

as their loved ones. In addition, it is fiscally responsible to provide mental health treatment because proper preventive measures allow many patients to lead productive lives without having to be admitted into expensive long-term-care facilities. Mr. DINGELL's motion asks for the maximum level of mental health coverage that does not drive up the premium costs for others, and I am supportive of this motion.

In addition, the motion deletes medical savings accounts [MSAs] from H.R. 3103. Although I supported final passage of H.R. 3103 in late March because of the importance of providing workers health insurance portability, I did not support the MSA provisions as written in the bill. If we are going to include MSAs in this legislation, I believe that we should implement them on a demonstration basis so we can test the cost effectiveness of MSAs as well as the impact they would have on the insurance pool as a whole. We must ensure that the health and well-being of all Americans is the most important consideration regarding the establishment of MSAs, not just the health of those who can afford a special account.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3103 has many important provisions. It prohibits insurance companies from denying health care coverage to workers who move to another company, or who lose their jobs or become self-employed. The legislation also bars insurers from excluding coverage of preexisting illnesses for more than a year. In addition, this bill increases the tax deduction for health insurance costs paid by the self-employed, and it expands the opportunity for small businesses to form coalitions to provide them with health insurance.

Enactment of these measures is too important to be held up by disagreements on mental health benefits and MSAs. Therefore, I hope that we will move swiftly toward compromise on these issues so that we can provide our constituents with quality health insurance reform legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. PALLONE. 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 182, nays 235, answered "present" 2, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 226]

YEAS—182

Abercrombie	Berman	Bryant (TX)
Ackerman	Bevill	Bunn
Andrews	Bishop	Cardin
Baesler	Blumenauer	Chapman
Baldacci	Bonior	Clay
Barcia	Borski	Clayton
Barrett (WI)	Boucher	Clement
Becerra	Browder	Clyburn
Beilenson	Brown (CA)	Coleman
Bentsen	Brown (OH)	Collins (IL)

Collins (MI)	Kanjorski
Conyers	Kaptur
Costello	Kennedy (MA)
Coyne	Kennedy (RI)
Cramer	Kennelly
Cummings	Kildee
Danner	Klecza
de la Garza	Klink
DeFazio	LaFalce
DeLauro	Lantos
Dellums	Levin
Dicks	Lewis (GA)
Dingell	Lofgren
Dixon	Lowey
Doggett	Luther
Dooley	Maloney
Doyle	Manton
Durbin	Markey
Edwards	Martinez
Engel	Martini
Eshoo	Mascara
Evans	Matsui
Farr	McCarthy
Fattah	McDermott
Fazio	McHale
Fields (LA)	McKinney
Filner	McNulty
Flake	Meehan
Foglietta	Meek
Ford	Menendez
Frank (MA)	Millender
Frost	McDonald
Furse	Miller (CA)
Gephardt	Minge
Gilman	Mink
Gonzalez	Moakley
Gordon	Mollohan
Green (TX)	Moran
Gutierrez	Morella
Hall (OH)	Murtha
Hefner	Nadler
Hilliard	Neal
Hinchey	Oberstar
Holden	Obey
Hoyer	Olver
Jackson (IL)	Ortiz
Jackson-Lee	Orton
(TX)	Owens
Jefferson	Pallone
Johnson (SD)	Pastor
Johnson, E. B.	Payne (NJ)
Johnston	Payne (VA)

NAYS—235

Allard	Cox	Gunderson
Archer	Crane	Gutknecht
Armey	Crapo	Hall (TX)
Bachus	Creameans	Hamilton
Baker (CA)	Cubin	Hancock
Baker (LA)	Cunningham	Hansen
Ballenger	Davis	Hastert
Barr	Deal	Hastings (WA)
Barrett (NE)	DeLay	Hayworth
Bartlett	Diaz-Balart	Hefley
Barton	Dickey	Heineman
Bass	Doolittle	Hergert
Bereuter	Dornan	Hilleary
Bilbray	Dreier	Hobson
Bilirakis	Duncan	Hoekstra
Bliley	Dunn	Hoke
Blute	Ehlers	Horn
Boehlert	Ehrlich	Hostettler
Boehner	Emerson	Houghton
Bonilla	Ensign	Hunter
Bono	Everett	Hutchinson
Brewster	Ewing	Hyde
Brownback	Fawell	Inglis
Bryant (TN)	Fields (TX)	Istook
Bunning	Flanagan	Johnson (CT)
Burr	Foley	Johnson, Sam
Burton	Forbes	Jones
Buyer	Fowler	Kasich
Callahan	Fox	Kelly
Camp	Franks (CT)	Kim
Campbell	Franks (NJ)	King
Canady	Frelinghuysen	Kingston
Castle	Frisa	Klug
Chabot	Funderburk	Knollenberg
Chambliss	Galleghy	Kolbe
Chenoweth	Ganske	LaHood
Christensen	Gekas	Largent
Chrysler	Geren	Latham
Clinger	Gilchrest	LaTourette
Coble	Gillmor	Laughlin
Coburn	Goodlatte	Lazio
Collins (GA)	Goss	Leach
Combest	Graham	Lewis (CA)
Condit	Greene (UT)	Lewis (KY)
Cooley	Greenwood	Lightfoot

Linder	Pombo	Smith (WA)
Lipinski	Porter	Solomon
Livingston	Portman	Souder
LoBiondo	Poshard	Spence
Longley	Pryce	Stearns
Lucas	Quillen	Stockman
Manzullo	Quinn	Stump
McCollum	Radanovich	Talent
McCrery	Ramstad	Tate
McHugh	Regula	Tauzin
McInnis	Riggs	Taylor (MS)
McIntosh	Roberts	Taylor (NC)
McKeon	Roemer	Thomas
Metcalf	Rogers	Thornberry
Meyers	Rohrabacher	Tiahrt
Mica	Ros-Lehtinen	Upton
Miller (FL)	Roth	Vucanovich
Molinari	Royce	Walker
Montgomery	Salmon	Walsh
Moorhead	Sanford	Wamp
Myers	Saxton	Watts (OK)
Myrick	Scarborough	Weldon (FL)
Nethercutt	Schaefer	Weldon (PA)
Neumann	Seastrand	Weller
Ney	Sensenbrenner	White
Norwood	Shadegg	Whitfield
Nussle	Shaw	Wicker
Oxley	Shays	Wolf
Packard	Shuster	Young (AK)
Parker	Sisisky	Young (FL)
Paxon	Skeen	Zeliff
Peterson (MN)	Smith (MI)	Zimmer
Petri	Smith (NJ)	
Pickett	Smith (TX)	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Goodling Jacobs

NOT VOTING—15

Bateman	Gejdenson	Lincoln
Brown (FL)	Gibbons	McDade
Calvert	Harman	Schiff
Deutsch	Hastings (FL)	Stenholm
English	Hayes	Torricelli

□ 1315

Messrs. SAXTON, ROEMER, HORN, and HOSTETTLER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1315

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WALKER).

Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ARCHER, THOMAS, BLILEY, BILIRAKIS, GOODLING, FAWELL, HYDE, MCCOLLUM, HASTERT, GIBBONS, STARK, DINGELL, WAXMAN, CLAY, CONYERS, and BONIOR.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 3540, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 445 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3540.

□ 1316

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3540) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, with Mr. HANSEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, June 5, 1996, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 97, line 8.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, June 6, 1996, no amendments to the bill are in order except the following amendments, if offered by the member specified or a designee: amendments Nos. 54, 58, and 76 by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]; amendment No. 10 by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK]; amendment No. 69 by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER]; and amendment No. 75 by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

Debate on each amendment and all amendments thereto will be limited to 20 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, except that amendments Nos. 54 and 10 shall each be debatable for 45 minutes.

Consideration of these amendments shall proceed without intervening motion except one motion to rise if offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

AMENDMENT NO. 58 OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 58 offered by Mr. OBEY: On page 97, after line 5, insert:

"SEC. 573. None of the funds made available under the heading 'Foreign Military Financing Program' may be made available for any country when it is made known to the President that the government of such country has not agreed to the Department of Defense conducting during the current fiscal year nonreimbursable audits of private firms whose contracts are made directly with foreign government and are financed with funds made available under this heading (as well as subcontractors thereunder) as requested by the Defense Security Assistance Agency."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 10 minutes in support of the

amendment, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] will be recognized for 10 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment restores through a limitation a requirement that foreign countries agree to an outside audit as a condition of receiving FMF grants from the United States. It was included in the foreign operations bill some time ago as a result of several rather notable bribery cases involving U.S. funds and foreign officials.

It is my understanding that the chairman is prepared to accept this amendment because it is drafted as a limitation. Its effect is slightly different than current law. I can assure the chairman I have no intention to change current law, and would work with him in conference to restore the language of current law in the appropriate place in the bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 76 OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 76 offered by Mr. OBEY: On page 97, after line 5, insert:

"SEC. 573. Not more than 100,000,000 of the funds made available under the heading 'Foreign Military Financing Program' may be made available for use in financing the procurement of defense articles, defense services, or design and construction services that are not sold by the United States Government under the Arms Export Control Act to countries other than Israel and Egypt."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 10 minutes in support of the amendment, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] will be recognized for 10 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

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

Mr. Chairman, again, this amendment restores language, again through the device of a limitation which has been carried in the foreign operations bill for several years. It limits to \$100 million the amount that can be spent for direct commercial contracts, except for Egypt and Israel. Its effect is to limit the extent to which countries can contract on their own for goods and services and thereby escape the oversight requirements of the Export Control Act.

Mr. Chairman, it is again an anti-fraud safeguard. I attempted during debate on the bill last week to restore this language in identical form in the appropriate place in the bill, but the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] made a point of order against the amendment because it was legislative in nature. Because I feel so strongly about the need to include this provision in the legislation, I am now offering it in the form of a limitation.

Again, because of the requirement to do so in this form, its effect is slightly different than the current law, but it is my understanding that the chairman will accept the amendment. I can assure him I have no intention of changing current law, and will work with him to bring it into compliance as we meet in conference.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do intend to accept the amendment, but before the vote, I had agreed with the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] that we would enter into a colloquy. She has a committee hearing that she has to attend to, and I agreed to let her come in at this point to have a colloquy.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield for just a second before doing that, I also have an agreement to yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] on the remainder of my time.

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

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I simply rise to read into the RECORD a letter that I received from the Turkish Ambassador early this week:

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Yesterday's House action in adopting two anti-Turkey amendments to the FY 1997 foreign aid bill is not fitting for U.S.-Turkish relations. I cannot overemphasize the importance of these issues in Turkey. It was inevitable that House passage of these amendments would provoke a strong reaction from the Turkish people, who question anew the benefits of our five decades of alliance with the United States and self-sacrificing support for U.S. policy.

The initial step we have taken in response is to inform the U.S. Government that Turkey declines U.S. economic assistance. The basis of our friendship with the United States has never been foreign aid, even in years past when the amounts were much greater. Rather, our friendship has been based on shared interests, interests which are gravely jeopardized by yesterday's developments.

Nevertheless, I do want to recognize that many Members stood up for strong U.S.-Turkish friendship. I want to express my appreciation to you for your leadership against these pernicious amendments. I hope you will continue to work to ensure that these provisions are not enacted into law, and offer you my total cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, I read that into the RECORD just to emphasize one more time what I consider to be the grave consequences that resulted from what I considered to be unwise action.

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

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman makes an excellent point that many times we get wrapped up in debate on the floor of this House and we do not recognize what an audience worldwide we have. Last week the House sent a strong message to Turkey about something that took place decades ago and yet we do not chastise or demand certain apologies from other countries who have committed atrocities, even in later years.

I agree with the gentleman from Texas about his concern. I have the same letter from the ambassador, and I think that the Congress made a mistake in the language that we inserted in the bill. I hope that it will not cause any injury to the fact that Turkey is a tremendous ally of ours in any NATO endeavor, and I hope that this Congress will not forget that during the Persian Gulf war and during other wars, Turkey has always been there, and that we have bases that we are utilizing in Turkey that are strategically important to our national defense and to the defense of other allies of ours throughout the world.

So I think we made a mistake. But the debate was heard, and it is a lesson to all of us that what we say here is very important.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, that is right.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, what we say on the floor of this House is taken very seriously by countries all over the world, and I hope that some day we will be able to convey our appreciation to the Turks for the contributions that they have made in the past.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Alabama very much, and I would simply remind him that if the Turks wanted to today, they could open the spigot on the Iraqi pipeline and bust the embargo, just as one example.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Alabama regarding human rights in Ethiopia, as the House continues to consider this foreign aid bill.

Let me thank the chairman, first of all, for the work that he has done with my office as we have worked on this, even last year, as the gentleman may recall. I think it is very important that we move forward on this issue.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to enter into a colloquy with the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished

chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs for participating, as I said, in this colloquy, especially in light of the limited time that we have remaining to debate this important legislation.

There are numerous reports that the Ethiopian Government is harassing and unfairly detaining journalists, academicians, opposition party officials and other citizens. These events raise questions about freedom of speech, freedom of the press and the independence of the judiciary within Ethiopia.

I know that we have come a long way, Mr. Chairman, but I would ask the question, does the gentleman think that the United States Government should do more to support human rights in Ethiopia as we move this foreign operations bill forward?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, yes. I encourage the State Department, as a matter of fact, to carefully assess the situation in the country and use its influence with the Ethiopian Government to encourage them to improve human rights. I would note that the current government in Ethiopia is light years ahead of the former regime in terms of human rights.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman recalls, I successfully offered an amendment to the 1996 foreign operations appropriations bill which requires the State Department to closely monitor human rights progress in Ethiopia as it monitors funds for Ethiopia. We have been in dialog with the State Department, I have had a briefing, and that is why I rise again today. We realize that all is not well, even though possible progress may have been made.

