

# Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

---

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

---

**WHORM Subject File Code:** FI004

(Finance: Budget – Appropriations)

**Case file Number(s):** 172839

(2 of 2)

**Box:** 97

---

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digitized-textual-material>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/white-house-inventories>

Contact a reference archivist at: **reagan.library@nara.gov**

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/research-support/citation-guide>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

1 or on account of the provision of false information to the  
2 Secretary, may not--

3 (A) export any goods or technology directly or  
4 indirectly to South Africa;

5 (B) receive any credit or deduction under the  
6 Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for any income, war  
7 profits, or excess profits taxes paid or accrued to  
8 South Africa; or

9 (C) use the services of the Export-Import Bank of  
10 the United States.

11 (2)(A) In addition to the penalties set forth in  
12 paragraph (1), the Secretary may impose upon any United  
13 States person subject to those penalties--

14 (i) if other than an individual, a fine of not more  
15 than \$1,000,000, or

16 (ii) if an individual, a fine of not more than  
17 \$50,000.

18 (B)(i) Any officer, director, or employee of a United  
19 States person subject to the penalties set forth in  
20 subparagraph (A), or any individual in control of that  
21 United States person, who knowingly and willfully ordered,  
22 authorized, acquiesced in, or carried out the act or  
23 practice constituting the violation involved and (ii) any  
24 agent of such United States person who knowingly and  
25 willfully carried out such act or practice, shall be subject

1 to a fine, imposed by the Secretary, of not more than  
2 \$10,000.

3 (C) A fine imposed under subparagraph (B) may not be  
4 paid, directly or indirectly, by the United States person  
5 committing the violation involved.

6 (D) The payment of any fine imposed under this paragraph  
7 shall be deposited in the miscellaneous receipts of the  
8 Treasury. In the event of the failure of any person to pay a  
9 fine imposed under this paragraph, the fine may be recovered  
10 in a civil action in the name of the United States brought  
11 by the Secretary in an appropriate United States district  
12 court.

13 (3) Any United States person who violates the provisions  
14 of paragraph (1)(A) of this subsection shall, in addition to  
15 any other penalty specified in this Act, be fined, for each  
16 such violation, not more than five times the value of the  
17 exports involved or \$50,000, whichever is greater, or  
18 imprisoned not more than five years, or both. For purposes  
19 of paragraph (1)(A) of this subsection, "'goods'" and  
20 "'technology'" have the same meanings as are given those  
21 terms in paragraphs (3) and (4) of section 16 of the Export  
22 Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2415).

23 (e) The Secretary shall issue an order carrying out any  
24 penalty imposed under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection  
25 (d).

1       (f)(1) The Secretary shall, at least once in every  
2 2-year period, review and, in accordance with subsection  
3 (c), make a redetermination with respect to the compliance  
4 of each United States person referred to in section 711 of  
5 this Act with the provisions of this subtitle and any  
6 regulations issued to carry out this subtitle.

7       (2) In the case of any United States person with respect  
8 to whom the Secretary makes a determination under subsection  
9 (c) or paragraph (1) of this subsection either that the  
10 person is not in compliance with this subtitle or any  
11 regulations issued to carry out this subtitle, or that the  
12 compliance of the person with this subtitle or those  
13 regulations cannot be established on account of a failure to  
14 provide information to the Secretary or on account of the  
15 provision of false information to the Secretary, the  
16 Secretary shall, upon the request of that person and after  
17 giving that person an opportunity for a hearing, review and  
18 redetermine that person's compliance within 60 days after  
19 that person files the first annual report pursuant to  
20 subsection (a) of this section after the negative  
21 determination is made.

22       (g) Any United States person aggrieved by a  
23 determination of the Secretary under subsection (c) or (f)  
24 of this section may seek judicial review of that  
25 determination in accordance with the provisions of chapter 7

1 of title 5, United States Code.

2 (h) Any sanction imposed under subsection (d)(1)(B) of  
3 this section on a United States person shall first apply  
4 with respect to the taxable year in which the determination  
5 on the basis of which the sanction was imposed is made under  
6 subsection (c) or (f), as the case may be.

7 (i) The Secretary shall submit an annual report to the  
8 Congress on the compliance of those United States persons  
9 referred to in section 711 of this Act with the provisions  
10 of this subtitle.

