sharing, because other countries will say, "If the United States does not participate, if the United States does not pay its dues, then why should we? If the United States is trying to pull back on its financial commitment, why should we commit when we are a much smaller country?"

It discourages burden sharing at a time when we need to involve other countries.

Finally, it limits U.S. population assistance programs. One of the biggest problems we will confront in the year 2000 and beyond is the question of an exploding population. Under this bill, as many as 7 million couples will be denied the opportunity to get family planning assistance. I am not advocating any kind of coercive abortions, but I am saying people ought to be able to get information and assistance to engage in family planning.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], a senior member of our Committee on International Relations and the chairman of our Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to advise the body that the gentleman's statement a moment ago was entirely wrong. There is nothing authorizing or providing for population control funds in this bill either way. It simply is silent on the issue. There is no foreign aid in this bill. That was dropped at

the insistence of the Democrats during the House-Senate conference committee, and it would have led to a filibuster beyond any doubt on the Senate side had we insisted that be in there. So it was dropped. It is not there.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address some of my remarks this evening to my Democratic colleagues, because, frankly, I am astonished again by some of the disinformation going on about what is in the bill or not in the bill.

I am also a little bit hurt by the suggestion this was not a bipartisan bill. The budget savings in the consolidation provisions are there, but they have been modified. There has been compromise with a capital "C" with regards to this bill to meet what we thought were the administration's objections. But the goal posts keep moving back.

Let me speak primarily, however, to the human rights provisions which we have worked very, very hard in my Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights and in the full committee with the leadership of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Opposition to the violation of fundamental human rights is not a partisan issue, and this bill contains stronger human rights provisions than any previous foreign relations authorization act that I have seen on this floor during my 16 years as a Member of this House. Frankly, they were even stronger when the bill passed the House, but we had to moderate some of them and we dropped others to meet the objections of the administration.

I am very pleased that the Humanitarian Corridors Act is in this report. I offered that bill as a freestanding bill and as an amendment to the bill when it came up. It seems to me a very modest proposal to say that those countries that receive U.S. foreign assistance cannot impede or inhibit or proscribe the transiting of humanitarian aid to another country.

I speak, of course, to Turkey and the fact they have disallowed humanitarian assistance to Armenia. It is important if we have relations and provide foreign aid that we say to our allies, allow these medicines and other kinds of assistance to get to our friends in Armenia.

There is also the McBride Principles championed by our good and distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN]. That is in here. I just notice and would say parenthetically, Mr. Clinton just got the Irishman-of-the-Year award. He should not veto this bill. This will be the first time we codify the McBride Principles that many of us have talked about. Now we are going to do something about it in this legislation.

There is also an authority to provide the Special Envoy to Tibet. It is not mandatory. I think it is a step forward in the right direction, so that human rights can be further recognized in that very troubled region of the world.

The Migration and Refugee Assistance provisions come under our subcommittee. We, after hearings and hearing from all of the refugee community, have decided that it was very important that we hold harmless the refugee budget. The world is awash with refugees. We have to at least provide, I think, this modest amount of money to provide for them. There is \$671 million in each of the fiscal years for refugee programs, \$500,000 higher than the administration's 1996 request, and substantially higher than the estimates that the administration's requests were based on for 1997. So we held those refugee assistance accounts harmless.

There is also allocation of funds for certain Burmese refugees and for the resettlement of refugees to Israel. They are carried over from the prior year. We have also authorized such funds that are necessary for the resettlement of certain Southeast Asia refugees in the high risk categories identified by the Lautenberg amendment, primarily those that served with the United States forces in the former government of South Vietnam, religious refugees and members of the Hmong ethnic minority from Laos.

Subsection 1104(b) prohibits expenditures on programs involving repatriation to Vietnam, to Laos or Cambodia, unless the remaining asylum seekers have been or will be interviewed by United States immigration officers, and unless resettlement offers have been made or will be made to those found to be refugees under United States law.

This provision was modified in conference to make it clear that the refugee status interviews can, under certain circumstances, be held in the asylum seeker's country of origin. This is to accommodate the administration's so-called Track Two plan for interviews in Vietnam. This plan will only work if we can somehow guarantee the safety of the asylum seekers during the interview process. We are not there yet, but this provision, which did pass the House 266 to 156 in a broad bipartisan vote, will help us with those boat people, so that we close out the comprehensive plan of action with honor and kindness, and not cruelty.

The section on the Cuban immigration policies, and this is I think very timely, Mr. Chairman, this would require periodic reports on the Cuban Government's methods of enforcing its 1994 and 1995 anti-immigration agreements with the United States, and on the treatment of persons returned by the United States to Cuba.

SECTION 1252, EXTENSION OF CERTAIN ADJUDICATION PROVISIONS

Mr. Speaker, this section extends the Lautenberg amendment, which identifies certain high-risk refugee categories and provides that applicants in these categories are presumed to be refugees if they assert both a fear of persecution and a credible basis for their fear of persecution. The high-risk categories include nationals or residents of an independent state of the former Soviet Union or Estonia,

Latvia, or Lithuania who are Jews or evangelical Christians, as well as certain Southeast Asians. (See section 1104 above.) The provision would also extend until October 1, 1997, the Attorney General's ability to adjust the status of aliens who are nationals of an independent state of the former Soviet Union, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Vietnam, Laos, or Cambodia and were granted parole into the United States after August 14, 1988, to the status of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

SECTION 1253, U.S. POLICY REGARDING THE INVOLUNTARY RETURN OF REFUGEES

The House-passed provision would have provided that no funds authorized by this act be used for the involuntary return of any person to a country in which he or she has a well-founded fear of persecution. This provision has been modified to meet DOS concerns. The conference provision omits the prohibition against using DOS funds to assist or promote such returns—to meet the argument that the House-passed provision might have been violated if a DOS official made a phone call. Also, the provision is now limited to refugee accounts, not all DOS accounts. The effect of this provision, therefore, is to provide that funds for refugee protection may not be used to forcibly repatriate people unless it has been determined that they are not refugees.