The gentleman supported my amendment. As the State Department obligates the funds for Ethiopia in fiscal year 1997, I think that it is still critically important that the department continue to carefully monitor the country's human rights progress. Some progress has occurred but much remains to be done.

I strongly believe that Congress should be on record in the debate on H.R. 3540, the foreign operations appropriations bill for fiscal year 1997, as encouraging the State Department to continue this monitoring of Ethiopia. Does the gentleman from Alabama agree?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, yes, I do agree. I believe that it is our role as Members of Congress not to dictate foreign policy to the executive branch but to express strong messages of concern to the State Department on human rights violations by countries who receive U.S. foreign assistance.

□ 1330

I am pleased that we have had this opportunity to discuss this important issue.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for

his kindness in allowing me to again bring this very important issue to the Congress. I appreciate his interest and concern about this matter. The numerous citizens in Houston and around the country who trace their ancestry to Ethiopia and all Americans who believe in democracy and human rights appreciate as well the opportunity to focus the Nation's attention on this issue.

I do believe with the ability of the State Department to continue to monitor these human rights violations that we will find ourselves better placed to assist the Ethiopian people and those of Ethiopian ancestry.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the Obey amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ZIMMER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ZIMMER: Page 97, after line 5, insert the following:

PROHIBITION ON DEVELOPMENT OF SHOPPING CENTER NEAR THE FORMER AUSCHWITZ CONCENTRATION CAMP

SEC. 573. It is the sense of the Congress that the Government of Poland should prohibit development of a shopping center within the 500-yard protective zone surrounding the former Auschwitz concentration camp in the town of Oswiecim, Poland.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

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

The amendment I am offering is very straightforward. I would put the Congress of the United States on record opposing commercial development within the internationally recognized protective zone surrounding Auschwitz, the former Nazi death camp in Poland. I know that a point of order is being reserved because of technical rules rather than substance by the chairman of the subcommittee, but I strongly believe that the voice of Congress should be heard on this matter. The foreign operations appropriations bill before us is an appropriate vehicle given the nearly \$70 million in assistance that we give to Poland.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very timely amendment. Last year, a developer put into motion plans to construct a shopping mall immediately opposite the Auschwitz main gate and within a 500-yard protective zone that surrounds Auschwitz. The proposed mall included

retail stores, a supermarket, a fast food stand, and a large parking lot.

In March, the Polish Government officially halted the project after worldwide criticism denouncing it as desecration of the world's largest Holocaust site. The Government at the time said its decision was final. Yet just last week, wire services reported that the project developer had resumed construction in defiance of the Government's order and continued work for 2 days before construction was again suspended.

Mr. Chairman, Auschwitz is a place of profound significance. It is a haunting reminder of the depravity and corruption that humanity at its worst is capable of. That reminder is the most powerful protection we have against such horrors occurring again.

Auschwitz is also a precious memorial to the lives of 1½ million people, mainly Jews, whose lives were so horribly sacrificed to that depravity and that corruption.

The idea of stores, a supermarket, and fast food stands being built within the protective boundaries of Auschwitz assaults both intellect and sensibility. It is an insult to those who died in the Holocaust. It is an insult to those who survived the Holocaust, and it is an insult to all of us the world over who believe that the significance of Auschwitz must never be distorted or lost.

The Government of Poland has stated emphatically that it will not allow such commercial development to go forward. I applaud that promise and the efforts the Government has made to keep it. I hope the entire Congress will go on record joining this opposition to what is nothing less than an act of sacrilege.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, first let me commend the gentleman for bringing this amendment to the floor today. I think it is of great importance and my personal thanks to him for doing so.

Mr. Chairman, I have often been amazed during my time in the Congress by some of the incredible events that occur from time to time that are brought to our attention. I have seldom been appalled. Today I am appalled, appalled at the proposal of a developer in Poland to build a commercial development right next to Auschwitz death camp. Imagine if you will for just a moment a strip mall built at a place, for example, inside Arlington Cemetery, just about the same thing. I cannot believe that you can honor the millions of Catholics and Gypsies and Jews slaughtered by the Nazis with this kind of development.

This is desecration and, frankly, I think it pretty sick.

I call on the Polish Government to honor its commitment to disallow this project, and I call on the United States Government to use its full authority to assist the Polish Government in this endeavor.

Once again, I want to commend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] for bringing this to the floor today.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, further reserving my point of order, I would also like to thank the gentleman for bringing this issue to the attention of this Congress. Many Americans and a lot of Members of this House share the concerns that the gentleman has expressed. However, since the amendment is legislative in nature and should be addressed by the Committee on International Relations, I hope he brings this issue to the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the chairman of the authorizing committee.

Since the amendment is legislative, I would hope the gentleman would withdraw his proposal. If this issue has not been resolved to the gentleman's satisfaction or at least fully considered by the appropriate committee of the House by the time of conference with the Senate, I pledged to the gentleman that I will do my best to include language in the statement of the managers similar to his amendment. But once again, I thank him for bringing his amendment to the attention of the House and his willingness to hopefully withdraw the amendment.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, based on those assurances, I will withdraw the amendment. Before doing so, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL] who has introduced freestanding legislation on this subject some months ago.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me the time.

I just wanted to comment on this. I have, as the gentleman says, submitted a resolution talking about the events outside of the Auschwitz death camp. I want to make just a couple of very brief points. That is, I think we all agree that it is totally inappropriate to think about any kind of mall or commercial development at actually such a place that should almost be sacred ground with so many people murdered and martyred there.

I think it is an absolute outrage that this mall would even have been contemplated being built. It violates agreements that the Polish Government has made internationally, stating that within a certain amount of feet or meters from the Auschwitz death camp that nothing like this could happen. It is absolutely an outrage that one would even consider. And when you consider that the town is 7 kilometers away, it is even more insulting to think that a mall could not have been built in the town or near the town but would be built at the entrance, to the infamous entrance to the death camp where those horrible words, those lies, *Arbeit Macht Frei*, work makes you free, were put by the camp.

So many of us have been trying for many, many months to point out this

outrage and to get the assurance from the Government of Poland that this would not continue. I must say the Government of Poland, to its credit, has shown that it does not want the mall to be built, has attempted to give me assurances that it will not be built. And I would hold them to their word. I think it is very, very important that a government that makes these international agreements adheres to them.

I just want to say to my colleague from New Jersey and to others who have expressed similar concerns and outrage with the thought of this happening that I intend to pursue my resolution which is cosponsored by the other gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON]. We will pursue it in the Committee on International Relations. We think it is appropriate that Congress goes on record as opposing it.

I do, again, want to say that I am happy that we have been getting positive responses from the new leaders of Poland and from the Polish Government who have told us that this will not be built. With those assurances and the fact that it is bipartisan and we are going to work to pass my resolution, I welcome the help and support of the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to take the opportunity to commend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] for his pending amendment, which would express the sense of Congress that the Government of Poland ensure that construction never takes place at the site of the infamous Auschwitz concentration camp.

Although we have received commitments from the Polish Government that they will not permit development at Auschwitz, periodically there are problems with local developers. Accordingly, the Polish authorities are to be commended for their commitment to the sanctity of Auschwitz and the memories of the millions of innocent men, women, and children who crossed its portals.

However, as our concern is still appropriately registered on this sensitive matter, I am pleased to cosponsor this amendment with Mr. ZIMMER. Under leave that will be obtained I would request that the statement issued last week by the Polish Government be made a part of the RECORD.

EMBASSY OF THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND,
Washington, DC, June 5, 1996.

As regards the latest Reuter release on the alleged resumption of the construction of a shopping center near the state Museum of Auschwitz-Birkenau, please be informed of the following—as received from official sources in Warsaw:

1. No construction work has been resumed.
2. There is no change in the clear position of the Government of Poland, as well as of the local authorities concerning the decision to halt the construction made on March 22.
3. The press spokesperson of the Government called the announced intention of the developer to resume the project "the investor's lawlessness". Moreover, the Chief of the Office of the Council of Ministers while confirming the previously undertaken decision of the Government, emphasized its firmness to execute the decision by administrative measures.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY: On page 97, after line 5, insert:

"SEC. 573. None of the funds appropriated under the heading 'International Military Education and Training' may be made available for Cambodia and Thailand."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 22½ minutes and a Member in opposition will be recognized for 22½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] who has some comments he wants to make about an amendment that was left out of the agreement.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding his time to me.

I will not offer this amendment. I am precluded from offering this amendment due to the UC that was arrived at last week, but I think that this was a noncontroversial amendment that both Republicans and Democrats would have agreed to. We had it in the June 5 RECORD last week, amendment number, it was actually H.R. 3540, amendment No. 78, page 97. This amendment dealt with the ongoing conflict between the Russians and the Chechens.

Certainly on last year's foreign operations bill, we got up and we spoke about the need to bring an end to this war that has killed probably over 30,000 Chechens and maybe close to 5,000 Russians. This ongoing war threatens not only the human rights situation in Russia. It threatens their economic stability, when they are transferring so much money that we are loaning through the IMF, trying to bring their economy back to stability and back to growth, when they are now taking this money to fight a war and kill Chechens day after day in a brutal and inhuman manner.

We attached some successful legislation last year to the foreign operations bill that cut \$5 million out of aid to Russia, saying we must bring an end to this war. And this is a signal from the American people and the U.S. Congress that we want to see it end now. No longer will this war go on. We are not going to subsidize this war.

I think it was successful. Now they have entered into successful negotiations where they have exchanged protocols over the weekend, where they have agreed on exchange of prisoners. They have agreed on a cease-fire. This resolution simply says they have broken half a dozen cease-fire agreements already, stick to this one.

The Congress applauds you. Republicans and Democrats applaud Mr. Yandarbiyev and Mr. Yeltsin for this agreement. Stick to it and stick to it after the June 16 election in Russia. I know the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] has been over to Chechnya and seen this conflict and this tragedy go on and on and on, when the Russians first engaged the Chechens and thought they could overrun this country in a period of a couple days.

Well, 18, 19, 20 months later we still see this brutality going on. So this resolution simply says, keep up the good work on diplomatic negotiations. Please abide by the two protocol agreements signed over the weekend. Please try to come to some kind of resolution on the territorial status of Chechnya and after the elections continue this good will and this diplomacy.

I would hope that in conference that the distinguished chairman would continue to bring this kind of issue before the State Department and make this a priority. I hope that in some way with this dialog and hopefully with the colloquy and Members with like interests, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and others, that we can keep this issue as a vital part of foreign policy between the United States and the Russian people.

□ 1345

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

Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER], let me say that I am glad that he brought this to the attention of the House. It is rather amazing to me how we can pick on a little country like Indonesia and at the same time be sending millions of dollars to Russia and letting them slaughter 30,000 people in Chechnya and not even mentioning it in this bill.

So I think that the gentleman is absolutely correct in bringing this issue to the attention of the Congress, and we will certainly address this issue at some point in conference.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] for a colloquy.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to bring to the attention of the body there is a man named Robert Hussein who was converted to Christianity in Kuwait. As a result of his conversion to Christianity on May 29, a court in Kuwait has found him guilty, and the punishment is potential death. And the endangered species in this world today that we talk about so much are Christians. Christians are being persecuted around the world more today than any other time in this century, and I just wanted to urge the gentleman from Alabama if he would follow this because, if he recalls, and I know he does,

during the 1980's we in a bipartisan way, Republicans and Democrats, stood firm with those of the Jewish faith who were persecuted in Russia. In fact, I am concerned that the persecution will begin again after this election. They are basically privatizing anti-Semitism in Russia.

So it is important for us to rally to the defense of those who are being persecuted, and because of so many Christians being persecuted in the Middle East and other places, and Robert Hussein, who has been potentially sentenced to death, and the fact that the United States Government sent hundreds of thousands of troops in defense of Kuwait and 300 Americans died, if the gentleman from Alabama would be sympathetic in following this issue, particularly later this year, but next year if this does not change, or if anything should happen to Mr. Hussein.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, let me say that I just found out about this atrocity that is evidently going to take place, or possible could take place in Kuwait, and I cannot fathom any government in any land condoning the execution of an individual for switching religions, especially to Christianity. And for me to hear this is most appalling.

I should remind the Kuwait Government, just as we reminded the Turkish Government, erroneously so I think, about something that took place. A great majority of the people that came to defend Kuwait, that granted them the sovereignty over their nation, were Christian people. It is an insult, in addition to being absolutely morally wrong, it is an insult to the American people to have that government at this point begin to condemn to death people who choose a certain religion.

So I appreciate very much the gentleman bringing the matter to the attention of the floor. I hope that some Kuwaiti representatives are listening somewhere, and I hope that they hear our message, that this is not something that we in the United States can or should tolerate.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] for that very strong statement.

Mr. Chairman, on May 29, 1996, a judge in the Kuwaiti family court declared Robert Hussein to be an apostate. The judge, Amar Al-Sabiti, also gave a written ruling stating that Mr. Hussein's wife should be divorced from him and his possessions should be distributed among his heirs and he could be killed. "The Imam [ruler] should kill him without a chance to repent."

Hussein Qambar Ali, a convert from Islam to Christianity, is in the midst of a national court case. This decision by the court sets a precedent as to whether or not the Kuwaiti Constitution will be interpreted under Islamic Sharia law. This would mean that the constitutional religious freedom guarantees would be void and a convert—or apostate—could be killed with impunity.

Hussein has changed his name to Robert Hussein. Robert got into this situation through a court case over the custody of his children.

His estranged wife, a Muslim, will not allow him to see his children despite his winning custody of them in court. Robert returned to court to have the decision enforced, and everything has been in an uproar as Hussein publicly confessed his conversion to Christianity.

Several Muslim lawyers have filed cases against Hussein wanting him to be charged with apostasy. Members of Parliament have called for his death. Hussein has had to live in hiding, has lost his family business due to his family not allowing him to be part of it as he is no longer a Muslim. The Sharia family court is looking at the case to see if it has jurisdiction or if this is a civil matter because it deals with Hussein's civil rights: child custody, inheritance, and most importantly, freedom of religion.