11 REGULATIONS

12 SEC. 715. (a) The Secretary shall, after consulting with  
13 the Advisory Councils established pursuant to section 713 of  
14 this Act, issue such regulations as are necessary to carry  
15 out this subtitle. Such regulations shall be issued not  
16 later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this  
17 Act. The Secretary shall establish dates by which United  
18 States persons must comply with the different provisions of  
19 this subtitle, except that the date for compliance with all  
20 the provisions of this subtitle shall not be later than one  
21 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

22 (b) Before issuing final regulations pursuant to  
23 subsection (a), the Secretary shall publish in the Federal  
24 Register the regulations proposed to be issued and shall  
25 give interested persons at least 30 days to submit comments

1 on the proposed regulations. The Secretary shall, in issuing  
2 the final regulations, take into account the comments so  
3 submitted.

4 WAIVER OR TERMINATION OF PROVISIONS

5 SEC. 716. (a) In any case in which the President  
6 determines that compliance by a United States person with  
7 the provisions of this subtitle would harm the national  
8 security of the United States, the President may waive those  
9 provisions with respect to that United States person. The  
10 President shall publish in the Federal Register each waiver  
11 granted under this subsection and shall submit to the  
12 Congress each such waiver and the justification for granting  
13 the waiver. Any such waiver shall become effective at the  
14 end of 30 calendar days after the date on which the waiver  
15 is submitted to the Congress unless the Congress, within  
16 that 30-day period, adopts a concurrent resolution  
17 disapproving the waiver.

18 (b) Upon a written determination by the President that  
19 the Government of South Africa has terminated its practice  
20 of systematic racial discrimination and allows all the  
21 people of South Africa, regardless of race or ethnic origin,  
22 to participate fully in the social, political, and economic  
23 life in that country, the provisions of this subtitle and  
24 any regulations issued to carry out this subtitle shall  
25 cease to be effective.

1 SUBTITLE 2--PROHIBITION ON LOANS AND IMPORTATION OF GOLD

2 COINS

3 LOANS TO SOUTH AFRICA

4 SEC. 721. (a) No bank or other financial or lending  
5 institution operating under the laws of the United States  
6 (including any insurance company) may make any loan directly  
7 or through a foreign subsidiary to the South African  
8 Government or to any corporation, partnership, or other  
9 organization which is owned or controlled by the South  
10 African Government, as determined under regulations issued  
11 by the Secretary. The prohibition contained in this  
12 subsection shall not apply to loans for educational,  
13 housing, or health facilities which are available to all  
14 persons on a totally nondiscriminatory basis and which are  
15 located in geographic areas accessible to all population  
16 groups without any legal or administrative restriction.

17 (b) The prohibition contained in subsection (a) of this  
18 section shall not apply to any loan or extension of credit  
19 for which an agreement is entered into before the date of  
20 the enactment of this Act.

21 GOLD COINS

22 SEC. 722. No person, including any bank or other  
23 financial or lending institution operating under the laws of  
24 the United States, may import into the United States any  
25 South African krugerrand or any other gold coin minted in

1 South Africa or offered for sale by the South African  
2 Government.

3 ENFORCEMENT; PENALTIES

4 SEC. 723. (a) The Secretary, in consultation with the  
5 Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce,  
6 shall take the necessary steps to insure compliance with the  
7 provisions of this subtitle, including--

8 (1) issuing such regulations as the Secretary  
9 considers necessary to carry out this subtitle;

10 (2) establishing mechanisms to monitor compliance  
11 with the provisions of this subtitle and any regulations  
12 issued pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection;

13 (3) in any case in which the Secretary has reason to  
14 believe that a violation of subsection (a) has occurred  
15 or is about to occur, referring the matter to the  
16 Attorney General for appropriate action; and

17 (4) in any case in which the Secretary has reason to  
18 believe that any person has furnished the Secretary with  
19 false information relating to the provisions of this  
20 subtitle, referring the matter to the Attorney General  
21 for appropriate action.

22 (b)(1) Any person, other than an individual, that  
23 violates section 721 or 722 of this Act shall be fined not  
24 more than \$1,000,000.

25 (2) Any individual who violates section 721 of this Act



1 shall be fined not more than \$50,000, or imprisoned not more  
2 than five years, or both.

3 (3) Any individual who violates section 722 of this Act  
4 shall be fined not more than five times the value of the  
5 krugerrands or gold coins involved.