SECTION 1255, PERSECUTION FOR RESISTANCE TO COERCIVE POPULATION CONTROL METHODS

This section would provide that forced abortion, forced sterilization, or persecution for resistance to such measures are persecution on account of political opinion within the meaning of the refugee definition in the Immigration and Nationality Act. It would effectively reinstate the prior interpretation of the law, which was reversed by an INS order on August 5, 1994.

SEC. 1256, U.S. POLICY WITH RESPECT TO THE INVOLUNTARY RETURN OF PERSONS SUBJECTED TO TORTURE

This section would prohibit the use of funds authorized by this act in the involuntary return of any person to a place in which he or she is in serious danger of subjection to torture. This provision has been substantially modified to meet DOS concerns. The section now specifically subjects the definition of torture to all reservations, understandings, etc., adopted by the United States when it ratified the Convention Against Torture. The conference also eliminated the assist or promote language to which DOS objected. (See section 1254 above.)

SEC. 1304, RESPONSIBILITIES OF BUREAU CHARGED WITH REFUGEES

The House-passed provision would have established. This provision would have established a coordinator for human rights and refugees within the Office of the Secretary of State. It would also have established a statutory bureau of Refugee and Migration assistance. Under the House provision, the coordinator for human rights and refugees would supervise the Bureau of Refugee and Migration Assistance and the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, and would report directly to the Secretary of State. The conference substantially modified this provision to meet DOS concerns. The Department had argued that human rights and refugee protection are distinct functions requiring two separate bureaus, and also that the institution of a coordinator who reported to the Secretary rather than an Undersecretary might have the unintended effect of isolating these bureaus. The

conference therefore modified the provision to specify only that the bureau with responsibility for refugee and migration and refugee assistance be independent of the bureau charged with responsibility for population policy. The department can, of course, still maintain a population office in another bureau, as it did prior to 1993. The present provision is designed to reinforce the principle that refugees are linked primarily to human rights problems, not demographic problems.

Related human rights issues:

SEC. 1102(E), LIMITATION ON FUNDING FOR UNDP PROGRAMS IN BURMA

Reduces funding to the UNDP in each fiscal year by the estimated cost of UNDP projects in and for Burma, unless the President certifies that all such projects are directed toward the needs of the poor; are conducted through international or private voluntary organizations independent of the SLORC; do not benefit the SLORC; and are endorsed by the democratic leadership of the Burmese people.

SEC. 1408, CONDUCT OF CERTAIN EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

This section requires that exchanges with countries whose people do not enjoy freedom and democracy be carried out in cooperation with human rights and pro-democracy leaders in these countries. The administration successfully argued for the deletion of language that would have extended eligibility for scholarships and exchanges in such countries—including China, Viet Nam, Cambodia, Laos, and East Timor—to exiles from these countries.

SEC. 1410, EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGES FOR TIBETANS AND BURMESE

This section carries over a provision of prior law to require that exiles from these countries be eligible for scholarships and exchange programs. In the absence of this provision, exiles would be excluded from eligibility for such programs, and the selection process would necessarily be conducted in cooperation with the regimes that rule Burma and Tibet.

SEC. 1611, REPORTS TO CONGRESS ON BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

This section requires periodic reports on human rights protection under the Dayton agreement, the status of refugees, and the treatment of the Albanian ethnic majority in Serb-held Kosova.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard about how this bill is pro-fiscal responsibility. It is also pro-human rights. I urge a "yes" vote on the conference report.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I address this bill on two levels: No. 1, my interest in Africa; and, No. 2, just general foreign policy.

□ 1845

First, the bill cuts back the development funds for Africa. There is \$800 million for 600 million people, and now that is gone.

Next, the bill does not want to send peacekeeping forces to Africa, and we saw 400,000 people die in Rwanda because of that. Next, in spite of what the gentleman said, and I am sure the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] will address this, too, the housing development funds are not there for future operations in South Africa.

Now, by not addressing the problems created in the foreign ops appropriations bill, we are going to cut back population assistance funds, family planning. As the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN] said, 7 million couples in the world in developing countries will not have any access to family planning information. People will starve in Africa because of this, and unwanted babies will be born.

Now, let us talk about foreign policy. I almost feel that I am in a time warp going back to 1919 when they were voting to get out of the League of Nations here. Mr. Speaker, we are slipping into isolationism, if there ever was one. There are more provisions in this bill that will stymie the President from having and operating foreign policy, and we cannot operate with 435 Secretaries of State here.

We cannot micromanage foreign policy. This was not done by this body during the Bush administration. It was not done by this body in the Reagan administration. It is wrong, and we should kill this bill.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that we do allow the housing program in South Africa. We have not eliminated it. Apparently, the gentleman has some misinformation.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield so that I may respond, the gentleman's bill has not eliminated what is in progress right now; but has eliminated any future allocations to the housing project.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, no, that is not correct. "The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to guarantees which have been issued for the benefit of the Republic of South Africa," and I am quoting from the bill itself.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH], the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Economic Policy and Trade.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the chairman of our Committee on International Relations and all the conferees for the excellent work on this bill. I think what has been lost sight of here today is that this bill is really a reform bill. We have included in this legislation, for example, two provisions that every Member of this House should support and can support.

The first of these provisions will at long last curtail the foreign aid pipeline. When I bring up these issues, this is not something that we have taken out of the paper. This is our GAO accounting office which has made a recommendation to us, and this is where we are getting the initiatives for this particular legislation.

For example, how many of our colleagues know that AID has a huge backlog of funds, some \$8.5 billion at last count? These funds are left over from previous years going all the way

back to 1987. Here we do not know where the next nickel is coming from, and we have a foreign aid pipeline that has money in it since 1987. That is nearly a decade.

These funds are sitting there waiting for some foreign aid bureaucrat to dream up some way of spending the money. In 1991 the General Accounting Office did an investigation of the foreign aid pipeline, and here it is. This is what we are talking about. They concluded that these funds remaining should not be remaining for more than 2 years. They ought to be deauthorized after 2 years because it is an open invitation to waste, fraud, and abuse if we do not do that.

For 5 years I have sponsored legislation to cut off the pipeline. This House passed that pipeline twice. Today it is incorporated into this bill, and I thank the conferees and the chairman of the Committee on International Relations for having the foresight and the intestinal fortitude to move forward with this plan.