The United States still has troops in Kuwait. American troops died while fighting to protect Kuwaiti from Iraq and Saddam Hussein.

We should urge the Kuwaiti Government to make a public statement supporting Hussein's constitutional rights and his freedom of religion and guaranteeing his protection from death threats from those who want to kill him. Also, the Kuwaiti Government should ensure that their judicial process has integrity, both in the legal representation Hussein should have, which he does not have, and in showing the legitimacy of Kuwait's Constitution—Will it stand?

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for bringing to the floor's attention this violation of human rights. Any time we find intolerance with regard to religion is something the entire Congress should stand up and fight against, and for that reason I commend the gentleman for his efforts and want to join with him in expressing abhorrence of what Kuwait has done with regard to this case.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I once again rise reluctantly in opposition to the amendment that the gentleman from Wisconsin would offer, because I deeply respect his vast knowledge of world affairs.

However, while I hold my friend's foreign policy views in high regard, I must tell him that I do not think that this amendment will achieve his objective. It will simply undermine, I think, our relationship with a key friend in South Asia.

The United States has an extensive security relationship with the Government of Thailand. Our military conducts numerous joint exercise programs with the Thai military, including frequent port visits by the United States Navy. The United States also actively collaborates with the Thai military.

In addition, the prepositioning of munitions and other military equipment improves the readiness and logistical reach of United States forces in this region.

Thailand's cooperation and reconnaissance support for our counterdrug effort is essential to the United States ability to cut drug trafficking in Asia.

And finally, Thailand is equally essential to the success of the Joint Task Force for Full POW-MIA Accounting and its effort to answer the remaining questions about Americans missing in action.

IMET training itself is invaluable for the Thai military. In my opinion, it improves professional conduct and capabilities of the Thai military while training them to improve, at the same time, their human rights performances.

So I hope that the gentleman will see my view on this. Recognizing how I respect him, I will also assure the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] that I will work closely with the gentleman to strengthen language to emphasize the message he is trying to give and that I will work with him to put strong language in the bill in conference.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me first of all take just a moment to comment on the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] with respect to Kuwait. I am certainly not familiar with the incident to which he referred, but let me say that, as one Member of Congress, I have to say that I have never in my life found a government or a royal family as arrogant or as condescending as the Kuwaiti Government and royal family, and I have never seen a government more quick to pursue its own personal and political interest above the interests of its own people more than the Kuwaiti Government.

I will never forget going to Kuwait City after Kuwait had been liberated by NATO and United States forces, talking to a good many Wisconsin GI's who were in Kuwait who told me that, when the first United States aid came into Kuwait City, that we had Kuwaiti officials saying to them, "Yes, do send it into this neighborhood; no, don't send the aid into that neighborhood," because the latter neighborhood had been populated by people who were not political supporters of the royal family. So they were perfectly willing to see loyal Kuwaiti citizens denied assistance after that war simply because of their political beliefs.

So I would certainly join with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] in expressing the desire to do whatever can be done from the outside to affect the conduct of that government, which I found to be incredibly arrogant and insufferable through the years that I have had any experience dealing with them.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] before I make my statement on the amendment that is before us, after which I will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a colloquy with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

Notice has been given of a hearing before our subcommittee chaired by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] on which we all serve, and this concerns Kuwaiti business practices,

this hearing. I believe it is in about 2 weeks, and I would be curious to know, and I would encourage, that perhaps we might expand that hearing on this business practices to include this matter that the gentleman brought before the House.

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

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

Mr. WOLF. That would be wonderful because I am very concerned about the man's life. He has been threatened and sentenced to actually death, so I think it would be good if the gentleman and Mr. CALLAHAN would do that.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, it is, of course, up to the gentleman from Alabama, but the hearing is scheduled for June 19; that is next week.

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

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no reservation whatsoever about including this subject matter in the hearing that we have scheduled. The hearing we have scheduled is to discuss some of what I think are unfair business practices by the Government of Kuwait. But we can include human rights as well, and certainly this is a gross human rights violation, and I think that we should, and I will, after consultation with the gentleman, be happy to include in our hearing or part of our hearing a discussion of this execution that is pending there.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] for doing that, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], I thank him for bringing that to our attention.

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

Mr. Chairman, having dispensed with all of that, let me now explain what it is that has motivated me to bring this proposal before the body.

Mr. Chairman, I will acknowledge that choosing the route of limiting IMET funds in order to get at this problem is a blunt instrument. The problem is that there are no other instruments available at this point. We have a very serious problem in that we are concerned about continuing timber sales by the Khmer Rouge, sales which are occurring with the complicity both of the Cambodian Government and the Thai military.

Last year this committee heard allegations that both the Cambodian and Thai military were cooperating in facilitating the sale of tropical timber from areas controlled by the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia. As a result, last year's bill contained language which is repeated in this year's bill which requires the President to terminate assistance to any country organization that he determines is cooperating tactically or strategically with the Khmer Rouge and military operations

or which is not taking steps to prevent a pattern or practice of commercial relations between its members and the Khmer Rouge.

Now, for those of my colleagues who have forgotten, the Khmer Rouge are those people who are responsible for the slaughter, the wholesale slaughter, of millions of innocent people because they were even more fanatic than the Red Guards under Mao Tse-tung in China, and they just wiped out millions and millions of people.

Mr. Chairman, the problem with the language that was contained in the bill last year is that it was worded in a way as to be worthless because it does not fit the facts of what is going on. In fact, the Thai military is allowing private Thai companies to develop commercial relations with the Khmer Rouge to buy their timber and then allow its transport through their territory. So the pattern of commercial relations takes place between the companies themselves and the Khmer Rouge, not the military in the Khmer Rouge; and therefore the language of the bill last year was circumvented.

I am told that that means that the Khmer Rouge are, through this device, through this ruse, are obtaining \$10 million or \$20 million a month. Now, I do not think Americans want to see the Khmer Rouge get a dime, and I certainly do not think they want us to have an aid relationship with a country, with a government, which is facilitating the delivery of that kind of assistance to some of the most blood thirsty people in the history of the planet.

And so I offer this language because it was the only way that we could reach either of the governments in power.

I would say that the Prince of Cambodia himself was recently quoted in the press as saying, quote, "Thai traders in the Khmer Rouge would surely find a way to make a deal to export felled logs from its controlled area so the legitimate Cambodian Government would lose income." So I guess what he is saying is "If you can't beat them, join them." It seems to me that we have got to find a way to shut this down, and that is why I suggested this amendment.

But I know the administration has great concerns about going after IMET; in this case for other reasons. And so what I would like to do is to withdraw the amendment, with the understanding that the subcommittee chairman would help in conference so that we can try to strengthen the language which is in the existing bill so that we do not, to the greatest extent possible—we end the fact that government to which we are providing aid seems to be cooperating in a device by which money is allowed to flow to the hands of some of the bloodiest fools in the history of this world.

□ 1400

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEREUTER. I thank the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly share the gentleman's concern about the activity that is going on and the complicity, at least among commercial interests there, perhaps involving the governments as well. I do appreciate the gentleman's statement that the IMET tool is a blunt instrument and probably not the way to proceed. I think we have perhaps a more effective way to pressure the parties concerned, and that might be through the international community's massive financial support for the Government of Cambodia.

There is an op-ed piece in today's Washington Post on this very subject. In fact, this gentleman brought a resolution to the floor which was passed last March expressing the concern of what is happening in Cambodia.

What I think we might focus on is that July 11 and 12 donors meeting, a donors conference on Cambodia. I think that offers the international community a golden opportunity.

We could call on the United States to take the lead at this meeting to impress upon the leaders in Phnom Penh who clearly play a part in this continuing problem of logging the KR-controlled territory. We could call on them for the recognition that there is a need for sustainable logging practices and transparency in government contacting that I think could help resolve the KR's logging issue, and therefore avoid problems with Thailand and with the Government of Cambodia.

So I offer that suggestion which I think all of us should pursue, and advance it here for the administration to consider making it a priority at that July 11 and 12 meeting.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments. Let me simply say, I think we need to understand that in addition to everything else I have said, in the meantime the Khmer Rouge are continuing to plant new land mines every blessed day they can. That further displaces innocent Cambodians, and it just seems to me that the worldwide community has an obligation to respond to this problem.

I would say that, with the concurrence of the subcommittee chairman, I will withdraw this amendment with the understanding that if we cannot get some language that really does the trick this year, and if we cannot get other action coming in other ways as the gentleman from Nebraska suggested, then blunt instrument or no, it will leave me with no alternative but to go after IMET next year and I intend to do it with a vengeance.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield before withdrawing his amendment, let me just say that I share the goal of the gentleman from Wisconsin. I think that we cannot tolerate the type of activity for which he is concerned. However, I do not think that this is the way to do it.

I appreciate very much the gentleman's position. I do pledge to work with him to ensure that our amplified message is given to those governments, that we are not going to tolerate this and that indeed, if they do not change or unless they show some indication of nonsupport, that we are very seriously going to consider next year the possibility of reducing the IMET Program there. But I appreciate very much the gentleman withdrawing the amendment.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the chairman. As I say, I recognize that IMET is a blunt instrument to use, so it may be the wrong way to proceed. We will now have a year to find out, and if we do not get some real action that affects things in real ways on the ground, we will have no choice but to go back at it next year.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3540 allows continued International Military and Education Training [IMET] for Thailand and Cambodia. The Obey amendment would prohibit IMET for these countries. Passage of the Obey amendment will not save the taxpayers one dime, but would merely force the administration to move the IMET funds to some other countries.

This Member considers such a prohibition unwarranted and unwise. Here is why.

Thailand is a long-time treaty ally with a democratic form of government, located along key strategic international waterways. American forces conduct more than 40 joint exercises with Thailand each year—more than any other country in Asia. These exercises are important to the readiness and training of American, as well as Thai, forces in Asia. Moreover, Thailand provides the Seventh Fleet with easy access to its military facilities when needed, most recently during Desert Shield and Desert Storm. Particularly in light of the closure of our basis in the Philippines, use of Thai facilities allows us to maintain our forward deployed presence in the crucial Southeast Asia/Indochina region.

The close military-to-military ties we enjoy with Thailand are fostered by the fact that so many military leaders in Thailand have been trained in the United States through the IMET program. Not only does this American training provide us access to key Thai leaders, but it also engenders a natural preference for U.S. military hardware and supplies. The sale of defense equipment to Thailand allows important interoperability with U.S. forces in the region and creates high-paying American jobs in the important manufacturing sector. Just recently McDonnell Douglas won a \$600 million contract for fighter aircraft to Thailand.

THAI-KR COOPERATION

The basis for today's Obey amendment is evidence of continued commercial cooperation between some Thai companies and the genocidal Khmer Rouge forces in neighboring Cambodia. This Member's staff has been fully briefed on this issue, and I know it would be naive to suggest that no such cooperation exists, particularly in the logging industry. Despite this commercial cooperation, however, there remains some question about the extent of Thai Government involvement and complicity in this trade.

In this Member's view, the use of IMET funding, both for Thailand and Cambodia, as

a stick against commercial cooperation with the KR is misguided. A much more effective way to pressure the parties concerned is through the international community's massive financial support for the Government of Cambodia.

The upcoming July 11–12 Donors' Conference on Cambodia offers the international community a golden opportunity. This Member calls on the United States to take the lead at this meeting to impress upon the leaders in Phnom Penh—who clearly play a major part in the continued problem of logging in KR-controlled territory—of the need for sustainable logging practices and transparency in government contracting which would contribute much to resolving the KR logging issue. The international community still provides 40 percent of the national budget of Cambodia and should use this leverage to promote more responsible policies on Cambodia's leaders.

CAMBODIA HUMAN RIGHTS

This Member also believes we should use the Donors' Conference to improve human rights and democracy in Cambodia. On March 26, 1996, this body passed House Resolution 345, which this Member introduced, which expresses serious concern about deteriorating human rights conditions in Cambodia. This Member remains concerned about government repression in Cambodia, particularly in light of the recent murder of an outspoken Cambodian journalist. We should not, however, use IMET as a club against Phnom Penh. Instead we should insist that the IMET courses offered to Cambodia contribute to human rights training for Cambodia's military and use the July Donor's Conference to pressure the Cambodian Government for a return to openness and respect for dissent.

This Member urges his colleagues to vote "no" on the Obey amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SOUDER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 69 offered by Mr. SOUDER: Page 97, after line 5, insert the following:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO MEXICO

SEC. 573. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be obligated or expended for the Government of Mexico, except if it is made known to the Federal entity or official to which funds are appropriated under this Act that—

(1) the Government of Mexico is taking actions to reduce the amount of illegal drugs entering the United States from Mexico; and

(2) the Government of Mexico—

(A) is taking effective actions to apply vigorously all law enforcement resources to investigate, track, capture, incarcerate, and prosecute individuals controlling, supervising, or managing international narcotics cartels or other similar entities and the accomplices of such individuals, individuals responsible for, or otherwise involved in, corruption, and individuals involved in money-laundering;

(B) is pursuing international anti-drug trafficking initiatives;

(C) is cooperating fully with international efforts at narcotics interdiction; and

(D) is cooperating fully with requests by the United States for assistance in investigations of money-laundering violations and is making progress toward implementation of effective laws to prohibit money-laundering.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER] is recognized for 10 minutes in support of his amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will prohibit any funds available in this bill from going to Mexico unless the agency receiving the funds certifies that Mexico has taken specific antinarcotics actions.