6 (c)(1) Whenever a person violates section 721 or 722 of  
7 this Act--

8 (A) any officer, director, or employee of such  
9 person, or any natural person in control of such person,  
10 who knowingly and willfully ordered, authorized,  
11 acquiesced in, or carried out the act or practice  
12 constituting the violation, and

13 (B) any agent of such person who knowingly and  
14 willfully carried out such act or practice,  
15 shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than \$10,000, or  
16 imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

17 (2) A fine imposed under paragraph (1) on an individual  
18 for an act or practice constituting a violation may not be  
19 paid, directly or indirectly, by the person committing the  
20 violation itself.

21 WAIVER BY PRESIDENT

22 SEC. 724. The President may waive the prohibitions  
23 contained in sections 721 and 722 of this Act for periods of  
24 not more than one year each if the President determines that  
25 the Government of South Africa has made substantial progress

1 toward the full participation of all the people of South  
2 Africa in the social, political, and economic life in that  
3 country and toward an end to discrimination based on race or  
4 ethnic origin. The President shall submit any such  
5 determination, and the basis therefor, to the Congress.  
6 Each such waiver shall take effect at the end of 30 calendar  
7 days after the date on which that determination is submitted  
8 to the Congress unless the Congress, within that 30-day  
9 period, adopts a concurrent resolution disapproving that  
10 determination.

11 SUBTITLE 3--GENERAL PROVISIONS

12 COOPERATION OF OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

13 SEC. 731. (a) Each department and agency of the United  
14 States shall cooperate with the Secretary in carrying out  
15 the provisions of this title, including, upon the request of  
16 the Secretary, taking steps to insure compliance with the  
17 provisions of this title and any regulations issued to carry  
18 out this title.

19 (b) The Secretary may secure directly from any  
20 department or agency of the United States information  
21 necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out the  
22 Secretary's functions under this title.

23 DEFINITIONS

24 SEC. 732. For purposes of this title--

25 (1) the term "'United States person'" means any

1 United States resident or national and any domestic  
2 concern (including any permanent domestic establishment  
3 of any foreign concern);

4 (2) the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of  
5 State;

6 (3) the term ''South Africa'' includes the Republic  
7 of South Africa; any territory under the administration,  
8 legal or illegal, of South Africa; and the  
9 ''bantustans'' or ''homelands'', to which South African  
10 blacks are assigned on the basis of ethnic origin,  
11 including the Transkei, Bophuthatswana, and Venda; and

12 (4) a United States person shall be presumed to  
13 control a corporation, partnership, or other enterprise  
14 in South Africa if--

15 (A) the United States person beneficially owns  
16 or controls (whether directly or indirectly) more  
17 than 50 percent of the outstanding voting securities  
18 of the corporation, partnership, or enterprise;

19 (B) the United States person beneficially owns  
20 or controls (whether directly or indirectly) 25  
21 percent or more of the voting securities of the  
22 corporation, partnership, or enterprise, if no other  
23 person owns or controls (whether directly or  
24 indirectly) an equal or larger percentage;

25 (C) the corporation, partnership, or enterprise

1 is operated by the United States person pursuant to  
2 the provisions of an exclusive management contract;

3 (D) a majority of the members of the board of  
4 directors of the corporation, partnership, or  
5 enterprise are also members of the comparable  
6 governing body of the United States person;

7 (E) the United States person has authority to  
8 appoint a majority of the members of the board of  
9 directors of the corporation, partnership, or  
10 enterprise; or

11 (F) the United States person has authority to  
12 appoint the chief operating officer of the  
13 corporation, partnership, or enterprise.

14 APPLICABILITY TO EVASIONS OF TITLE

15 SEC. 733. (a) Subtitle 1 of this title shall apply to  
16 any United States person who undertakes or causes to be  
17 undertaken any transaction or activity with the intent to  
18 evade the provisions of subtitle 1 of this title or any  
19 regulations issued to carry out that subtitle.

20 (b) Subtitle 2 of this title shall apply to any bank or  
21 other financial or lending institution operating under the  
22 laws of the United States, or to any other person, who or  
23 which undertakes or causes to be undertaken any transaction  
24 or activity with the intent to evade the provisions of  
25 subtitle 2 of this title or any regulations issued to carry

1 out that subtitle.

2 CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTIONS

3 SEC. 734. (a) Any resolution described in section 716(a)  
4 or 724 of this Act shall be considered in the Senate in  
5 accordance with the provisions of section 601(b) of the  
6 International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control  
7 Act of 1976.

8 (b) For the purpose of expediting the consideration and  
9 adoption of resolutions described in sections 716(a) and 724  
10 of this Act, a motion to proceed to the consideration of any  
11 such resolution after it has been reported by the  
12 appropriate committee shall be treated as highly privileged  
13 in the House of Representatives.