This provision alone will save nearly a half a billion dollars to our taxpayers. That has been sitting around in the pipeline, in this slush fund, for almost 10 years. This reform is long overdue, and today the House has a chance to do something about it. I say thank God. Let us put a halt to this foreign aid pipeline.

Second is the termination to some degree of the AID Housing Guarantee Program, and we are quoting from the GAO report on the housing guarantee program. Now, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JOHNSTON], my good friend, was talking about this in the well of the House. I think the reason that he got it wrong, Mr. Speaker, and that is not his fault, is that the White House the other day said that they were going to veto some bill because it cut out all the money for South Africa. The truth of it is that South Africa has been exempted, as the chairman of the committee has quoted from the bill itself.

This is a loan guarantee program now where the American taxpayer cosigns for loans around the world. One hundred percent guarantees. Listen to this: 100 percent guarantees. We do not do that for our own people, but we are doing it all over the world.

But what really aggravates a number of us is that when a borrower defaults anywhere in the world, the American taxpayer pays off the loan without question. We do not do that for our own home buyers here in the United States, yet we are doing it all over the world.

In my subcommittee we conducted a 2-year bipartisan investigation of this plan, and here is what we found. The GAO also found this, and right here it is. They found unbelievable losses caused by incompetence, waste, and fraud.

Here is the bottom line. We have some \$2.7 billion in guarantees. The United States has already lost \$542 million to cover the bad loans in 23 other

countries, foreign countries. What is worse, GAO estimates right here in this report to our Congress that we are going to be losing another \$500 million, half a billion dollars, just on these existing loans.

What does that mean? It means we are losing about a billion dollars. What this means is that we have a billion-dollar loss here on \$2.7 billion in guarantees. That is a 40-percent loss that the American taxpayer is picking up for home loans around the world.

This bill ends the program and imposes tough penalties on foreign governments which would default on these loans. This is a provision which my subcommittee originated. It will stop the losses and collect the money that is owed to us.

I cannot see why this Congress would want to continue to spend hundreds of billions of dollars that we know will go into waste, fraud, and abuse. We should not, and therefore we should vote for this conference report.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, when this bill came before the House last spring, it was titled then "The American Overseas Interest Act." At the time I voted against the bill, and I will have to vote against this conference report. A better title then, as now, would have been "The American Leadership Reduction and Avoidance Act."

The House-passed bill sought to force a reduction in American leadership in the world. It cut funding below levels needed to conduct foreign policy effectively. It placed severe limitations on population assistance programs and was riddled with policy directives designed to restrict the President's ability to conduct foreign policy.

Just as bad, the bill included provisions to eliminate the U.S. Information Agency, the Agency for International Development, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

I had hoped the conferees might fix the bill's defects enough so I could support the conference report. Unfortunately, that has not happened. The conference agreements funding provisions are no better than those in the original House version. It still contains devastating restrictions on population assistance, and there remain a variety of attempts to micromanage foreign policy at the expense of necessary Presidential prerogative.

And with respect to the elimination of the three agencies, the only difference is that it contains a waiver now which gives the President the right to pick the victim and to protect any two agencies he chooses from elimination. Some may argue that this is an acceptable compromise because the President will be able to save USIA and AID, agencies that have the broadest mandates and constituencies.

The assumption is that only the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency will be sacrificed to the forces of

isolation and retrenchment. I do not believe that that is a compromise in any case that we can or should accept.

Effective foreign policy should represent the pursuit of enlightened self-interest. And certainly one of the most pressing interests in American foreign policy right now is controlling the spread of weapons of mass destruction. This becomes all the more important as regional and ethnic conflicts continue to explode across the planet.

Today more than ever before it is in our critical self-interest to maintain an independent agency that advocates, negotiates, implements, and verifies effective arms control agreements and those connected with nonproliferation disarmament policies generally. That agency is the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. We will do this country a great disservice if we sacrifice it under the wrong-headed choices that are required under this bill.

Mr. Speaker, because of its independent status, ACDA brings to the policy table an expert and undiluted arms control viewpoint. Often, this viewpoint differs from the State Department's perspective, which cannot focus solely or primarily on arms control issues. This is why ACDA was created and that is why ACDA has continued to prove its worth to U.S. national security over the years.

This bill would probably eliminate ACDA's independent voice on arms control. By presumably submerging some vestige of ACDA in the State Department, direct access to the President, the National Security Adviser, and the Secretary of State on arms control issues, now authorized to the Director of ACDA, would be gone, along with direct ACDA participation in the interagency policymaking process where significant arms control and nonproliferation decisions are made.

The supporters of the bill claim that ACDA is a cold-war relic that's no longer relevant. This claim shows them to be out of touch with the realities of the foreign policy environment we face. Given the threat of a revival of Russian nationalism and military expansion, and the new dangers of the post-cold-war world, ACDA is a relic today only if weapons of mass destruction are a rumor and the threats of proliferation are a myth.

The authors of H.R. 1561 claim that it would save money by eliminating an independent ACDA. In fact, according to the Congressional Research Service, it will cost \$10 million to eliminate ACDA.

ACDA's basic annual budget is \$50 million. According to the U.S. Strategic Command, existing strategic arms treaties save about \$100 billion a year. Since these treaties took about a decade to negotiate, you could argue that there's a payoff of 200 to 1 from ACDA. That argument may be a bit of a reach, but I suspect that the impact of this ill-conceived legislation may well be the reverse—one bill and 200 new problems caused by the disruption, dislocation, and crippling reductions contained in this bill.

The compromise in this conference agreement to sacrifice ACDA alone comes at exactly the wrong moment—as the U.S. Government is pursuing the biggest and broadest arms control and nonproliferation agenda in history. Now is not the time to be dismantling the one agency whose sole mandate is to for-

mulate, negotiate, and verify arms control, and nonproliferation policies and agreements.