I want to thank the cosponsors of this bill: Chairman BILL ZELIFF of New Hampshire, who has been a leader in our Congress' effort to reduce drug abuse, cosponsored this last year with me; also International Relations Committee Chairman GILMAN as a cosponsor. Other original cosponsors include my friend from Florida, Mr. MICA, who has been active on the subcommittee; the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. BLUTE; the gentleman from Washington, Mr. METCALF; the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. MCINTOSH; the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. FUNDERBURK; the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. SHADEGG; the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. COBURN; and the gentlewoman from California, Mrs. SEASTRAND.

The problem is real simple. The State Department's 1996 Narcotics Control Strategy concluded that no country in the world poses a more immediate narcotics threat to America than Mexico. Mexican drug lords now supply more than 70 percent of the cocaine sold and 80 percent of the marijuana imported into the United States, as well as growing quantities of heroin and methamphetamines. Drug seizures in Mexico lagged for most of 1995, and the final seizure total remained flat and well below the record level. They are making progress but they need to make more.

At the same time the DEA administrator, Mr. Constantine, and the State Department have recently expressed serious concern that Mexico has, "become the money laundering haven of choice for initial placement of U.S. drug cash into the world's financial system." Drug dealers are literally packing 18-wheel trucks full of cash and driving them to Mexico for laundering. Up to 90 percent of drug cartel profits move through Mexico.

I was very privileged to go with the CODEL from this Congress to Mexico, as well as Panama, Colombia, Peru, and Bolivia, and we met with President Zedillo as well as the foreign minister and members of the House and Senate of Mexico. I was convinced, as were the others with us, that President Zedillo and the leadership of Mexico has a strong commitment to trying to reduce the narcotics flow to America.

I also understand their point that it is our demand that is propelling much of the growth of coca leaves around the country, the distribution, and what is coming into our country. We do have to work on our internal problems but they also must work on the exporting of drugs into America.

I also understand the difficulty of patrolling the long borders we have with Mexico, particularly as we open trade. That is all true. Few issues are as explosive as the immigration issue and the NAFTA issue as well as the drug issue, the support of the peso and the environmental questions along the borders.

If our two great nations are to work together, we have to have a strong continued commitment from the Government of Mexico not just to talk but to crack down on the drug lords.

This particular amendment passed last year 411-0 when we asked for a rollcall vote. It is the actions that must be changed and stiffened in the future. I want to continue to point out that I am impressed with the sincerity of the Government of Mexico and I am particularly impressed with their commitments, but we need to see additional and continued progress on this issue.

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

Mr. SOUDER. I yield to the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Souder amendment and commend the gentleman from Indiana for this initiative.

Illicit drugs are an international threat to all countries: corruption, addiction, and lawlessness exact an enormous price. Because drug cartels have extraordinary resources, no country can fight this problem alone. Producer countries, transit countries, and consumer countries all share in the costs of the drug scourge and, therefore, must all share the responsibility for solving the problem.

One very conservative estimate places the annual cost of drug abuse to U.S. society at \$67 billion—in terms of crime, lost productivity, and health care. Other estimates run as high as \$500 billion. Another tangible impact is on U.S. youth. Data suggest that if cocaine abuse were listed on death certificates, it would constitute the leading cause of death of people 14 to 44 years of age in New York City.

Experience proves that concerted efforts that attack each link in the drug chain can produce dramatic results. For example, new levels of cooperation have led to significant strides against the Cali cartel kingpins. With a vigorous program that addressed each of the pillars—eradication, interdiction, enforcement, education, and treatment—

cocaine use in the United States dropped 80 percent in that period, from 5.8 million users down to 1.3 million.

According to the United States Drug Enforcement Agency, drug trafficking groups in Mexico have become the primary suppliers of drugs abused in the United States. Up to 70 percent of the cocaine available in the United States transits Mexico; 50 percent of marijuana is produced in Mexico; Mexican traffickers are now the largest suppliers of methamphetamine sold in the United States; and Mexican heroin is the predominant form of that product found in the Western United States.

Several years ago, Mexican drug organizations partnered with Colombian producers to smuggle cocaine into the United States. As their expertise and operational capabilities grew, Mexican cartels began to demand 50 percent of the shipment as payment for their smuggling services; as a result, the wealth and reach of these local criminal bands grew dangerously as they gained an independent foothold in the lucrative wholesale business in the United States.

In addition to taking control of the methamphetamine trade, drug organizations in Mexico have also become major figures in the diversion of precursor chemicals that are used to produce methamphetamine. It is apparent that these Mexican cartels have used the largesse of the cocaine trade to develop the capacity to manufacture as well as transit their own product, methamphetamine, whose use in major cities in the Western and Southwestern United States is on the rise.

With the fall of the Cali cartel, their Mexican partners may be uniquely positioned to fill the void, given the proximity to the United States market, our 2,000-mile common border, and the political and economic disruptions in Mexico, both countries may suffer dramatically in the very near term.

In March, President Clinton certified Mexico as fully cooperative with United States antidrug efforts. The administration asserted that the Mexican Government had pledged a major offensive against the drug cartels and drug-related corruption and, in 1995, had intensified antinarcotics efforts, prosecuted corrupt officials, and sought to expand cooperation with the United States and other governments.

Some in Congress disagree emphatically with President Clinton's certification of Mexico's antidrug efforts, in light of infamous, well-publicized examples of corruption. They note that, although the Mexican Government may have the political will to fight illicit drugs, corruption is common enough to undermine good intentions.

All sides can agree that drug cartels have become so wealthy and powerful that they can undermine the best efforts of any government. In the United States, we fight internal corruption through strict internal inspection and integrity controls and generally well-paid, professional police forces. We also

rely on a professional, independent prosecutorial system that deters and detects corruption in law enforcement services.

Law enforcement experts note that Mexico's antidrug efforts do not have these tools at their disposal. They are hampered by weaknesses in their legal structure: the law does not provide for the use of wiretaps, confidential informants, or witness protection programs; prosecutors cannot build cases for conspiracy to break the law; and money laundering is not a criminal offense.

These experts assert that these tools are indispensable to efforts to fight organized crime in the United States and they are needed badly by Mexico's law enforcement agencies. United States cooperation, including the sharing of vital law enforcement intelligence, can be expanded further if Mexico strengthens its own antidrug units.

It should be noted that the Mexican Government has moved within the last few months to adopt some of these legislative measures to strengthen their capability to pursue and prosecute drug traffickers.

The Souder amendment is simple and straightforward. It conditions United States aid to Mexico on efforts by the Mexican Government to reduce the amount of illegal drugs entering the United States. It also expects that government to apply its own law enforcement resources and cooperate fully with us to break up the drug cartels operating in Mexico and to fight money laundering.

By passing this amendment, we do not prejudice Mexico and we do not excuse our own country from doing all that it can to fight drugs. As a matter of fact, many of my colleagues and I would like to see greater funding for antidrug cooperation in this legislation—and we will be working to achieve that objective.

Mr. Chairman, the drug cartels pose an international threat. We must work with Mexico and other friends throughout the world to meet this deadly challenge.

Once again, I commend Mr. Souder for his amendment and urge my colleagues to fully support his amendment.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA].

Mr. MICA. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana should be adopted overwhelmingly by the House of Representatives, and I commend the gentleman for his leadership on this issue. We serve on the same investigations and oversight subcommittee of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. We have looked at the lack of a national drug policy. We heard the chairman of this committee speak just a minute ago about 70 percent of the hard drugs coming into this country, we found in

our committee examination, are coming in through Mexico.

The United States has bent over backward to help Mexico and this Congress has aided Mexico with a trade agreement. I did not agree with some of the provisions of that particular trade agreement. This administration bailed out Mexico. I cannot think of a nation who has done more to help an ally, to help a partner in the Western Hemisphere than the United States or this administration or this Congress.

And what do we get in return? Seventy percent of the illegal drugs. We even went so far as to certify Mexico as compliant and we decertified Colombia, yet the onslaught of hard drugs coming through Mexico is absolutely appalling. The results should astound every Member of Congress and every American.

Look at this chart showing what has happened here since 1992 when this administration extended this helping hand. Our 12th graders, our 10th graders, our 8th graders are getting slaughtered. Cocaine is coming in record amounts, heroin is coming in, marijuana is coming in.

This amendment sends a message to Mexico that this Congress, this administration, these representatives of the people who are seeing their children slaughtered in the streets, who are seeing juvenile crime skyrocket through the ceiling are saying, "Hey, wait a minute, Mexico, we have taken it all we can and we are going to send you a message that we want this stopped."

It is a very clear message. The latest data by DAWN is absolutely startling. Cocaine-related emergencies increased 12 percent; heroin-related episodes increased 27 percent. This is for the first half of 1995. Marijuana-related episodes, 32 percent. Methamphetamines, 35 percent. Designer drugs are killing our young people and creating crime; 70 percent of the crimes in my district are committed by people who are involved in narcotics and they are coming through Mexico. This sends a message: Stop. And we mean it.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition so that I may have more time to speak.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona is in opposition?

Mr. KOLBE. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will not use the entire 10 minutes and I think this amendment is going to go by voice. But let me say about this amendment that, while I think that no one disagrees with the intent of this amendment that we should have cooperation with Mexico, that I do think that it at least

bears mentioning here on the floor what is happening, and the, I think, positive things that have happened with Mexico.

I just listened to my colleague from Florida. I could not agree with him more that what is happening in this country is terrible and what is happening with the rise of drug addiction among young people and youth using drugs, hard drugs, is a very serious problem. There is no question that we should be very concerned about it, and there is no question we should be concerned about both the source of these drugs and how they get to this country.

It is the how they get to this country, the channel, that we are talking about here today, because for the most part the hard drugs we are talking about, the cocaine, the heroin, are not produced in Mexico but they become the transit point, the place from which these are transported into the United States. As we have been more effective in south Florida in cutting off the drugs coming in from South America, we have now found that Mexico and Central America are the key places in which these drugs come in.

□ 1415

Let us not in a sense blame the messenger, blame the people who are simply there geographically at our doorstep, because of our problem we have. I think clearly Mexico has a responsibility to work with us on this, and I think they are. That is what I wanted to take this time, just to mention some of the things that have happened in Mexico under the Zedillo administration.

Not long ago, just a few months ago, the Mexican Government, at our request, arrested and expelled very promptly from Mexico to the United States so we could try the individual, Juan Garcia Abrego, the head of the Gulf cartel, one of the key people we had been trying to get apprehended and get into the United States for drug violations. That was a major step by the Mexican Government to cooperate with us.

I might say as the chairman of the United States-Mexico Interparliamentary Meeting just a few weeks ago in Mexico, I heard from Mexican parliamentarians about how they thought this was outrageous because they had violated their own legal procedures and protections in extraditing this individual so promptly and quickly to the United States, and yet it is what we requested. I think we should at least acknowledge when we are talking about this there have been positive steps that have taken place.

At the end of May, a couple of weeks ago, the Mexicans arrested and expelled Jose Luis Pereyra Salas, a major Bolivian drug trafficker. So they are picking up some of these major drug traffickers, they are getting at the head of this Hydra of drug cartels that is operating there in Mexico.

They recently extradited two Mexican nationals, something they were not

able to do before, to the United States, who were wanted for heinous crimes. That is an important departure from their past procedures on extraditions. Under the extradition treaty, we have been able to get American nationals extradited to the United States, but never Mexican nationals. Now, the two that were extradited, they were not extradited on drug-related crimes, but they were heinous crimes, one of which has been talked about in this body on several different occasions by one of our colleagues. So that was an important step.

But I think the most important thing that I think should be mentioned today is the passage in Mexico within the last 6 weeks of the most important, the first and most important, money laundering legislation to counter money laundering, and the first time that Mexico has taken up this issue.

There is no question, the Mexican banks, as has happened with banks all over the world, whether in the Cayman Islands or whether sometimes in Switzerland or often in the United States, banks inadvertently, or sometimes through sloppiness or carelessness or sometimes because they do not care, allow themselves to be used for money laundering. That is why you need to have tough laws that make it clear to the banks what their responsibilities are in money laundering.

This legislation was drafted and worked on, they asked us for some assistance on it, we gave them technical assistance. This is their legislation. But we think it is a very good piece of legislation. Now they have to go through the process of making it work, of getting all the rules to implement it, the specifics to the banks, what they must do. But it is a very tough piece of legislation. It is what we have been asking the Mexicans to do for a long period of time.

I rise only to mention this, because I think it is important at the same time we say, and I think it is appropriate that we say that money under this law should not go to the Mexican Government, or any government for that matter, that is not cooperating with us on drug interdiction and interdicting drug trafficking. We would not be sending money to those countries. But I think it is important at the same time that we say that, that we do acknowledge that there have within some important steps that have been made by Mexico.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this deals with another slightly different subject, but I rise to engage the chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Mr. CALLAHAN, in a colloquy.

I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, that earlier I had intended to offer an

amendment to increase funding for the Micro and Small Enterprise Development Program. Although I did not offer that amendment, I strongly support this program. This is a highly successful program that helps people help themselves.

By helping poor people to increase their income and assets, we are enabling them to improve their own welfare, health, housing and education, all at a very small cost-effective investment. This is a program that works, and this is the type of activity that we as a Congress should be encouraging.

Mr. Chairman, when the opportunity presents itself, as you go into conference with the other body, it is my understanding you will work with me to support additional assistance for the Micro and Small Enterprise Development Program.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Florida for his observations and share his support for the Micro and Small Enterprise Development Program.

I would be pleased to work with the gentleman, and with others in this body and the other body to support and possibly even expand this program.

Mr. Chairman, we are going to accept the amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRANK OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts: Page 97, after line 5, insert the following new section:

PROHIBITION OF IMET ASSISTANCE FOR INDONESIA

SEC. 573. None of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading "International Military Education and Training" may be made available to the Government of Indonesia.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILSON. How much time will there be on this amendment and how will it be allocated?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. FRANK] will be recognized for 22½ minutes, and a Member opposed, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], will be recognized for 22½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent, because I will be

due in a markup, that I be permitted to turn over the management for our side of the time to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. REED].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike out the international military education and training for the country of Indonesia. Indonesia made an international solemn agreement through the U.N. to take over the area known as East Timor. Indonesian rule in East Timor has been one of the most oppressive and brutal we have seen.