14 CONSTRUCTION OF TITLE; SEVERABILITY

15 SEC. 735. (a) Nothing in this title shall be construed  
16 as constituting any recognition by the United States of the  
17 homelands referred to in section 732(3) of this Act.

18 (b) If any provision of this title or the application of  
19 this title to any person or circumstance is held invalid,  
20 neither the remainder of this title nor the application of  
21 that provision to other persons or circumstances shall be  
22 affected thereby.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEARS 1984 AND 1985 FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY, THE BOARD FOR INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING, THE INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION, AND THE ASIA FOUNDATION, TO ESTABLISH THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

MAY 16, 1983.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. ZABLOCKI, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs,  
submitted the following

## REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 2915]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 2915) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1984 and 1985 for the Department of State, the United States Information Agency, the Board for International Broadcasting, the Inter-American Foundation, and the Asia Foundation, to establish the National Endowment for Democracy, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

### COMMITTEE ACTION

On March 1, 1983, the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, Hon. Powell A. Moore, sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives Executive Communication 461 which contained a draft bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1984 and 1985 for the Department of State, and for other purposes. This communication was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and on March 3, 1983, the chairman, Hon. Clement J. Zablocki, referred it to the Subcommittee on International Operations.

On March 9, 1983, the Director of the United States Information Agency, Hon. Charles Z. Wick, sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives Executive Communication 520 which contained a draft bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1984 and 1985

The committee notes that these amounts are identical to the original budget requests for the Asia Foundation, but that the request was submitted as part of the U.S. Information Agency budget. Since this was done as a matter of budgetary convenience and not to reflect a change in the authority or activities of the Foundation, the committee has moved the budgeted amounts back to the State Department budget, as reflected in the chart under title I above. The committee also notes that the executive branch request reflects the desire to include the programs of the Asia Foundation as part of the thrust of "Project Democracy," an administration initiative to emphasize the promotion of democratic institution-building, training, and development overseas. Since these have been the purposes of the Foundation for its entire history, the committee sees no reason to alter the oversight relationship between the Foundation and the Department of State, nor to suggest that the Foundation's independence, its charter or activities should alter in any way.

#### TITLE VI—NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY

##### *Section 601—Short title*

This section provides a short title of "National Endowment for Democracy Act" for the provisions of this title. This legislation is a response to the felt need to increase the U.S. public diplomacy effort overseas in a manner which involves U.S. private sector initiatives to strengthen democratic values and institutions abroad.

Over the past 40 years, the United States has been committed to the goals of democratic institution-building abroad. During this same period, the Congress, under both Democratic and Republican leadership, has supported and helped to shape the national consensus in favor of such initiatives. From the earliest days of the Marshall plan, "Point 4" economic assistance, the advent of international broadcasting as an element of public diplomacy, and government-supported exchange programs such as those authorized by the Fulbright-Hays Act, several themes have recurred.

Such initiatives reflected concretely the underlying national consensus on broad U.S. foreign policy goals. Second, the new programs did not threaten to undermine—either by accident or design—the funding and operations of other existing popularly supported programs. Third, the new programs enjoyed genuine bipartisan support across a wide spectrum of American leadership opinion. The programs funded by the National Endowment for Democracy are intended to reflect these criteria.

This new proposal is the result of a 6-month nongovernmental research study by the two major U.S. political parties, labor, and business—involving Democrats, Republicans, liberals, moderates, and conservatives—to design new, private sector approaches which will foster and strengthen democratic values and institutions abroad. Named the Democracy Program, this study was often confused with the Reagan administration's \$65 million proposal for a "Project Democracy," discussed in title II above, whose broad purposes are to enhance and increase existing public diplomacy programs of the U.S. Government, and to develop new governmental



initiatives to promote democracy and democratic institution-building overseas.

Private sector efforts in the past have been fruitful, except for the AFL-CIO's regional institutes and a range of programs sponsored by leading foundations and private voluntary organizations. Indeed, for several decades, the AFL-CIO had been running regional institutes in Latin America, Africa, and Asia, often working under difficult local circumstances in nondemocratic societies to support democratic trade unions and train their organizers. Since World War II the American labor movement has also been active in efforts to support democratic workers' movements, first in Western Europe—when threatened by Communist disruptions in the bleak aftermath of the war—and most recently in Eastern Europe with its assistance to Poland's Solidarity movement.