Now is the time to retain ACDA and to let it build on its past successes. I urge a vote against this conference report.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], a senior member of our Committee on International Relations and the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises in support for the conference report on H.R. 1561. As vice chairman of the Committee on International Relations, this Member has worked over a period of some months with his colleagues to craft this conference report; however, no one has worked harder than the distinguished gentleman from New York, Chairman GILMAN, who has skillfully navigated a difficult process to produce this legislation.

There are many important provisions in this conference report, many of which my colleagues will discuss. This Member will discuss only a few key provisions.

First, it should be remembered that many of the Members elected to the 104th Congress came to this body with a strong commitment to reduce government and eliminate unnecessary agencies. Attempt have been made, and overall spending has been reduced somewhat, but all sizable Federal agencies thus far have seemed impervious to elimination.

But with this conference report, Mr. Speaker, the Congress will be consolidating and eliminating agencies. It is true that the President is given the discretion to decide which of three agencies—AID, USIA, or ACDA—would be folded into the State Department, but the net effect would be to eliminate at least one unnecessary and duplicative agency. Each Member of this body who votes for this legislation will be able to return to their district and point to the elimination of at least one agency while preserving those important functions now performed by ACDA, USIA, or AID.

And, this Member would tell his colleagues on the other side of the aisle that the conference report's plan to reduce agencies is wholly in keeping with Secretary of State Christopher's initial proposals to overhaul the U.S. foreign policy apparatus—a plan that regrettably fell by the wayside early in this administration.

Another major accomplishment of H.R. 1561 is the elimination of the Housing Guarantee Program as it operates in most countries. This program, which was created to guarantee loans made by U.S. investors to support shelter-related projects in developing countries, has evolved into a terribly inefficient and badly mismanaged fiasco that is losing tens of millions of dollars

annually. Indeed, a recent study by the General Accounting Office estimates that the Housing Guarantee Program may end up costing the United States \$1 billion in loan default and other costs. It is a program that deserves to die, Mr. Speaker, and enactment of this conference report would terminate it in most areas.

Yet another major foreign policy concern drafted by this Member and by the H.R. 1561 conference report is aimed at ensuring that the Congress retains some measure of responsibility for our relations with North Korea. Mr. Speaker, in its haste to ensure that North Korea receives assistance in the construction of lightwater nuclear reactors, this administration has effectively bypassed the normal congressional review of foreign assistance. This legislation ensures that future funds for North Korea for this particularly effort receive proper congressional scrutiny. This legislation also ensures that further progress in United States-North Korean relations are also dependent upon progress in the North-South dialog, progress on the final accounting for American MIA's in the Korean war, and cessation of North Korea's proliferation of ballistic missiles and support for international terrorism. This is an important policy message that this body needs to deliver.

Last, Mr. Speaker, this Member would point to the resolution of longstanding claims, against frozen Iraqi assets. The H.R. 1561 conference report ensures that American exporters and financial institutions with legitimate claims against the Government of Iraq for commercial activities initiated before the conflict will receive compensation out of Iraqi assets held since the Persian Gulf war. The result is that, after almost 6 years of arbitrary decisions, arrogance, and intransigence by the State Department's Office of Foreign Assets Control, these outstanding claims will be resolved. This is a matter of basic fairness, Mr. Speaker, but these are also important pro-growth, pro-trade provisions. It also should be noted that these provisions are not mentioned as one of the President's listed objections to this legislation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this Member would urge his colleagues to support the conference report on H.R. 1561. There are certainly some provisions in this legislation, like some of the southeast Asia refugee provisions and the Tibet Envoy, which this Member cannot support. However, legislation is subject to necessary compromises and it is important that the Congress attempt to pass this authorization legislation.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

(Mrs. LOWEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

□ 1900

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the MacBride Prin-

ciples and the provision in H.R. 1561 that embodies the MacBride Principles. Regrettably, the provision dealing with the MacBride Principles is one of the only positive portions of this terribly flawed bill. As a result, I will not be able to cast my vote in support of H.R. 1561.

The MacBride Principles consist of nine fair employment principles. They are a code of conduct for United States companies doing business in Northern Ireland, and they call for nondiscriminatory United States investment in Northern Ireland.

I strongly support greater accountability of organizations receiving United States assistance in Ireland, and I have demanded that these organizations comply with the MacBride Principles. During consideration of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1996, I offered an amendment that urged all organizations receiving funding from the International Fund for Ireland to comply with the MacBride Principles. My amendment was included in the final version of the bill that was signed into law by President Clinton earlier this year.

Recipients of United States aid must not be allowed to violate the human rights—including religious freedoms—of Catholics living in Northern Ireland. I offered my language on the MacBride Principles in the Foreign Operations bill out of deep concern for continued religious discrimination in Northern Ireland. But now, the MacBride Principles provision in this bill is being held hostage by the other unacceptable provisions of H.R. 1561.

The administration has said it will veto this bill, and I will vote against it. H.R. 1561 does not eliminate all of the restrictions placed on international family planning assistance in the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act. These harmful provisions will severely impact women and children in developing nations. In fact, a study released last week by several populations assistance groups estimates that the decrease in international family planning funds will result in an increase of more than 1.5 million abortions worldwide.

The bill also forces the administration to consolidate or eliminate several critically important foreign affairs agencies: it undercuts the United States ability to maintain its interests overseas, and it negatively impacts the U.S. leadership role in the United Nations by providing inadequate levels of funding and requiring unworkable notification requirements.

Mr. Speaker, the MacBride Principles should be a cornerstone of United States foreign policy in Northern Ireland. That is why I strongly support efforts to tie U.S. assistance to these Principles. However, H.R. 1561 is a bad bill. I would hope that when President Clinton vetoes H.R. 1561—as he has promised to do—we can pass the MacBride Principles as an independent piece of legislation.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yield-

ing this time to me. I thank him for his consistent leadership in opposition to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, we are at a crossroads in world history, really, and we find ourselves with tremendous responsibility on our shoulders. The whole rest of the world looks to us as the single superpower to lead them to a safer, to a fairer, a more prosperous world, and a world that reflects our principles of democracy, of freedom of expression, of freedom of religion, of respect for human rights, and three principal instruments that we have available to use to achieve these objectives are the Agency for International Development, U.S. Information Agency, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

The Agency for International Development has, in fact, developed quite a pool of unspent money, as was cited earlier, but they have done that because they also want to use that agency for leverage, to get recipients to respect human rights, to respect the democratic process, to develop economically without exploiting the people. They Agency for International Development, in fact, generates far more profit revenue for American firms than we would ever invest in AID. What they are doing is developing the purchasing capability, particularly in Third World countries, that present market opportunities for American firms. They are streamlined, they are focused, they are a good agency.