East Timor had been controlled by Portugal. This is a case where colonialism looks pretty good to people in retrospect. Indeed it is to the credit of the people of Portugal that they have continuously spoken out against the oppression which the Government of Indonesia has visited on the people of East Timor.

What the Indonesians have done is simply violate their international obligations, agreements they had made, to treat the people of East Timor fairly. There continues to be one of the most oppressive regimes. The people of East Timor, who have sought to preserve their own identity, their freedom of religion, freedom of speech, have been consistently and brutally mistreated.

That is going to be documented in the debate. But I want to deal now with the arguments we are going to hear that will say, oh, yes, the Indonesians have not done what they should do, but this is not the way to do it.

One thing should be very clear. When we are talking to those who specialize in foreign policy, to them there is never a way to do anything. Whatever method anyone puts forward for dealing with any wrong anywhere in the world turns out to be not the right method at a given time. Any effort to try to vindicate human rights will run up against a whole variety of arguments. One is that we must rely on Indonesia, in part for its strategic stability.

One thing that strikes me when we debate foreign policy, we are constantly being told that America must be careful less we alienate, unsettle, destabilize, other nations. How come nobody ever has to worry about what we think?

I do not understand the logic that says because we are quite wealthy and quite powerful, we therefore must accept the fact that our views ought to be disregarded and we must worry about offending others? Is the relationship between the United States and Indonesia useful in preserving stability? I believe it is. I believe it is so useful, that the Indonesians will not jeopardize it based on this.

The argument is always given that we should not take this or that step be-

cause we will anger some nation who has been the recipient of our protection, cooperation and investment. None of these nations that I am aware of are doing this as a favor to us. They are doing it because it is even more in their self-interest than ours.

There is a particular reason why I think it is important for us to begin a policy of refusing American assistance to blatant violators of human rights is Indonesia and elsewhere in Asia. There is a distressing pattern in much of South Asia of people, nations, progressing economically, while showing a fundamental disregard for democracy and human rights.

One of the things we like to tell ourselves has been there is some necessary connection between expanding free market economy, between capitalism at its best, and democracy. I wish I were more confident of that. But I think the pattern is emerging in much of Asia where nations are showing a capacity to develop economically while remaining from the standpoint of human rights quite retarded.

Indonesia is a nation with very little democracy internally, a great deal of corruption, and with a terribly oppressive record against East Timor. I believe there are important strategic reasons why they welcome American cooperation sufficiently so they are not going to repudiate it altogether. The question is: Do we do anything whatsoever to effectuate our view that the systematic mistreatment of the people of East Timor must stop? I know we will be told, at least I have been told this privately, we have changed the IMET around. It now becomes a force for good, naked to the eye. I do not understand how that argument can be made when we see a continuation of the pattern on the part of Indonesia of a systematic mistreatment of those people.

Therefore, in pursuance of human rights, in pursuance of the obligation the world has to the people of East Timor who were turned over to Indonesia through international means, and in defense of the principle that human rights cannot simply be disregarded, I hope this amendment is adopted, and that the Indonesian Government will get a strong message from the United States that this behavior is not acceptable.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I reserve the balance of my time, which will hereafter be managed by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. REED].

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman from Massachusetts, I hope his amendment is not adopted.

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I regret that I rise to oppose the Frank amendment, which

would prohibit international military, education and training [IMET] for Indonesia.

The provision contained in the amendment before us would restrict the IMET program to the more human rights oriented expanded IMET courses. This provision is identical to existing law in the fiscal year 1996 foreign operations appropriations bill, as well as the authorization bill that was adopted by both the House and the Senate.

However, while I am opposing this amendment, I want to make it clear that I continue to have strong reservations about Indonesia's human rights record. Indonesia's military has an abhorrent human rights record. There is no debating that fact. The House needs to speak with one voice in condemning the continuing human rights abuses being perpetuated by the military.

That said, it is my view that continuing an IMET program in Indonesia will enhance rather than diminish United States ability to positively influence Indonesia's human rights policies and behavior. We need to stay engaged with the Indonesian military. Providing IMET will contribute to the professionalism and human rights sensitivity of Indonesia's military.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose the Frank amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment, which is offered by myself and my colleagues, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. It would prohibit all military education and training funds for Indonesia, IMET funds.

Currently, Indonesia receives expended IMET. Unfortunately, the Indonesian military has not made progress in improving its human rights record. The record is very clear. Indeed, the Department of State's "Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1995" states that the Indonesian Government continues to commit serious human rights violations in East Timor.

The report further states:

The armed forces continued to be responsible for the most serious human rights abuses.

On East Timor, no progress was made in accounting for missing persons following the 1991 Dili incident or the 10 other Timorese that disappeared in 1995.

□ 1430

And finally, "The armed forces used excessive force in making arrests following anti-integration rioting in Dili in October."

Mr. Chairman, our IMET resources are designed to provide training for other military forces around the world. It is not designed to encourage or in any way aid or abet in such human rights abuses. And, in fact, one would hope that these resources and the training that is involved with them

would be a strong barrier against such abuses of human rights.

We are not at this juncture criticizing the IMET program. The IMET program, as it is practiced around the world, is a valuable source of American foreign policy and military preparedness and national security strength for our country and our allies. But we cannot, I think, sit idly by, watching these abuses in East Timor against a people who were the victims of an invasion 20 years ago and continue to fund this type of military support for their regime, their military, those people who have been identified by our State Department as being the perpetrators of these types of human rights abuses.

In 1992, Congress, in a sense of shock and outrage, cut off IMET funds to East Timor. In 1991, on film, the British Broadcasting Corp. filmed the massacre of 250 East Timor residents by the forces of the Indonesian Armed Forces. That was such a shocking revolting incident that we acted properly and cut off those funds. We restored those moneys, but we restored those moneys with the idea that the Indonesian military had learned their lesson; that they would not continue these practices of human rights abuses.

Sadly, sadly, Mr. Chairman, that lesson has not been learned. It is incumbent upon us today to once again reiterate our strong opposition to these abuses and to do it in a palpable, tangible way, to do it by eliminating IMET funds for the Government of Indonesia and their armed forces. This is a position which, I think, has strong support in many different quarters.

Mr. Chairman, I will at the appropriate time introduce a letter in the extension of remarks from the Catholic Conference in support of this amendment, and included in that letter is the following language: "Curtailling IMET funding to Indonesia constitutes a small but symbolically important expression by our government of the need for Indonesia to show greater will in resolving these problems." We cannot allow another 20 years of abuses to continue in East Timor.

I would also say for the record, which I think is important, Mr. Chairman, we have spent our the last several days debating this bill, in different guises, talking about Desert Storm and over valiant efforts to liberate Kuwait from the unprovoked aggression of Iraq in 1991.

Well, the similarities in this situation are ironic but associate, but in this situation it was the Government of Indonesia that struck a defenseless country, overran it without any justification under international law, and today not only do we not condemn that invasion vigorously but we continue to assist the Indonesian military. It would be as if we had stood by idly and passively in the gulf and now today continued to assist the Iraqi Armed Forces.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think justice and human rights and sound policy is on

the side of this amendment and I hope it passes.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], the ranking Democrat on our subcommittee.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I rise in opposition to the amendment. Of course, the administration is also opposed to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, IMET for Indonesia was completely cut off from 1992 to 1995. In fiscal year 1996, as part of a compromise on the issue, Congress agreed to allow for expanded IMET only. This means any training provided has to contain some elements of human rights training. The bill contains the same restriction as last year, that is only expanded IMET for Indonesia which ensures training and human rights.

I would, therefore, vigorously oppose this amendment. The committee has taken a compromise position and it should be sustained.

Mr. Chairman, I would like also to read a couple of paragraphs from a letter that I just received a few minutes ago from Secretary of Defense Perry and General Shalikashvili.

Strategically located Indonesia, with the world's fourth largest population, is increasingly important to United States interests. It is influential regionally, where it has been a force for stability, and globally. As we continue to rationalize and economize on our overseas military deployments, military cooperation with key countries such as Indonesia becomes an ever greater element in our ability to project power and influence. The IMET program in Indonesia enhances rather than diminishes U.S. ability to positively influence Indonesia's human rights policies.

That from the Secretary of Defense.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would say that the United States has very, very broad interests in Indonesia, ranging from vast commercial contracts to arms sales. It represents one of Asia's most promising expanding markets for American goods, with the United States occupying 12 percent of total imports. Our aid program helps protect the environment, improve conditions in East Timor, open opportunities for U.S. business, and stop the spread of AIDS. Any of those reasons, I submit, are reason enough to vote against this amendment and I urge the House to do so.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Frank amendment to eliminate international military education and training funding for Indonesia.

First of all, I would like to commend Chairman CALLAHAN for his efforts to address my concerns on this issue. I appreciate his support for expanded IMET

for Indonesia when I know he might rather have allowed Indonesia to receive full IMET assistance. However, as the chairman knows, I still have very serious concerns about Indonesia's human rights record.

In 1992, we voted to end all IMET assistance for Indonesia because of that country's abysmal human rights record and their continued oppression of the people of East Timor. Despite the lack of improvement in Indonesia's human rights record, and the opposition of myself and many of my colleagues, a modified IMET program was approved for Indonesia in the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1996.

When this provision was added to the foreign aid bill last year, we said we would monitor the human rights situation in Indonesia very carefully and act accordingly this year. Well, the State Department's country report on Indonesia was released in March, and according to the report, "The Government continued to commit serious human rights abuses."

The State Department report also said that in Indonesia "reports of extrajudicial killings, disappearances, and torture of those in custody by security forces increased." Not decreased. Not stayed the same. Increased. Should we really be sending Indonesia more military assistance now when they have not addressed these critical human rights issues? I don't think so.

Indonesia's policy in East Timor is about the oppression of people who oppose Indonesia's right to torture, kill, and repress the people of East Timor. It is about the 200,000 Timorese who have been slaughtered since the Indonesian occupation in 1975; 200,000 killed out of a total population of 700,000. It is about genocide.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and send a message to Indonesia that we will not tolerate continued human rights abuses.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific of the Committee on International Relations, the House of Representatives' most leading expert on Southeast Asia and on trade and American businesses in the region.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate his coming to the floor and especially waiting for an hour to make his observations.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

I rise in strong opposition to the amendment by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK]. We have to remember always, when we approach these issues, what is in our national interest and what is not; what has a positive impact and what does not.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentlewoman from New York began to make clear,

Indonesia does not have an IMET Program from us, they have an E-IMET Program or an expanded IMET Program, and there is quite a difference. In fact, an expanded IMET Program is specifically oriented to focusing on improving human rights activities and practices within a military.

We also have to get over the idea that the IMET or E-IMET Program is a grant of assistance to a foreign government. We do it because it is in our national interest to increase military-to-military cooperation, and because it is in our strategic interest to have this relationship.

There are many economic and strategic reasons why the E-IMET Program should be continued for Indonesia, but I would like to focus on the Human rights concerns and why, in fact, the frustrations of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] are not well taken. He can certainly be frustrated with the failure, as he sees it, to improve conditions in East Timor, but, in fact, the E-IMET Program is designed specifically to deal with human rights issues and human rights policies within the military. The E-IMET Program improves their performance in that respect. It is to our advantage, if we are interested in improving the human rights conditions.

The E-IMET Program is one of the most effective tools that we have for promoting both our security interests and improving human rights performance in other countries. The IMET or E-IMET Program in Indonesia enhances rather than diminishes our ability to influence the Indonesian military's policies and behavior.

Now, I understand that the gentleman from Massachusetts, and both gentlemen from Rhode Island have very big Portuguese American populations in their districts. These are great people, exceptional Americans, but they have to, in fact, I think be educated to the fact that there are better methods for improving human rights performance than to deny E-IMET.

Mr. Chairman, the E-IMET Program is bringing results within the military, and I will provide an example in a few minutes. The E-IMET Program exposes Indonesia's military students to western values, to civilian rule, and to the role of a professional military in a democracy. It will encourage efforts underway in the Indonesian military to improve professionalism, accountability, and respect for human rights.

The E-IMET Program for Indonesia, which is a product of this gentleman's amendment in a foreign aid bill in the past, is all that H.R. 3540 allows for Indonesia. It is designed to address issues, again, in democracy, human rights, military justice, and the concept of civilian control over the military. We should support human rights training for Indonesia through E-IMET, and this Member urges his colleagues for that reason to vote "no" on the Frank amendment.

As some of my colleagues know, one of the troubled areas in Indonesia right now is a part of the island that is a part of Indonesia called Irian Jaya. The legal adviser on the staff of the Kodam command in Jayapura, Irian Jaya, it has recently been revealed, is the author of a human rights handbook distributed to all troops in the command; it contains his innovations. They have also issued rules of engagement annexes to operational orders, which specifically says what troops should do and, more important, what they should not do when they engage in field operations in that respect.

I am talking very specifically about how they treat the citizens of their country, regardless of religion.

□ 1445

It has been said that since January when he started issuing these rules of engagement annexes, there have been no human rights violations in the Indonesian military in Irian Jaya. When asked where he came up with these innovations, he said it all came out of his experience at the U.S. Army Judge Advocate General's School, where he was an IMET student.

Let me end by reminding my colleagues why the E-IMET Program is a positive step toward improving human rights in Indonesia. The United States engagement with the Indonesian military, through IMET and specifically through E-IMET and other programs, enhances our ability to influence Indonesian human rights behavior and serving our broader interests in the region.

Second, it provides the Indonesian military with the human rights courses in the E-IMET Program that will contribute to their professionalism and the human rights sensitivity of the Indonesian military.