Nonetheless, there has never been a comprehensive structure for a nongovernmental effort through which the resources of America's private sector constituencies—the separate and autonomous programs of energetic institutions—could be mobilized effectively. Those involved in the Democracy Program recognized from the beginning that to be effective, such a structure should have the involvement of both national political parties, organized labor, and the business community, among other private institutions.

Nor was the Democracy Program first to recognize the problem or pioneer in creating solutions. During the 1950's President Eisenhower, Senators J. William Fulbright and Hubert H. Humphrey, and leaders of the American labor movement, such as George Meany and Walter Reuther, proposed and developed mechanisms to assist democratic institutional development abroad openly and through the private sector.

A decade later, during the months that followed the public revelation in 1967 of the CIA's covert funding of overseas activities by some American private voluntary organizations, the Johnson administration concluded after careful study that the U.S. Government should totally halt all secret financial subsidies to such nongovernmental groups. At the same time, Johnson officials urged creation of a new, quasi-autonomous nongovernmental organization ("Quango") to provide public funds openly for the overseas activities of American private-sector groups engaged in worthwhile international programs. Anticipating the Johnson proposals, a number of House Members, led by Hon. Dante B. Fascell, introduced in April 1967 a bill to create an Institute of International Affairs. Unfortunately, concern over the problem of past covert funding overrode sufficient interest in constructive future solutions beyond terminating all CIA involvement.

Events and institutions in Europe triggered new interest in the possibility of a nongovernmental "democracy quango" during the late 1970's. Americans became committed to participating in the process of monitoring the Helsinki accords, especially in human rights ("Basket Three") provisions as these affected Soviet bloc behavior. This concern led not only to the creation of the bipartisan Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe but also to legislation introduced in 1978 to establish an "Institute on Human Rights and Freedoms" (among other bills introduced on similar



themes). The House Committee on International Relations reported the measure only to have it blocked in the full House.

Independently, during this same period a number of American political leaders became intrigued by the activities of the German "stiftungen"—the political foundations which now collectively receive over \$150 million annually from the German Bundestag. These four publicly funded foundations in the Federal Republic of Germany are each allied to a major political party. Today, these foundations sponsor efforts in over five dozen countries to encourage the institutional development vital to the emergence of pluralist cultures. The work undertaken by the Konrad Adenauer (CDU), Friedrich Ebert (SPD), Friedrich Naumann (FDU), and Hans Seidel (CSU) foundations has been so effective that the idea of party foundations has spread to countries as diverse as Spain (which recently created its own political foundations after witnessing the helpful role played by the German foundations in sustaining Spanish democracy), Portugal, Venezuela, and the United States.

Similarly, the American labor movement was taking stock of the effects of U.S. withdrawal from the International Labor Organization (ILO) in 1977. AFL-CIO leaders renewed their longstanding interest in the possibility of expanding the Federation's international work. They explored the possibility of a legislatively created labor foundation that could disburse public funds to its existing institutes and other organizations doing labor-supported international work.

A number of these interests came together in the spring of 1982 to produce a critical mass of public attention. A study was proposed in a letter to the President by the bipartisan American Political Foundation and the Democratic and Republican Party chairmen to determine ways and means for promoting the growth of democracy and democratic institutions. The letter referred specifically to the German party foundations' "open and effective programs to support democratic political forces throughout the world," and suggested that the study—which would be conducted under the auspices of the bipartisan American Political Foundation—"take up such questions as whether programs should be bipartisan, what, if any, should be the connection with the government, how to handle the tension between maintaining friendly relations with current governments while sowing the seeds of democratic successors, how to encourage domestic pluralistic forces in totalitarian countries, and what levels of resources are required."

President Reagan devoted space to the research study in his June 1982 address to the British Parliament. His comments attracted largely favorable reactions. Such reservations as emerged centered upon three issues: Concern lest the programs proposed be other than long-range and bipartisan in scope; anxiety that the administration would attempt to exploit the research study for immediate propaganda purposes in its broader public diplomacy initiatives; and opposition to a dominant political tilt in defining the context and recipients of democratic political assistance. The subsequent recommendations of the Democracy Program study put these fears to rest.

During the summer and fall of 1982, considerable time and energy was devoted to arranging the delicate balance of political

and institutional interests within the structure of the research study, in close consultation with the leadership of the two major political parties and the leaders of the AFL-CIO and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. In the late fall, the Democracy Program study was officially launched with the announcement of a bipartisan executive board and program director. A staff and initial consultants were selected who were broadly representative of the areas of scholarly expertise and political balance required by the study, including representatives of the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, labor, and business programs.