The U.S. Information Agency represents the opportunity to spread truth, which oftentimes is that it makes the difference between genocide and peaceful resolution of problems. We need more truth, unbiased truth. If we had more of it in Bosnia or in Rwanda, we might well not have had the genocide that happened. We need to be putting more investment in the U.S. Information Agency because it deserves credibility, and at a time when we see the proliferation of nuclear weapons and chemicals, biological weapons of mass destruction, why would we ever think of cutting back on the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency?

So if we want a safer, a more productive, a fairer world that reflects our principles of democracy and freedom of expression, then we want to vote against this bill, and, if anything, we want to strengthen these three agencies.

This is not a good bill; this is an isolationist bill. We ought to be moving forward and accepting the mantle of leadership that is thrust upon us now. It is a great opportunity. Let us not miss it.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I just hope my colleagues, particularly those who may be listening to this debate back in their offices, are very clear that there is nothing in

this bill that authorizes population control funding. There is no policy guidance either way. The Mexico City policy is not in here. I wish it had been, but it is not, and I would like to ask my friends on the Democratic side, perhaps the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], if he can just clarify so that everyone knows, when the Democratic substitute was offered in the conference committee, did it have language in it dealing with the population issue, did it authorize population or not?

My understanding was it simply did not have section C, which is exactly what the conference report of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] does not have, so that there is no authorization, population is not advanced, it is not pushed backwards. It is simply not in this bill.

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

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

Mr. BERMAN. The gentleman is correct in that this bill does not deal with a number of the foreign aid issues.

But where the gentleman is wrong is this was an opportunity to get rid of the harsh and unfair restrictions on the existing program.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Let me make it very clear, Mr. Speaker. I offered during the time that we were in the conference committee, and this really fleshed out where some people, particularly on the proabortion side, is on family planning. We would be more than happy to life any percentage restriction on population provided it has the very principled Mexico City policy that says no organization that performs abortions except for rape, incest or life of the mother gets money.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. I might say that the bill is better than the original bill that came before the House, and I know that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] has worked very hard to make the bill better, but it still is not good enough.

I believe that American diplomacy is essential. I believe, as the world power that we are, we need to remain engaged in the world. This bill, in my opinion, goes in the opposite direction. It slashes money for foreign affairs agencies, it slashes money for foreign aid, it slashes money for arms control, it slashes money for peacekeeping. The people that serve our country in the Embassies around the world are very demoralized, and rightfully so. The bill has a serious isolationism bent.

We cannot have it both ways, my colleagues. We cannot be the leader of the free world, indeed the leader of the world, and tell other countries that we want them to emulate us in terms of being more open, more democratic, a free society, and at the same time we are pulling back, putting our heads in

the sand and being isolationist. We cannot have it both ways, and this clearly, in reducing the level of aid, in reducing the importance of foreign affairs and foreign involvement, we are truly going back to the days when the United States was an isolationist country. I do not think that is the direction in which we ought to go.

Family planning; it pulls back in family planning as well. The country programs; it pulls back as well there.

It seems to me that we spent so much money in the era of the cold war. We won that cold war. We beat the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union and the Eastern bloc countries crumbled. Did we spend billions and billions and billions of dollars on an arms race only to throw it all away? Now that we have won? To say that we do not want to stay engaged in the world? To say that we want to retrench and pull back?

The American public believes that foreign aid is about 15 percent of our budget when in reality it is less than 1 percent of our budget, and in my opinion that is certainly not enough if we want to say that we are the leaders of the world, and we are. Nobody anointed us and said that we were the leaders. We choose to be the leaders, as well we should.

I believe with leadership comes responsibility. I believe that, if we want to ensure that the fledgling democracies in this world continue to prosper and grow, then we have got to provide the help, we have got to provide the aid, especially with the developing countries. A little bit of aid goes such a long, long way.

But what are we telling the world with this? We are saying that we want to step backwards into the era of isolationism.

Now we have problems with the U.N. The U.N. has not always been an ideal or done what we like it to do, but I would think that the world would be a lot worse if we did not have a U.N., and here we are retrenching even there.

So let me just say, if I may conclude to my colleagues, I think this bill goes in the wrong direction and it ought to be defeated.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK], a member of our Committee on International Relations.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate our chairman on a fine bill, and I also want to congratulate the ranking member for his leadership for many years in this field.

I rise in strong support of the conference report. The American people clearly want us to balance the budget, they want us to cut foreign aid bureaucracy, and this bill does that.

This is not an isolationist bill. The United States cannot and should not engage in isolationism. But the world has changed. The cold war is over, and we need to reduce the apparatuses that are associated with that cold war in this time of tight budgets.

And I have to disagree with some of my colleagues on the Democrat side of

the aisle, that they would suggest that we are pulling back and being isolationist by some of the reforms of the cold war institutions and suggesting that the United States' leadership in the world is dependent upon having the United States Information Agency, and AID and ACDA when our real tools for leadership in the world and the reason the United States is the leading country of the world is a strong, vibrant, growing economy, a strong military apparatus and standing for principles, principles of freedom, and justice, and liberty, and those are the things that give the United States leadership. It is not bureaucracies, and there are fine people that are in these agencies, and they work hard, and they do a good job.

But the truth of the matter is we are broke. We are \$5 trillion in the hole, and the American people are far more concerned about health care for our children than they are about a foreign aid bureaucracy, and we should be far more concerned about Medicare than about foreign aid, and that is what this is about. This is about making tough decisions during times of tight budgets.