Third, in 1991, Congress established the expand E-IMET Program with four explicit objectives, three of which directly relate to human rights issues: A, to foster greater respect for the principles of civilian control of the military; B, to improve military justice and military codes of conduct in accordance with internationally recognized human rights; and the third of the four points that relates to human rights, to enhance cooperation between the military and local police in the area of counternarcotics.

Mr. Chairman, these elements in our E-IMET Program are exactly what we need to have happening within the Indonesian military. The human rights concerns that we have with Indonesia should be addressed by appropriate means. The E-IMET Program is an appropriate means to address human rights performance within the Indonesian military.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues, therefore, to reject the Frank amendment. It is not only a questionable amendment in its impact; it is a step in exactly the wrong direction.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, I rise today as a supporter of IMET. This is a program which is right in the right time and in the right place, but IMET in Indonesia at this time represents the wrong place at the wrong time.

Congress did the right thing in 1992, when at the urging of my predecessor from Rhode Island, Ron Machtley, we cut off IMET to Indonesia. When Congress did that, they sent a clear message to the dictatorship in Jakarta. They said: You need to stop the human rights abuses in East Timor; your record in East Timor does not merit your receiving IMET.

Last year, unfortunately, Congress restored IMET to Indonesia. Since this time human rights abuses have continued and have gotten worse. Another year will just provide more encouragement for those carrying out these abusive practices.

Since Indonesia brutally invaded East Timor 20 years ago, almost one-third of the population has been killed. One-third of the population has been killed. This could not have happened without the knowledge and participation of the military, the very military that we are going to reward if we pass this IMET in this bill and if we do not pass the Frank amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the record of leadership in Indonesia is clear and unmistakable. After the Santa Cruz massacre, General Try Sutrisno, the commander of the Indonesian military at the time, and he is now currently the vice president of Indonesia, was quoted as saying that those who had gathered at the cemetery were disrupters who must be crushed. He said, and I quote, "Delinquents like these have to be shot, and we will shoot them," he said. General Mantriri, the regional commander for East Timor, was quoted just after the Santa Cruz massacre as saying, quote unquote, that, "The massacre was proper," and, I quote, "We do not regret anything."

These are the words of the military commanders that this U.S. Congress is about to lend assistance to. These very military commanders who are saying these things.

These abuses continue. Just yesterday, just yesterday, there are reports that are yet to be confirmed that East Timorese youths were shot at by police forces in Baucau. They were protesting the destruction of the portrait of the Virgin Mary, and youths took to the streets. There are reports that house-to-house searches were conducted.

My office has learned that Bishop Bello, who is recognized by all as the conscience of East Timor and is one of the most respected human rights leaders in the world and was one of the finalists for the Nobel Peace Prize last year, Bishop Bello was more upset than friends have said they have heard him in years.

Mr. Chairman, I think we need to send a clear message to the leaders of Indonesia that we will not sit by and

let these abuses continue. And I urge my colleagues to support the Frank amendment and send a clear message to Indonesia we are not going to sanction continued abuses of human rights.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PICKETT].

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

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I am here in opposition to this amendment not because I condone the human rights policies of Indonesia but because I am very, very strongly committed to our own Nation's defense program. Make no mistake about it, the IMET program is one of the most valuable tools that we use as a Nation to engage in preventive defense on behalf of our country.

This program enables us to bring to this country distinguished military officers from other countries and train them in the way that our military does business, in the way our military relates to the civilian sector, and the way our military works with other militaries around the world. It is a very important program. It is not a program designed exclusively for the benefit of in this case Indonesia or, for that case, any other foreign nation. It benefits the United States of America.

It makes our defense program stronger. It extends the scope of influence of the United States of America.

When these people come and visit in this country, they take back with them characteristics that we cannot communicate or instill any other way. And time and again we have heard the military of our Nation talk about working with other military members that are in foreign countries and having a first-time relation with them because of the fact that these people have come to the United States of America, have worked in our schools here, have worked with our military people, and have taken back with them personal relationships that they continue to build on year after year after year.

It is a magnificent investment that we make, and one that has returned dividends manyfold on the money that has been invested in it. It should not be looked upon as simply a gift over something to trade off for some kind of conduct of another nation. It is much, much too valuable for that. This is a very strong component of our Nation's defense program. And you might ask, well, why is it in the foreign operations bill? And my answer is I do not know. I think it more properly belongs in the defense appropriations bill. But nevertheless we are here with it. But we should not let the fact that it is in the foreign operations bill obscure from us the reality that this is indeed a defense expenditure and one that is a very valuable component of our Nation's defense program and experience has shown that it works well.

For example, the top three military officers in Indonesia have all partici-

pated in this program, and they are people that our military works with on a regular basis, based upon the contacts that have been built up as a result of their working with the IMET program.

As has been said before, this program is going to enhance rather than diminish the ability of our Nation to influence the conduct of Indonesia in the way it handles its human rights policies.

I would urge the Members to recognize the importance of this program to our own military and to reject this amendment because I think it will not serve the long-term interests of our Nation.

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

Mr. Chairman, I respect a great deal both the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PICKETT] and their comments.

Mr. Chairman, this is not an amendment attempting to undercut the very important goals of IMET. I spent 12 years in the U.S. Army, and I had the opportunity to actually train with and serve with foreign officers who were brought into this country through the IMET program. It is a very valuable program and a very worthwhile program. And it does, as the gentleman from Virginia indicated, give our country an opportunity to impress upon foreign officers our values, both our democratic values and our professional standards.

But the other side of that equation is that this program gives, in many respects, an imprimatur to the military forces that participate in the program, and I think we have to ask very serious questions at this juncture, given the record in Indonesia, whether we want to give the imprimatur to the armed forces of Indonesia. There have been indications that progress is being made.

But progress in human rights in East Timor is in the eye of the beholder. And I would refer to the letter I made reference to before from the Catholic Conference from Father Drew Christiansen: "Rather than improvements in human rights, there have been over the past year numerous reports from authoritative sources of continued harassment and arrests of many, especially young people, seeking to express in a nonviolent fashion their disagreement with the status quo. There continue to be vicious attacks by gangs of paramilitaries and a climate of fear created by the security forces that at times amounts to a reign of terror."

And so I would argue, based upon the observations of Father Christiansen and his colleagues in the Catholic Conference, that our IMET training has not achieved success yet and, in fact, what it does is provide a symbolic approval of these operations in East Timor by Indonesian security forces. And also it has not yet moved forward the Government of Indonesia together

with other world leaders in the world community to recognize their occupation, their illegal occupation of East Timor, and to give justice to the East Timor and to its people. And I think in that regard we have again invoked the leverage of withdrawing IMET from the armed forces of Indonesia.

Now, the gentleman from Nebraska talked about the strategic value of Indonesia. I believe there is strategic value there. But I would point out that in the period from 1992 until about a year or so ago, when we restored expanded IMET, the Government of Indonesia did not turn away from the United States, did not seek to ally itself with other regional powers. And I would suspect that if once again we revoked IMET, they would not turn away from us, turn away from their own self-interest, which is a relationship with the United States in the world community.

We are not at all seeking to undercut the economic ties that we are developing with the Government of Indonesia. Those ties, I think, also are based upon mutual self-interest, but what we are doing is trying to establish very clearly that the Government of Indonesia and its armed forces must act with more sensitivity, more consideration of the people of East Timor, and if they cannot do that, they then would not be allowed to participate in this expanded IMET. And for all of the above reasons, I would urge that this measure be adopted and the amendment be accepted by the committee.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], which would cut off all IMET to Indonesia.

Mr. Chairman, I notice that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] had other business and could not be here to hear the extended debate; not here to hear the eloquent statements of people that are knowledgeable in this affair. But I am sure that had he been here, no doubt he might have taken serious consideration to withdraw this amendment.

But since it has not been withdrawn, as the gentleman knows, the subcommittee has been very attentive to this issue and in last year's bill we agreed to provide expanded IMET to Indonesia. Expanded IMET is only for training the military in the areas of democratization, respect for human rights, and the rule of law. It really should be called restricted IMET.

Because our fiscal year 1996 bill was not enacted into law until early this year, Indonesia really has not had the benefit of this type of training. The committee's position this year simply reflects last year's compromise on this issue—it allows the expanded IMET program to work with Indonesian officers to improve their human rights performance. No military training is provided. Personally, I support full

military training for Indonesia, but I reached a compromise with my colleagues on the committee and last year I supported the House position in conference.

Currently the administration is planning visits to Indonesia by the U.S. Naval Justice School's Military Justice Mobile Education Team and the U.S. Naval Postgraduate School's Civil-Military Relations Mobile Education Team. Are these really the types of IMET programs that the House should be prohibiting? Well, that is exactly what the amendment by the gentleman from Massachusetts will do.

I strongly oppose this counter-productive amendment which will deny, I repeat deny, human rights training to the Indonesian military. Please vote "no" on the Frank amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Frank, Kennedy, Reed and Kennedy amendment to the fiscal year 1997 foreign operations appropriations bill which will prohibit all international military education [IMET] funding for Indonesia.

The Indonesia invasion and occupation of East Timor in 1975 was the beginning of a period of repression and human rights abuses in East Timor that has continued for over 20 years. It has claimed the lives of 200,000 Timorese, one-third of the original population. It has been done in defiance of the U.N. Security Council, which has twice called on Jakarta to withdraw without delay. The United States fully supported these resolutions.

The human rights situation remains serious in East Timor. In this year's State Department Country Report on Human Rights Practices, the Department notes "the most serious abuses, by Indonesia, include harsh repression of dissidents in East Timor * * * Reports of extrajudicial killings, disappearances and torture of those in custody by security forces increased."

Since the November 12, 1991, Santa Cruz Cemetery massacre, in which Indonesian troops armed with American M-16's gunned down more than 200 Timorese civilians, Congress has taken a series of initiatives which have begun to shift the direction of United States policy.

While imperfect, the ban on IMET funding for Indonesia has been one source of leverage. First imposed in October 1992, the ban has sent an important message to Indonesia about our concerns regarding human rights in East Timor. By approving IMET military training funds, Congress turns a blind eye to continued abuses in East Timor and lets Indonesia off the hook.

The political issue in East Timor is a very basic one: The people simply want the right to vote in a U.N.-supervised referendum, in which they would be given the right to choose whether they want to be independent or become part of Indonesia. Without any international pressure on the regime in Jakarta, the ability of the people in East Timor to exercise their right of self-determination will continue to be infringed upon.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Frank amendment to prohibit the use of international military education and training funds for Indonesia. It appears to me that this amendment is designed only to insult

Indonesia and would have only negative effects on United States-Indonesian relations. Furthermore, if enacted, I believe this amendment would actually hinder the kind of changes and increased respect for human rights its proponents claim to seek.

First, let's be clear on what IMET is. IMET is not guns and ammunition. It's not even combat training. The IMET program sponsors up and coming Indonesian military officers to come to the United States to receive either technical training—like accounting—or professional education including military justice and human rights awareness. Thus, IMET participants are exposed to the very issues about which the sponsors of the Frank amendment are most concerned. How better to ensure that the Indonesian military enhances its professionalism and sensitivity to the human rights concerns we've identified than to include this in their training? Especially when the Indonesian military wants this training? They are seeking our help. If the sponsors of this amendment listen to their own words, then they would see that we ought to continue to provide this training.

Second, IMET also plays an important role in improving United States-Indonesian security ties. Indonesia occupies a very central and strategic position in Southeast Asia. Indonesia is a key member of ASEAN and a moderate leader of the non-aligned movement. It is the world's largest Moslem country. Indonesia is very supportive of the United States presence in Southeast Asia and provides us with places in lieu of bases. The modest support the Indonesian military receives from IMET goes a long way in solidifying this relationship. It also provides our own military with exposure to senior and mid-level Indonesian military officers with all of the associated benefits such relations provide.

Third, with 190 million people, Indonesia is a growing market for American goods and services. Last year alone, the United States exported \$3.3 billion, an increase of over 20 percent from last year. Indonesia is the host to over \$6 billion in United States investments. Whether we like it or not, IMET has, in part, come to represent a bellwether of United States engagement with Indonesia. It has become a symbol of United States attitude toward Indonesia. Therefore, to prohibit IMET will be seen by Indonesians—all Indonesians, not just the Suharto government—as a slap. Unlike most of my colleagues, as a first generation Asian-American, I have a pretty good understanding of how East Asians think. And, I can assure every one of you, this will be interpreted as a direct insult against the Indonesian Nation as a whole.

Such an insult will have a direct and negative affect on all aspects of our relationship, including economic ties. At risk are jobs and incomes of Americans rights here at home. The only ones really cheering for the misguided symbolism of the Frank amendment are our Asian and European competitors.

Finally, I am sensitive to the situation in East Timor. Unfortunately, the history as well as the future of East Timor is not as simple and black and white as proponents of this amendment claim. Progress is being made with regard to East Timor, though I agree that more is needed. However, cutting IMET will have no positive effect on East Timor. The Frank amendment is merely pandering to only special interest in East Timor at great expense

overall U.S. interests in the region. In fact, as I pointed out, prohibiting of IMET could actually setback the process of improving human rights in Indonesia.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote for America's best interests and reject this misguided amendment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Frank-Kennedy-Reed amendment to prohibit IMET for Indonesia. I appreciate Chairman CALLAHAN's initiative last year and again this year to limit IMET for Indonesia to expanded-IMET only. Nonetheless, in light of continuing human rights abuses and Indonesia's economic strength I do not believe that the Indonesian military should be trained with United States taxpayers' dollars.

According to the U.S. State Department's country reports on human rights practices for 1995, human rights in Indonesia continued to be a problem. The report notes that—in Indonesia "there continued to be numerous, credible reports of human rights abuses by the military and police * * *." The human rights problems in Indonesia noted by the State Department report include:

The (Indonesian) Government continued to commit serious human rights abuses. The most serious abuses included harsh repression of dissidents in East Timor, Aceh, and Irian Jaya. Reports of extrajudicial killings, disappearances, and torture of those in custody by security forces increased. Reports of arbitrary arrests and detentions and the use of excessive violence (including deadly force) in dealing with suspected criminals or perceived troublemakers continued.