Subsequently, the report of The Democracy Program entitled "The Commitment to Democracy: A Bipartisan Approach" was issued. Its recommendations are reflected in this title. Among the functions envisioned for the Endowment are the following: (a) To perform general oversight functions relating to its activities to insure that the charter's purposes are being met; (b) to evaluate grant proposals from the private sector and to support the collaborative efforts of private sector grantees to design programs which combine their experience and institutional perspectives; (c) to provide scholarships and fellowships which carry out the purposes of the Endowment and support programs designed to teach democratic concepts; (d) to serve as the "umbrella" organization through which the four party, labor, and business instrumentalities, enumerated in section 611, may receive funding (in addition to those amounts already earmarked) and within which each one can evolve independently, but in a cooperative and collaborative manner; (e) to serve as an intermediary between private sector groups and as a clearinghouse for inquiries and proposals in order to bring groups together and to create new opportunities for democratic assistance.

#### *Section 602—Establishment of the National Endowment for Democracy*

Section 602(a) authorizes the establishment of a private, nonprofit corporation called the National Endowment for Democracy.

Section 602(b) provides that the Endowment will not be considered an agency or establishment of the U.S. Government.

Section 602(c) provides that the Endowment will be subject to the provisions of this title. In addition, to the extent consistent with this title, the Endowment will also be subject to the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act.

Section 602(d) provides that the principal offices of the Endowment shall be located in the District of Columbia.

#### *Section 603—Purposes of the Endowment*

Section 603(a) outlines the purposes of the Endowment, thus defining the parameters of its activities.

Section 603(a)(1) describes the broad purpose of the Endowment, which is to use private sector initiatives to encourage free and democratic institutions worldwide. This specifically includes activities which promote individual rights and freedoms.

Section 603(a)(2) outlines one of the major methods which will be used by private sector groups carrying out the purposes of the Endowment. The section contemplates the use of exchanges between



U.S. private sector groups and democratic groups abroad in order to carry out the purposes of the Endowment. Among the private sector groups which will be involved in such exchanges are the Democratic and Republican parties and U.S. labor and business groups.

Section 603(a)(3) provides for the promotion of U.S. nongovernmental participation generally in democratic training programs and democratic institution-building abroad. Particular mention is made of the major U.S. political parties, labor and business, as well as other private sector groups.

Section 603(a)(4) enunciates the purpose of strengthening democratic electoral processes abroad in cooperation with democratic groups in a given country. This arrangement would involve agreement between the relevant groups in the United States and in the host country.

Section 603(a)(5) states as a purpose of the Endowment support for the participation of the major political parties, labor, business, and other U.S. private sector groups to foster cooperation with groups abroad dedicated to the cultural values, institutions and organizations of democratic pluralism.

Section 603(a)(6) states that the activities of the Endowment in encouraging the establishment and growth of democratic development are to be consistent with broad U.S. national interests and with the requirements of democratic groups abroad assisted by programs funded by the Endowment.

Section 603(b)(1) states specifically that the Endowment will provide funds for programs, but will not actually run programs itself.

Section 603(b)(2) states that funding will only be provided for programs meeting the purposes of the Endowment.

Section 603(b)(3) provides that the Endowment and its grantees will be subject to the oversight procedures of the Congress.

#### *Section 604—Incorporation of the Endowment*

Section 604(a) sets forth the 15 initial incorporators of the Endowment. These individuals will take the steps necessary to incorporate the National Endowment for Democracy under the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act. This includes drafting of the articles of incorporation and the bylaws, which will reflect the provisions of this title. The listed incorporators represent a cross-section of Americans active in businesses, labor, the major political parties and with expertise in foreign policy, public diplomacy, and the like.

Section 604(b) provides that the Honorable Dante B. Fascell shall serve as Chairman of the incorporators and interim Chairman of the Endowment until such time as a Chairman is elected under the bylaws of the Endowment. Is it expected that, during the pendency of the interim chairman, no funds will be disbursed by the Endowment.

#### *Section 605—Board of Directors*

Section 605(a) provides that the Endowment will be governed by a 15-member Board of Directors. Following the initial incorporation period, when the Board will consists of those individuals set forth

in Section 604 above, the Board will be self-perpetuating and elected in accordance with the Endowment's bylaws.

Section 605(b) provides that vacancies in the Board's membership shall not affect its powers. This provision reflects common practice.