I think this is a good bill in doing that, in changing the apparatuses. I think it should have eliminated the three international affairs agencies that were involved. But they compromised and went to one of the three and told the executive branch, "You decide in working with this of what you think works best in your foreign policy decisions that you have." That seems prudent to me. They cut the operating budget of the State Department and related agencies by \$1.3 billion, and in a time of tight budgets, when we are trying to increase health care for our children in this country, when we are trying to balance our own budget so we can have a strong economy, a strong military and stand for principle, those seem to me to be prudent and wise things to do. It reduces the program budgets of the State Department and related agencies by \$500 million below the fiscal year 1995 funding levels. These are all things that are going to be necessary, that are necessary, to balance the budgets so the United States can continue to have the global leadership by virtue of having a strong economy, a strong military and standing for the principles that we always have.

That is why I think this is a good bill. I congratulate the chairman on it.

□ 1915

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN].

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the bill and urge the House to defeat this measure.

I would like to just put this in the context of the history that I am aware of since I was elected to this House back in 1982. In every single Congress, with the Democrats controlling half of that in the House the entire period of time, the Republicans controlling the

Senate for the first 4 years that I was here, a Republican President for the first 12 of those 14 years, every single time the chairman of then the Committee on Foreign Affairs, working with the ranking member, and on a bipartisan basis, put together a State Department authorization bill that was bipartisan in nature, that had the support of the administration. Each and every time the State Department authorization bill was passed by a Congress, in some cases split, in some cases Democrat, and signed by a Republican President.

Every effort was made to provide more executive branch flexibility in the operations of our foreign affairs, not less. At the same time, in the area of foreign aid, with the exception of one Congress, each and every Congress that I served in in this House, and again, that is since 1983, the House passed a bipartisan foreign aid authorization bill that frequently got waylaid over in the Senate. One year we got a bill. In one of those Congresses on the issue of family planning and the abortion controversy, we failed here, but again, the fundamental approach was to do it on a bipartisan basis.

When this bill came through this Congress last year, there was not one whit of effort to try and do a bipartisan bill. Everyone but 12 Democrats voted against this bill. Now we come forward and we hear foreign aid has been dropped, but that is not quite an accurate statement. Foreign aid has been dropped except where a Member of the majority on the committee had a particular priority, so foreign aid was dropped, except we eliminated housing guarantees. Foreign aid authorization was dropped, except where we wanted to write something in on North Korea, or on humanitarian corridors, or on MacBride principles. We cherry-picked a few issues, the majority did, put them into a bill that was supposed to be just a State Department authorization bill, and then shoved it to the administration without one moment of time to talk about the pros and cons of forced consolidation against executive branch wishes.

Should ACDA be consolidated and folded into the State Department or should it be separate? There is an argument, maybe it is not persuasive, but at least it takes a second to pause and think, that we want an independent arms control proliferation agency that is not going to be run by the State Department with a direct voice to the National Security Council to raise issues of arms control and nonproliferation when economic pressures that might exist otherwise cause the State Department to be less clear on those kind of issues.

Should USIA be consolidated? There is at least an argument that having an independent agency involved in articulating the American point of view and a voice of truth and freedom to the world should not be under the direct control of our diplomatic services.

Maybe it is not a compelling argument, but it is an argument.

Should AID, the agency primarily focused with development assistance, be subordinated into the diplomatic service? Maybe, maybe not, but there are some good arguments against doing that, but the majority refused to spend time discussing the debate. They wanted to take home a trophy.

They decided, as one Member of the majority just said on this floor.

If this bill passes, all of you can go home and say you collapsed one of our international relations agencies. It is a trophy. No substantive arguments underlying the reason, just let us do it to do it, to hell with the executive branch, who cares what they want; forget the tradition of bipartisan approaches to this issue.

I think that is wrong. I think we ought to be providing sufficient resources, sufficient flexibility, and an underlying bipartisan approach to these critical issues around the world and the critical issues that are funded by the 150 accounts. This bill does not do it, so I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. GILLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, very briefly, we have tried to make this bipartisan. I have had markups in my subcommittee, because much of this is from my subcommittee. We had no-shows at the subcommittee markups. At full committee we had lack of participation, and the same thing happened in the House-Senate conference committee.

The substitute offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the Democratic alternative, said exactly what this bill says on the issue of population control, nothing. His bill said it, our bill says it, nothing, so it is not an issue here.

The issue of isolationist is absurd. When you have groups backing provisions of this bill like the United Israel Appeal, the American Jewish Committee, the American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, and a whole host of other groups, this is not an isolationist bill at all.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] has 7 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report. I do so because I think it fundamentally constrains the President's ability to conduct American foreign policy. It is an improvement over the previously passed House bill, but I think it has a long way to go before it becomes law.

First, I think the conference report mandates a very far-reaching reorganization of the U.S. foreign policy apparatus. That, as far as I have been able to discern, has no real connection to the problems of American foreign policy. Second, I think the conference

report does not give the President the flexibility he needs to conduct U.S. foreign policy and protect and promote U.S. interests.

Third, I think it cuts too deeply into spending across the board for foreign policy, making it much more difficult to promote and protect U.S. interests.

The President, of course, has promised to veto this conference report in its present form. I urge my colleagues to support the President and to defeat the conference report.

With respect to reorganization, the conference report, as others have said, dictates to the President how he should organize the foreign policy agencies. It dictates that at least one agency be eliminated. My view on this is that in the absence of any compelling evidence of the advantages of reorganization, which I really do not find here, I think the President should have the discretion to determine how to structure the foreign policy agencies.

The Administration has already instituted several significant streamlining and reorganization proposals for the foreign policy agencies. For example, the State Department alone has cut 1,300 jobs.

On the second point, the reduced funding for U.S. foreign policy I think damages our ability to carry out that policy. This conference report damages U.S. interests overseas by continuing to reduce funds available to operate overseas by about a half a billion dollars from 1995 levels. That would force the United States to retreat from its presence overseas and reduce U.S. influence. Areas that would be hurt include diplomatic posts, payments for international organizations and peacekeeping, sustainable development, and public diplomacy.

I think the point I would like to make on the funding dollars is that the cuts required by this conference report do not occur in a vacuum. For more than a decade now, the Congress has slashed spending for all categories of international affairs. Funding for economic and security assistance has been cut 10 percent in the last year alone, and that follows a 40 percent cut over the last decade. Spending for all international affairs accounts has been cut 45 percent in real terms in the last decade.