The State Department's report also states:

Elements of the armed forces continued to be responsible for the most serious human rights abuses. Military leaders in some cases showed willingness to admit publicly abuses by military personnel and take action against them, including in a brutal incident in East Timor. Punishment, however, rarely matched the severity of the abuse.

Some of our colleagues will argue that IMET benefits the United States by increasing the professionalism of the armed forces of other nations. That may, in some cases, be true. Unfortunately, history is now littered with cases of egregious human rights abuses being perpetrated by people who received U.S. military training. In some countries, IMET training endows those who receive it with a mantle of prestige and privilege. IMET provides a seal of approval of sorts for military people who receive it and therefore bestows a seal of approval on their military practices. The United States should not be in a position of supporting repressive or abusive practices either in an explicit or implicit way.

It is clear, to those who are willing to look, that the human rights situation in East Timor is terrible. The State Department's report provides documentation of some of last year's atrocities, many of which were perpetrated by the military. These practices have not ended. I have in my possession a list provided by a reputable human rights organization of 17 East Timorese people who have been arrested, beaten and tortured by the Indonesian armed forces at various locations around East Timor since January 1996. This list is incomplete, but it is representative of the ongoing practices of the Indonesian military.

The repressive activities of the Indonesian armed forces are by no means limited to East Timor, which Indonesia occupies illegally.

They also occur in many other places in Indonesia, including Irian Jaya, where NGO and church sources provided eyewitness accounts of over 40 victims of torture by the Indonesian military in late 1994 and early 1995.

I urge my colleagues to express their concern about human rights abuses in Indonesia by supporting the Frank-Kennedy-Reed amendment to prohibit IMET for Indonesia.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to funding for expanded international military and education training [IMET] for Indonesia. The actions perpetrated by Indonesia against the people of East Timor have been no less than reprehensible and do not deserve to be condoned by this Government. I do not question the efficacy of IMET programs in general, but rather the value to be gained by the United States in providing assistance to the Indonesian Government. As a champion of human rights throughout the world, the United States should make every effort to ensure that systematic aggression, like that against the East Timorese, is not allowed to continue. In order to do this, though, it is imperative that the Indonesian Government receives a firm answer from this country—such behavior will not be tolerated.

Indonesia's invasion of East Timor spawned an era of oppression directed against the East Timorese. Torture, abductions, disappearances, and massacres have all been common occurrences under its rule. The result has been the annihilation of nearly one-third of the East Timorese population. Portugal has strenuously objected to Indonesia's conduct in East Timor, but these objections have gone unheeded. Instead, the international community has silently accepted the situation. However, I refuse to stand idly by as the Indonesian Government is no less than rewarded for its actions with funds from this country.

The violence which has been unleashed against the people of East Timor must be stopped. A restoration of IMET funding to Indonesia, though, does not send this message. Rather, it encourages the Indonesian military to perpetuate the cycle of abuse. The East Timorese must be recognized for the basic human dignity we all share. For this reason, I stand opposed to this country's financial support of the Indonesian regime.

□ 1500

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 149, noes 272, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 227]

AYES—149

Andrews	Brown (OH)	Costello
Barrett (WI)	Cardin	Coyne
Becerra	Clay	Cummings
Beilenson	Clayton	Danner
Blute	Clement	DeFazio
Bonior	Collins (IL)	DeLauro
Borski	Collins (MI)	Dellums
Boucher	Conyers	Doggett

Duncan	Lantos
Durbin	Levin
Ehlers	Lewis (GA)
Ensign	Lipinski
Eshoo	LoBiondo
Evans	Lofgren
Farr	Lowe
Fattah	Luther
Fazio	Maloney
Fields (LA)	Markey
Filner	Martini
Flake	Mascara
Foglietta	McCarthy
Ford	McDermott
Fox	McHale
Frank (MA)	McKinney
Franks (CT)	McNulty
Franks (NJ)	Meehan
Funderburk	Meek
Furse	Menendez
Gedjenson	Millender-
Gutierrez	McDonald
Gutknecht	Miller (CA)
Hall (OH)	Mink
Hefner	Moakley
Hinchey	Moran
Holden	Nadler
Hoyer	Neal
Jackson (IL)	Oberstar
Jackson-Lee	Obey
(TX)	Olver
Johnson (SD)	Owens
Johnston	Pallone
Kanjorski	Pastor
Kaptur	Payne (NJ)
Kennedy (MA)	Pelosi
Kennedy (RI)	Porter
Kennelly	Poshard
Kildee	Rahall
Klecza	Ramstad
Klink	Rangel
Klug	Reed
LaHood	Rivers

NOES—272

Abercrombie	Coble	Goodlatte
Ackerman	Coburn	Goodling
Allard	Coleman	Gordon
Archer	Collins (GA)	Goss
Armey	Combest	Graham
Bachus	Condit	Green (TX)
Baessler	Cooley	Greene (UT)
Baker (CA)	Cox	Greenwood
Baker (LA)	Cramer	Gunderson
Baldacci	Crane	Hall (TX)
Ballenger	Crapo	Hamilton
Barcia	Creameans	Hancock
Barr	Cubin	Hansen
Barrett (NE)	Cunningham	Hastert
Bartlett	Davis	Hastings (WA)
Barton	de la Garza	Hayes
Bass	Deal	Hayworth
Bentsen	DeLay	Hefley
Bereuter	Diaz-Balart	Heineman
Berman	Dickey	Herger
Bevill	Dicks	Hilleary
Bilbray	Dingell	Hilliard
Bilirakis	Dixon	Hobson
Bishop	Dooley	Hoekstra
Bliley	Doolittle	Hoke
Blumenauer	Dornan	Horn
Boehlert	Doyle	Hostettler
Boehner	Dreier	Houghton
Bonilla	Dunn	Hunter
Bono	Edwards	Hutchinson
Brewster	Ehrlich	Hyde
Browder	Emerson	Inglis
Brown (FL)	Engel	Istook
Brownback	English	Jacobs
Bryant (TN)	Everett	Jefferson
Bryant (TX)	Ewing	Johnson (CT)
Bunn	Fawell	Johnson, E. B.
Bunning	Fields (TX)	Johnson, Sam
Burr	Flanagan	Jones
Burton	Foley	Kasich
Buyer	Forbes	Kelly
Callahan	Fowler	Kim
Camp	Frelinghuysen	King
Campbell	Frisa	Kingston
Canady	Frost	Knollenberg
Castle	Galleghy	Kolbe
Chabot	Ganske	LaFalce
Chambliss	Gekas	Largent
Chapman	Gephardt	Latham
Chenoweth	Geren	LaTourette
Christensen	Gilchrist	Laughlin
Chrysler	Gillmor	Lazio
Clinger	Gilman	Leach
Clyburn	Gonzalez	Lewis (CA)

Lewis (KY)	Packard	Smith (WA)
Lightfoot	Parker	Solomon
Linder	Paxon	Souder
Livingston	Payne (VA)	Spence
Longley	Peterson (FL)	Stenholm
Lucas	Peterson (MN)	Stump
Manton	Petri	Talent
Manzullo	Pickett	Tanner
Martinez	Pombo	Tate
Matsui	Pomeroy	Tauzin
McCollum	Portman	Taylor (MS)
McCrery	Pryce	Taylor (NC)
McHugh	Quillen	Tejeda
McInnis	Quinn	Thomas
McIntosh	Radanovich	Thompson
McKeon	Regula	Thornberry
Metcalfe	Richardson	Thornnton
Meyers	Riggs	Tiahrt
Mica	Roberts	Trafficant
Miller (FL)	Roemer	Vucanovich
Minge	Rogers	Walker
Molinari	Roth	Walsh
Mollohan	Salmon	Watts (OK)
Montgomery	Sanford	Waxman
Moorhead	Saxton	Weldon (FL)
Morella	Scarborough	Weldon (PA)
Murtha	Schaefer	Weller
Myers	Seastrand	White
Myrick	Sensenbrenner	Whitfield
Nethercutt	Shadeegg	Wicker
Neumann	Shaw	Wilson
Ney	Shuster	Wise
Norwood	Sisisky	Wolf
Nussle	Skeen	Young (AK)
Ortiz	Skelton	Young (FL)
Orton	Smith (MI)	Zeliff
Oxley	Smith (TX)	

NOT VOTING—13

Bateman	Harman	Schiff
Brown (CA)	Hastings (FL)	Studds
Calvert	Lincoln	Torricelli
Deutsch	McDade	
Gibbons	Rose	

□ 1520

Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. WAXMAN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. WATERS and Messrs. CLAY, FLAKE and VOLKMER changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(Mr. CALLAHAN asked and was given permission to address the Committee for 1 minute.)

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] for a colloquy.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, very recently, elections were held in Albania that international observers feel were rife with irregularities—including ballot stuffing, physical intimidation of voters and other acts of fraud and coercion. This is a grave cause of concern and I would inquire whether the Chairman would be open to consideration of provisions withholding assistance to Albania unless new elections are held.

Mr. CALLAHAN. I understand the gentleman's concern over the disturbing elections in Albania, and I will remain open to consideration of this matter in our conference committee with the Senate on this legislation.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule and the order of the House of June 6, 1996, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY) having assumed the chair, Mr. HANSEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union,

reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3540) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 445, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield for a few seconds to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for a comment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, in the few seconds that I have allocated to me I want to commend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], our chairman, for his excellent leadership of our subcommittee and for his shepherding us through these different issues. While I do not agree with all that is in the bill, I do commend the gentleman.

In addition to commending our excellent chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], for his magnificent shepherding of this legislation through subcommittee, full committee and to the floor, I want to join with him in acknowledging the fine work of our ranking member, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON]. While he will be on the floor when we take up the conference report, I am certain, this is the last bill that he brings to the floor from the committee, and I know that all the members of the subcommittee join our colleagues in commending him and thanking him for his leadership on the committee, his good humor in the face of strong opposition on some issues in the committee and his leadership to rally us around some of the issues of agreement.

With that, I want to once again commend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN]. I do not think our colleagues have any idea how difficult it is for this bill, to reach consensus on it, and we are all deeply in the debt of the gentleman.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Reclaiming my time, I am sorry that the confusion and the timing does not permit us to do justice to the gentleman from Texas, who is sitting in on his last few minutes of an appropriation bill, who has been sitting here for 19 years doing this same thing every 2 years. And I would like to thank also the subcommittee members who have worked so hard and are so allied with us in trying to formulate a bipartisan bill. And certainly the staff deserves recognition for the

yeoman job that they have done, as does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and all the people of our committee.

The gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] also deserves recognition for his yeomanship and his great handling of this bill sitting in the Speaker's chair.

Mr. Speaker, once again, in the final passage of this bill there have been those who came and tried to increase this level of spending that we do on foreign aid, but thanks to this committee and this Congress, we are cutting foreign aid, we are cutting the President's request by a billion dollars, we have now, with the passage of this bill, reduced the level of appropriation for foreign operations to less than 1 percent of our total budget.

So this is a vote to cut foreign aid and to appropriate responsibly what limited amount of money we are going to. I would encourage each Member to vote "aye" to cut foreign aid and to pass this responsible legislation.

Mr. DURBIN. I rise in support of assistance to Israel in the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1997.

The legislation before us today includes the President's full request for assistance to Israel, including economic support funds, foreign military finance grants, counterterrorism assistance, and funds for the resettlement of refugees from Eastern Europe. In addition, the legislation requires that this assistance be provided on an expedited basis.

The security and the prosperity of the United States are intricately interwoven with the security and prosperity of Israel. The American people and the people of Israel are inseparably joined by a common heritage, shared values and democratic forms of government. The threats to Israel—from political conflict, extremism, economic instability and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction—are also threats to the people of the United States.

We have seen historic changes in the Middle East in recent years as Israel has reached out to its neighbors for peace. But real dangers and significant obstacles to peace remain.

The people of Israel have just recently held elections and voted for new leaders. This is a time of transition for Israel, and Israel's people must know that the United States will remain a steadfast and strong ally.

The assistance we provide to Israel will strengthen our most important ally in the Middle East, deter aggression from hostile nations in the region, and ultimately protect the security of the United States. This assistance will help Israel to preserve a qualitative advantage in defense, even though it is heavily outspent by its larger neighbors. It will help Israel to absorb the economic cost of maintaining a strong defense. And it will once again assure the people of Israel, and its adversaries, of unwavering American support.

We must support Israel because it is the right thing to do, and because it is the wise course to take. I urge my colleagues to support the President's request for assistance to Israel and vote for final passage of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1997.

Ms. PELOSI. I commend Chairman CALLAHAN and Ranking Member WILSON for their

successful efforts for the second year in a row in putting together a foreign aid bill which has bipartisan support. As a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, I know the work that has gone into this bill and the efforts that have been made to bridge many differences on the purpose, the priorities, and the funding level of our foreign aid programs. I would like to thank the subcommittee staff, Charlie Flickner, Bill Inglee, John Shank, and Lori Maes, and our Democratic staffpersons Mark Murray and Kathleen Murphy for their hard work on this bill.

In the current fiscal climate, we have to make many difficult choices cutting funding for many worthy programs. Our decisions must be based on fact, not myth. We have before us today one of the most misunderstood and maligned bills the Congress is regularly privileged to consider. The misperceptions surrounding foreign aid are legion and we, as leaders, have an obligation to set the record straight.