Section 605(c) states that members of the Board shall not be deemed to be officers or employees of the United States. The section provides for per diem for the Board members while performing their duties.

#### *Section 606—Officers of the Endowment*

Section 606(a) provides that the chief executive officer of the Endowment shall be a President appointed by the Board. The President will carry out the daily operations of the Board, and will report to the Board under appropriate guidelines and procedures.

Section 606(b) provides for staff of the Endowment. The number and type will be determined by the Board.

Section 606(c) provides that the terms of officers of the Endowment will be set by the Board.

Section 606(d) prohibits officers of the Endowment from receiving compensation from any source other than the Endowment during the period of their employment by the Endowment.

#### *Section 607—Nonprofit nature of the Endowment*

Section 607(a) precludes the Endowment from issuing stock or paying dividends. This reflects the nonprofit character of the Endowment.

Section 607(b) prohibits any Board member, officer, or employee of the Endowment from gaining any personal benefit from the corporate assets of the Endowment, other than from duly authorized compensation.

#### *Section 608—Records and audit of the Endowment and the recipients of assistance*

Section 608 provides for normal auditing procedures for the Endowment and its grantees.

Section 608(a)(1) provides for regular annual audits of the Endowment by independent auditors. The section requires that all appropriate materials be made available for the audit.

Section 608(a)(2) requires that the independent audits are to be included in the annual report required by section 609 below. It further requires that the audit report set forth the scope of the audit and any other statements necessary to present a complete audit picture.

Section 608(b)(1) permits the financial transactions of the Endowment to be audited annually by the General Accounting Office. The section also provides for appropriate access by representatives of the General Accounting Office to materials necessary to the audits.

Section 608(b)(2) requires that the Comptroller General's audit report be sent to the Congress. It may contain such comments and information as the Comptroller General deems necessary to explain the audit. In addition, the report is required to discuss any transaction which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, has been conducted without legal authority. The section also provides that

copies of the audit report be sent to the President and to the Endowment when the report is submitted to the Congress.

Section 608(c)(1) provides that grantees of the Endowment must keep records appropriate to the conduct of an audit.

Section 608(c)(2) provides access to the Endowment or its duly authorized representatives (such as an independent auditor), for the purpose of auditing the records of the grantees. The same access is authorized for the Comptroller General of the United States or his or her duly authorized representatives.

#### *Section 609—Report of the Congress*

Section 609 provides for an annual report by the Endowment to the Congress. The report shall be submitted by December 31 of each year and shall include a comprehensive and detailed report of the Endowment's activities, operations, finances, and accomplishments, together with any recommendations the Endowment deems appropriate. The section further requires the Board members and officers of the Endowment to be available to testify before appropriate congressional committees.

#### *Section 610—Funding for the Endowment*

Section 610 provides the funding mechanism for the Endowment. Subsection (a) provides authority for the Director of the U.S. Information Agency to make grants to the Endowment from the "Salaries and Expenses" account of the agency. Subsection (b) permits the Endowment to use such funds for the purposes of the Endowment without regard to any limitation or guidelines normally imposed by USIA for its grantmaking activities.

#### *Section 611—Allocation of funds*

Section 611 earmarks specific amounts of money in fiscal years 1984 and 1985 for certain grantees of the Endowment. These include not less than \$5 million for each of the 2 fiscal years for the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs; not less than \$5 million for each of the 2 fiscal years for the National Republican Institute for International Affairs; not less than \$13,800,000 for the Free Trade Union Institute; and not less than \$2,500,000 for support of the private enterprise development programs of the National Chamber Foundation.

### REQUIRED REPORTS SECTION

#### COST ESTIMATE

The committee estimates that, assuming the full appropriation of the amounts authorized in this bill, the total budget authority required to carry out the provisions of H.R. 2915 will be an additional \$41,823,000 for fiscal year 1983, \$3,289,297,000 for fiscal year 1984, and \$3,590,708,000, for fiscal year 1985. The fiscal year allocation of the total cost is set forth in the Congressional Budget Office estimate below. The committee agrees with the protected cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office.



## INFLATIONARY IMPACT STATEMENT

The total fiscal year 1984 authorization contained in H.R. 2915 (\$3,289,297,000), if fully appropriated, would only amount to 0.36 percent of the President's total budget authority request for fiscal year 1984. In the committee's view, the negligible impact on inflationary forces of the authorization contained in this bill is far outweighed by the foreign policy purposes which the legislation addresses.