Our ability to use the United Nations to further our interests has been hurt by our unwillingness to pay our share of the budget or to pay over \$1 billion in arrears, and the United Nations, therefore, is on the brink of a financial crisis.

I think all of us agree that we are in tight budgetary times. I have supported many of the cuts that I have indicated, but my sense now is that we have cut these accounts enough. We should draw the line before we take away too many resources and impair the President's ability to conduct foreign policy.

Finally, the conference report damages U.S. foreign policy by imposing

too many restrictions on the President. This is not the time to be amending the Taiwan Relations Act. This is not the time to be tying the President's hands on relations with Vietnam. This is not the time to undercut U.S. efforts to reform the United Nations.

The conference report does all of those things. It does undermine the ability of the President to conduct policy. We have many different views in this body on the policy restrictions. I am certain that there are provisions that many of my colleagues support, but when we add it all up, when I examine the impact of all of these policy restrictions provisions, I conclude that they constitute a serious infringement on the President's power to conduct foreign policy.

So as we vote on this conference report, Mr. Speaker, I think Members should ask themselves this question: Does this bill help or does it hinder the President's ability to confront the many challenges we face in the world? I think the answer is that it hinders the President's ability to do that.

Members of Congress expect the President to provide leadership in foreign policy, but at the same time, we should not deny the President the resources to provide that leadership. This conference report weakens the President's ability to lead at a time when the world badly needs U.S. leadership. That is not the way for the Congress to play a responsible role in the conduct of American foreign policy, and I urge my colleagues to defeat of the conference report.

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

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

In closing, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues have heard many important reasons in support of this conference report. This measure delivers on the President's pledge that the era of big government is over, and at the same time, this measure improves the State Department and the management of the United Nations, and at the same time supports our vital U.S. diplomatic missions.

With regard to the MacBride principles included in the report, President Clinton, while Governor and candidate, stated

I like this principle. I believe in it. I would encourage my successor to embrace it. As President, I would encourage all Governors to look at it and embrace it. I think it is a good idea. I like them very much. I think it is a way to encourage investment, because it is a way to stabilize the political and economic climate in the work force by being free of discrimination. The argument is made against the principles in a country in which there is discrimination. I just do not buy that.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this conference report. It enhances our Government abroad.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the conference report to accompany H.R. 1561. This bill is veto bait and ought to be sent back to committee.

H.R. 1561 requires the elimination of three foreign policy agencies, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency [ACDA], the United States Information Agency [USIA], and the Agency for International Development [AID], merging their functions into the Department of State. Under the bill the President must submit a plan to accomplish this reorganization by October 1 of this year in order to abolish these agencies by March 1, 1997. The President's plan must save \$1.7 billion over the next 4 years.

Mr. Speaker, the problems with this bill are many. H.R. 1561 forces the President to consolidate agencies, even though he is provided with waiver authority for two of the three, the funding levels are low enough that he will be forced to consolidate other functions in order to adhere to the authorization levels in future years. In addition, the bill requires an unrealistic timetable for presenting a plan and then actually closing agencies within a year from now. The transition provisions are so inadequate that they do not even provide for useful methods of downsizing such as employee buy-outs, which have proven popular at other agencies.

H.R. 1561 also contains a variety of provisions which will harm our ability to participate in a number of international organizations ranging from the United Nations to the Inter-American Indian Institute. By either terminating our membership outright or requiring that we withhold a significant portion of our assessment, the bill ties the President's hands and hinders our ability to play an effective role in the international arena. There are many Members who agree that the United Nations is in need of reform. Many will agree that our assessment should be lower and most will agree that an independent U.N. Inspector General would be a valuable step. But to withhold our contributions and in effect bully the United Nations to go along will likely jeopardize progress already made in the areas of U.N. budgetary and management reform.

Mr. Speaker, the President has said that he will veto the conference report. I say let's save him the trouble by defeating a bad bill and bringing back a genuine bipartisan State Department authorization bill that we can all support and the President can sign.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 172, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]

YEAS—226

Allard	Gilman	Norwood
Andrews	Goodlatte	Nussle
Archer	Goodling	Oxley
Armey	Goss	Packard
Bachus	Graham	Parker
Baker (CA)	Greenwood	Paxon
Baker (LA)	Gunderson	Peterson (MN)
Ballenger	Gutknecht	Petri
Barr	Hancock	Pombo
Barrett (NE)	Hansen	Porter
Bartlett	Hastert	Portman
Bass	Hastings (WA)	Poshard
Bateman	Hayes	Pryce
Bereuter	Hayworth	Quillen
Bilbray	Hefley	Quinn
Bilirakis	Heineman	Radanovich
Bliley	Herger	Ramstad
Blute	Hilleary	Regula
Boehlert	Hobson	Riggs
Boehner	Hoekstra	Roberts
Bonilla	Hoke	Rogers
Bono	Horn	Rohrabacher
Brownback	Hostettler	Ros-Lehtinen
Bryant (TN)	Houghton	Roth
Bunn	Hunter	Roukema
Bunning	Hutchinson	Royce
Burr	Hyde	Salmon
Burton	Inglis	Sanford
Buyer	Istook	Saxton
Callahan	Jones	Scarborough
Calvert	Kasich	Schafer
Camp	Kelly	Schiff
Campbell	Kennedy (RI)	Seastrand
Canady	Kennelly	Sensenbrenner
Castle	Kim	Shadegg
Chabot	King	Shaw
Chambliss	Kingston	Shays
Chrysler	Klug	Shuster
Clinger	Knollenberg	Skeen
Coble	Kolbe	Smith (MI)
Coburn	LaHood	Smith (NJ)
Collins (GA)	Largent	Smith (TX)
Cooley	Latham	Smith (WA)
Cox	LaTourette	Solomon
Crane	Lazio	Souder
Crapo	Leach	Spence
Creameans	Lewis (CA)	Stearns
Cunningham	Lewis (KY)	Stump
Davis	Lightfoot	Talent
Deal	Linder	Tate
Diaz-Balart	Livingston	Tauzin
Dickey	LoBiondo	Thomas
Doolittle	Lofgren	Thornberry
Dornan	Longley	Tiahrt
Dreier	Lucas	Torkildsen
Dunn	Maloney	Torricelli
Ehlers	Manton	Upton
Ehrlich	Manzullo	Vucanovich
Emerson	Martini	Waldholtz
English	McCollum	Walker
Everett	McCrery	Walsh
Ewing	McHugh	Wamp
Fawell	McInnis	Watts (OK)
Flanagan	McIntosh	Weldon (FL)
Foley	McKeon	Weldon (PA)
Forbes	Metcalf	Weller
Fowler	Meyers	White
Fox	Mica	Whitfield
Franks (CT)	Miller (FL)	Wicker
Franks (NJ)	Molinari	Wolf
Frelinghuysen	Moorhead	Young (AK)
Frisa	Myers	Young (FL)
Funderburk	Myrick	Zeliff
Ganske	Nethercutt	Zimmer
Gekas	Neumann	
Gilchrest	Ney	