We will hear today from some of our colleagues that the American people do not support foreign aid. That is not true. The American people's overwhelming humanitarian response to crisis, to famine, to tragedy overseas, is evidence of their concern. According to recent surveys, Americans believe we should spend 15 percent of our budget on foreign aid—they think we spend 40 percent on foreign aid—and do not know that we spend less than 1 percent on foreign aid. Today's bill continues the recent downward trend in spending on foreign aid, providing \$1 billion less than the President's request for fiscal year 1997, and \$458 million less than the fiscal year 1996 level.

Foreign aid is a good investment in a number of ways. Our limited foreign aid dollars provide returns to our country many times over through assisting our allies and increasing our national security, providing much-needed humanitarian relief and easing human suffering. In addition, we get numerous economic benefits from our foreign aid investments. Eighty percent of our development assistance is spent here in the United States, providing jobs for American workers, and expanding markets abroad.

I support a number of this bill's provisions and thank Chairman CALLAHAN, in particular, for his continued leadership in providing funding for global AIDS programs and for his assistance in addressing my concerns about some reporting requirements related to Hong Kong. That said, I cannot ignore the parts of this bill which I believe should be changed. I am particularly concerned about the impact of funding cuts on programs to meet the needs of the poorest of the poor around the world, including IDA and the IADB's Fund for Special Operations. I am also concerned about the reduced ability of our foreign aid programs to meet the development challenges on the continent of Africa. I believe we should reinstate the Development Fund for Africa as a separate account and provide funding for the African Development Bank and African Development Foundation, for example.

And, I am particularly concerned about the consequences for the global environment of cuts in funding for global environment programs and of cuts in funding and restrictions on population assistance funds.

Overpopulation is a threat to us all. The world is already experiencing a serious strain on its natural resources; increased population

growth at current rates will only increase environmental degradation. We cannot be close-minded or short-sighted on this issue. What happens in other countries must be of interest here at home. Pollution does not stop at our borders. Diseases also do not stop at our borders. Stabilizing population growth is critical to us all.

In addition, I am very concerned that the population provisions contained in this bill will have the opposite impact of what our well-meaning colleagues intend. The 35-percent cut in population assistance funding contained in this bill can be expected to result in 7 million couples in developing countries left without access to modern, safe contraceptive methods; 4 million women experiencing unintended pregnancies; 1.6 million more abortions; 8,000 more women dying in pregnancy and childbirth, including those from unsafe abortions; and 134,000 infant deaths. These are not abstract arguments. These are real people whose suffering and whose deaths that we have the power to prevent.

U.S. foreign assistance has been at the forefront in saving lives, building democracy and achieving economic growth in the developing world. While failures associated with foreign aid programs have been well publicized, the success stories receive little attention. We can be proud that hundreds of millions of people around the world have achieved substantial improvements in their living standards around the world. We can be proud of the millions of children in developing countries whose lives have been saved by the immunization programs which we have funded.

Yes, improvements can still be made. Everything can always be improved. The administration should be commended for the progress it has made in increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of our development programs. We should make every effort to fund these programs at adequate and appropriate levels. This bill is a step in that direction.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer my support for the foreign operations appropriations measure before us today. I am not satisfied with all of the bill's provisions, notably the continued restrictions on international family planning. However, I believe that this bill contains some provisions that deserve our support, including our Nation's continued commitment to the Middle East peace process.

A new era in U.S. foreign assistance has been taking shape since the end of the cold war. New trends are developing which will guide the direction of our foreign policy and foreign assistance programs well into the next century. In light of these changes, I believe it is important for the United States to remain committed throughout the world. Such a commitment will serve to advance our global interests and influence.

This bill will appropriate \$11.9 billion for foreign aid and export assistance, \$1 billion less than the administration's request and \$458 million less than the fiscal year 1996 appropriation.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the committee has continued to show its support for sustainable agriculture programs. Programs like the small ruminants collaborative research support program at the University of California, Davis, promote sustainable agriculture in the developing world in the conjunction with the U.S. system of land grant colleges and univer-

sities. Finding and implementing sustainable, environmentally safe, agricultural techniques and crops is critical to providing long-term food security in Africa and throughout the world.

In addition, I would like to express my support for the efforts of Representatives VISCLOSKEY, BILIRAKIS, DURBIN, and others to strengthen the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act and increase pressure on Turkey to lift its 3 year blockade of United States relief supplies to Armenia.

This amendment will send a clear message to Turkey that the United States Congress will not tolerate, much less subsidize, the illegal blockade of American humanitarian relief aid to needy populations in Armenia. Turkey's embargo not only perpetuates the humanitarian crisis in Armenia, but also increases the costs of American assistance programs because of the necessity to circumvent Turkey. The amendment will ensure that Turkey complies with the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act before it receives any additional economic support funds.

I would also like to extend my support for the amendment offered by Representatives RADANOVICH and BONIOR. This amendment would withhold \$3 million of United States aid to Turkey until the Turkish Government has acknowledged the atrocities committed against the Armenian people. By linking Turkey's denial of this genocide to United States foreign aid levels, this amendment provides a practical incentive for Turkey to finally acknowledge its role in this genocide. Moreover, it would begin to decrease regional tensions and open the door to improved relations between Armenia and Turkey.

I would also like to express my support for the amendment offered by Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts to prohibit funding for the U.S. Army's School of the Americas. While the amendment was withdrawn, his underlying bill, H.R. 2652, is a legislative proposal worth supporting.

The School of the Americas and its graduates have linked the United States to some of the worst human rights violators in Latin America. These human rights abusers have been responsible for murders, coups, and numerous disappearances. This shameful record casts doubts on the intentions of the United States and damages our relationships. We need to take a serious look at the school and the awful legacy that it has left in Latin America.

I believe that reasonable, responsible levels of foreign assistance will continue to serve the economic, humanitarian, political, and strategic interests of the United States. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device and there were—yeas 366, nays 57, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 228]

YEAS—366

Abercrombie	Edwards	Klug
Ackerman	Ehrlich	Knollenberg
Allard	Emerson	Kolbe
Andrews	Engel	LaFalce
Archer	English	LaHood
Armey	Ensign	Lantos
Bachus	Eshoo	Largent
Baessler	Evans	Latham
Baker (CA)	Ewing	LaTourette
Baker (LA)	Farr	Lazio
Baldacci	Fawell	Leach
Ballenger	Fazio	Levin
Barcia	Fields (LA)	Lewis (CA)
Barr	Fields (TX)	Lewis (GA)
Barrett (WI)	Filner	Lewis (KY)
Bartlett	Flake	Lightfoot
Barton	Flanagan	Linder
Bass	Foley	Lipinski
Becerra	Forbes	Livingston
Bentsen	Ford	LoBiondo
Bereuter	Fowler	Lofgren
Berman	Fox	Longley
Bevill	Frank (MA)	Lowey
Bilbray	Franks (CT)	Luther
Bilirakis	Franks (NJ)	Maloney
Bishop	Frelinghuysen	Manton
Bliley	Frisa	Manzullo
Blumenauer	Frost	Markey
Blute	Funderburk	Martinez
Boehlert	Furse	Martini
Boehner	Galleghy	Mascara
Bonilla	Ganske	Matsui
Bonior	Gejdenson	McCarthy
Bono	Gekas	McCollum
Borski	Gephardt	McCrery
Boucher	Geren	McHale
Brewster	Gilchrest	McHugh
Browder	Gillmor	McInnis
Brown (CA)	Gilman	McIntosh
Brown (FL)	Gonzalez	McKeon
Brown (OH)	Goodlatte	McKinney
Brownback	Goodling	McNulty
Bryant (TN)	Gordon	Meehan
Bryant (TX)	Goss	Meek
Bunn	Graham	Menendez
Burr	Green (TX)	Metcalfe
Burton	Greene (UT)	Mica
Buyer	Greenwood	Millender-
Callahan	Gunderson	McDonald
Camp	Gutierrez	Miller (FL)
Canady	Hall (OH)	Mink
Cardin	Hamilton	Moakley
Castle	Hastert	Molinari
Chabot	Hastings (WA)	Moorhead
Chambliss	Hayes	Moran
Chapman	Hayworth	Morella
Christensen	Hefner	Murtha
Chrysler	Heineman	Myers
Clay	Hilleary	Myrick
Clayton	Hilliard	Nadler
Clement	Hinchey	Neal
Clinger	Hobson	Nethercutt
Clyburn	Hoekstra	Ney
Coble	Hoke	Norwood
Coleman	Holden	Nussle
Collins (GA)	Horn	Obey
Collins (IL)	Hostettler	Olver
Collins (MI)	Houghton	Ortiz
Costello	Hoyer	Orton
Cox	Hunter	Owens
Coyne	Hutchinson	Oxley
Cramer	Hyde	Packard
Crane	Inglis	Pallone
Crapo	Istook	Parker
Creameans	Jackson (IL)	Pastor
Cubin	Jackson-Lee	Paxon
Cummings	(TX)	Payne (VA)
Cunningham	Jefferson	Pelosi
Davis	Johnson (CT)	Peterson (FL)
de la Garza	Johnson (SD)	Peterson (MN)
Deal	Johnson, E.B.	Petri
DeLauro	Johnson, Sam	Pickett
DeLay	Johnston	Pomeroy
Dellums	Kanjorski	Porter
Diaz-Balart	Kaptur	Portman
Dickey	Kasich	Poshard
Dicks	Kelly	Pryce
Dingell	Kennedy (MA)	Quinn
Dixon	Kennedy (RI)	Ramstad
Doggett	Kennelly	Rangel
Dooley	Kildee	Reed
Dornan	Kim	Regula
Doyle	King	Richardson
Dreier	Kingston	Riggs
Dunn	Klecza	Rivers
Durbin	Klink	Roberts

Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NJ)	Vento
Rose	Smith (TX)	Visclosky
Roth	Smith (WA)	Vucanovich
Roukema	Souder	Walker
Roybal-Allard	Spence	Walsh
Royce	Spratt	Wamp
Rush	Stearns	Ward
Sabo	Stenholm	Waters
Salmon	Stockman	Watt (NC)
Sanford	Stokes	Watts (OK)
Sawyer	Stupak	Waxman
Saxton	Talent	Weldon (FL)
Scarborough	Tate	Weldon (PA)
Schaefer	Tauzin	Weller
Schumer	Taylor (NC)	White
Scott	Tejeda	Wicker
Seastrand	Thomas	Williams
Serrano	Thompson	Wilson
Shadegg	Thornberry	Wise
Shaw	Thornton	Wolf
Shays	Thurman	Woolsey
Sisisky	Tiahrt	Wynn
Skaggs	Torkildsen	Yates
Skeen	Torres	Young (AK)
Skelton	Torricelli	Zeliff
Slaughter	Towns	Zimmer
Smith (MI)	Upton	

NAYS—57

Barrett (NE)	Hall (TX)	Quillen
Beilenson	Hancock	Rahall
Bunning	Hansen	Roemer
Campbell	Hefley	Rogers
Chenoweth	Herger	Rohrabacher
Coburn	Jacobs	Sanders
Combest	Jones	Schroeder
Condit	Laughlin	Sensenbrenner
Conyers	Lucas	Shuster
Cooley	McDermott	Solomon
Danner	Meyers	Stark
DeFazio	Miller (CA)	Stump
Doolittle	Minge	Tanner
Duncan	Mollohan	Taylor (MS)
Ehlers	Montgomery	Trafficant
Everett	Neumann	Velazquez
Fattah	Oberstar	Volkmer
Foglietta	Payne (NJ)	Whitfield
Gutknecht	Pombo	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Bateman	Harman	Radanovich
Calvert	Hastings (FL)	Schiff
Deutsch	Lincoln	Studds
Gibbons	McDade	

□ 1546

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

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I missed two rollcall votes earlier today because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall vote No. 227 and "yes" on rollcall vote No. 228.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3603, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 451 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 451

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the

House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3603) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 2(l)(6) of rule XI, clause 7 of rule XXI, or section 302(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may reduce to not less than five minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall be not less than fifteen minutes. After the reading of the final lines of the bill, a motion that the Committee of the Whole rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted shall, if offered by the majority leader or a designee, have precedence over a motion to amend. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration of H.R. 3603 pursuant to the first section of this resolution, the appropriate allocation of new discretionary budget authority within the meaning of section 302(f)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall be \$12,802,000,000. The corresponding level of budget outlays shall be \$13,349,000,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. LINDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 451 is an open rule providing for consideration of H.R. 3603, the

Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and related agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1997.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule waives clause 2(l)(6) of rule 11, clause 7 of rule 21, or section 302(c) of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill. The rule also waives clause 2 of rule 21—which prohibits unauthorized appropriations and legislation on an appropriations bill—and waives clause 6 of rule 21—which prohibits reappropriating unexpended balances of appropriations in general appropriations bills—against provisions of the bill.

Under the conditions of House Resolution 451, after the reading of the final lines of the bill, a motion to rise, if offered by the majority leader or his designee, will have precedence over a motion to amend.

Mr. Speaker, this rule continues two new approaches on appropriations bills that were implemented during last year's appropriations process. First, the rule accords priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The rule does not require preprinting, but simply encourages Members to take advantage of the option in order to facilitate consideration of amendments on the House floor and to inform Members of the details of pending amendments.

Second, House Resolution 451 provides that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone recorded votes on any amendment and that the Chairman may reduce voting time on postponed questions to 5 minutes, provided that the vote immediately follow another recorded vote and that the voting time on the first in a series of votes is not less than 15 minutes. This will provide a more definite voting schedule for all Members and hopefully will help guarantee the timely completion of the appropriations bills.

House Resolution 451 also provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions, as is the right of the minority Members of the House. Finally, in section 2 of the rule, House Resolution 451 provides that the section 602(b) allocations in the budget resolution conference report will be in effect for the consideration of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 451 is a typical open rule to be considered for general appropriations bills. This rule does not restrict the normal open amending process in any way and any amendments that comply with the standing rules of the House may be offered for consideration. I know of a number of Members who wish to modify the bill through the amendment process, and I look forward to a thorough debate on those measures. While