NAYS—172

Abercrombie	Brown (OH)	Dicks
Ackerman	Cardin	Dingell
Baesler	Clay	Dixon
Baldacci	Clayton	Doggett
Barcia	Clement	Dooley
Barrett (WI)	Clyburn	Doyle
Becerra	Collins (MI)	Duncan
Beilenson	Combest	Edwards
Bentsen	Condit	Engel
Berman	Conyers	Ensign
Bevill	Costello	Eshoo
Bishop	Coyne	Evans
Bonior	Cramer	Farr
Borski	Danner	Fattah
Boucher	DeFazio	Fazio
Browder	DeLauro	Fields (LA)
Brown (CA)	Dellums	Filner
Brown (FL)	Deutsch	Foglietta

Ford	Lipinski	Reed
Frank (MA)	Lowey	Richardson
Frost	Luther	Rivers
Furse	Markey	Roemer
Gejdenson	Martinez	Roybal-Allard
Geren	Mascara	Sabo
Gillmor	Matsui	Sanders
Gonzalez	McCarthy	Sawyer
Gordon	McDermott	Schroeder
Gutierrez	McHale	Schumer
Hall (OH)	McKinney	Scott
Hall (TX)	McNulty	Serrano
Hamilton	Meehan	Sisisky
Harman	Meek	Skaggs
Hastings (FL)	Menendez	Skelton
Hefner	Miller (CA)	Slaughter
Hilliard	Minge	Spratt
Hinchey	Mink	Stenholm
Holden	Mollohan	Stupak
Hoyer	Montgomery	Tanner
Jackson (IL)	Moran	Taylor (MS)
Jackson-Lee	Morella	Thompson
(TX)	Murtha	Thornton
Jacobs	Nadler	Thurman
Jefferson	Neal	Torres
Johnson (CT)	Oberstar	Towns
Johnson (SD)	Obey	Trafficant
Johnson, E. B.	Olver	Velazquez
Johnston	Orton	Vento
Kanjorski	Owens	Visclosky
Kaptur	Pallone	Volkmer
Kennedy (MA)	Pastor	Ward
Kildee	Payne (NJ)	Waters
Klecзка	Payne (VA)	Watt (NC)
Klink	Pelosi	Williams
LaFalce	Peterson (FL)	Wise
Lantos	Pickett	Woolsey
Levin	Pomeroy	Wynn
Lewis (GA)	Rahall	Yates
Lincoln	Rangel	

NOT VOTING—33

Barton	Durbin	Ortiz
Brewster	Fields (TX)	Rose
Bryant (TX)	Flake	Rush
Chapman	Galleghy	Stark
Chenoweth	Gephardt	Stockman
Christensen	Gibbons	Stokes
Coleman	Green	Studds
Collins (IL)	Johnson, Sam	Taylor (NC)
Cubin	Laughlin	Tejeda
de la Garza	McDade	Waxman
DeLay	Moakley	Wilson

□ 1947

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. DeLay for, with Mr. Ortiz against.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. DICKEY changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks to the conference report on H.R. 1561.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2703, EFFECTIVE DEATH PENALTY AND PUBLIC SAFETY ACT OF 1996

Ms. PRYCE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-480) on the resolution (H. Res. 380) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2703) to combat terrorism, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING AMOUNTS FOR FURTHER EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Oversight be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 377), providing amounts for further expenses of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in the second session of the 104th Congress, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], the chairman of the Committee on Oversight, if he would explain the purpose of this resolution to the membership.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 377 is to provide an additional \$580,000 for expenses associated with the investigations and studies by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. \$400,000 of the \$580,000 is for the procurement of consultants in cases pending.

This resolution is obviously with some precedent. The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is really the only committee in the House that cannot determine its own agenda ahead of time. It is, by its very nature, a reactive committee.

We have in the past supported resolutions of this nature. As a matter of fact since 1982, seven resolutions have come to the floor. This resolution is necessary so that the committee can carry out the investigations, the studies, and the responses to Members' requests for explanations that are part and parcel the nature of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues support House Resolution 377. It is simply affording the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct the resources necessary to do its job.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to ob-

ject, I would concur in the gentleman's characterization of the resolution, and simply indicate that I hope the committee would return here expeditiously if there is any further need for funding for any purpose that comes before the committee. We are all anxious to see them proceed with all of their work as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 377

Resolved,

SECTION 1. FURTHER EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT.

For further expenses of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct (hereinafter in this resolution referred to as the "committee"), there shall be paid out of the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives not more than \$580,000, of which not more than \$400,000 may be used for procurement of consultant services under section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

SEC. 2. VOUCHERS.

Payments under this resolution shall be made on vouchers authorized by the committee, signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved in the manner directed by the Committee on House Oversight.

SEC. 3. LIMITATION.

Amounts shall be available under this resolution for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 1996, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 1997.

SEC. 4. REGULATIONS.

Amounts made available under this resolution shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Oversight.

SEC. 5. ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY.

The Committee on House Oversight shall have authority to make adjustments in amounts under section 1, if necessary to comply with an order of the President issued under section 254 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or to conform to any reduction in appropriations for the purposes of such section 1.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]