## STATEMENTS REQUIRED BY CLAUSE 2 (L) (3) OF HOUSE RULE XI

*(a) Oversight findings and recommendations*

As noted earlier in this report under "Committee Action," the Subcommittee on International Operations conducted extensive hearings on the executive branch's request. The subcommittee also held numerous oversight hearings on protection of Americans abroad, international communications and information policy, Foreign Service personnel issues, and U.N. finances. Other oversight activities which contributed to the formulation of this legislation included member and staff attendance at international conferences and various U.S. consular conferences and staff study missions investigating operational problems at U.S. missions overseas.

Based on these oversight activities, the subcommittee recommends adoption of the authorizations and provisions contained in H.R. 2915.

*(b) Budget authority*

The enactment of H.R. 2915 will create no new budget authority.

*(c) Committee on Government Operations summary*

No oversight findings and recommendations which relate to this measure have been received by the Committee on Government Operations under clause 4(c)(2) of rule X of the rules of the House.

## CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE—COST ESTIMATE

MAY 13, 1983.

1. Bill No.: H.R. 2915.
2. Bill title: To authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1984 and 1985 for the Department of State, the United States Information Agency, the Board for International Broadcasting, the Inter-American Foundation, and the Asia Foundation, to establish the National Endowment for Democracy, and for other purposes.
3. Bill status: As order reported by the House Committee of Foreign Affairs, May 12, 1983.
4. Bill purpose: The bill authorizes appropriations for the fiscal year 1984 and 1985 for the Department of State, the United States Information Agency, the Board for International Broadcasting, the Inter-American Foundation, the Asia Foundation, to establish the National Endowment for Democracy, and for other purposes. The bill authorized \$41.8 million in supplementals for the fiscal year 1983, \$3,284.0 million for the fiscal year 1984, and \$3,590.8 million for the fiscal year 1985.
5. Estimated cost to the Federal Government:

## INFLATIONARY IMPACT STATEMENT

The total fiscal year 1984 authorization contained in H.R. 2915 (\$3,289,297,000), if fully appropriated, would only amount to 0.36 percent of the President's total budget authority request for fiscal year 1984. In the committee's view, the negligible impact on inflationary forces of the authorization contained in this bill is far outweighed by the foreign policy purposes which the legislation addresses.

## STATEMENTS REQUIRED BY CLAUSE 2 (L) (3) OF HOUSE RULE XI

*(a) Oversight findings and recommendations*

As noted earlier in this report under "Committee Action," the Subcommittee on International Operations conducted extensive hearings on the executive branch's request. The subcommittee also held numerous oversight hearings on protection of Americans abroad, international communications and information policy, Foreign Service personnel issues, and U.N. finances. Other oversight activities which contributed to the formulation of this legislation included member and staff attendance at international conferences and various U.S. consular conferences and staff study missions investigating operational problems at U.S. missions overseas.

Based on these oversight activities, the subcommittee recommends adoption of the authorizations and provisions contained in H.R. 2915.

*(b) Budget authority*

The enactment of H.R. 2915 will create no new budget authority.

*(c) Committee on Government Operations summary*

No oversight findings and recommendations which relate to this measure have been received by the Committee on Government Operations under clause 4(c)(2) of rule X of the rules of the House.

## CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE—COST ESTIMATE

MAY 13, 1983.

1. Bill No.: H.R. 2915.
2. Bill title: To authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1984 and 1985 for the Department of State, the United States Information Agency, the Board for International Broadcasting, the Inter-American Foundation, and the Asia Foundation, to establish the National Endowment for Democracy, and for other purposes.
3. Bill status: As order reported by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, May 12, 1983.
4. Bill purpose: The bill authorizes appropriations for the fiscal year 1984 and 1985 for the Department of State, the United States Information Agency, the Board for International Broadcasting, the Inter-American Foundation, the Asia Foundation, to establish the National Endowment for Democracy, and for other purposes. The bill authorized \$41.8 million in supplementals for the fiscal year 1983, \$3,284.0 million for the fiscal year 1984, and \$3,590.8 million for the fiscal year 1985.
5. Estimated cost to the Federal Government:

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988
Budget function 150:						
Authorization level.....	41.8	3,260.8	3,563.3			
Estimated outlays.....	38.2	2,644.6	3,295.0	684.5	183.5	15.4
Budget function 300:						
Authorization level.....		23.2	27.5			
Estimated outlays.....		20.7	26.9	2.6	0.5	
Budget function 920:						
Authorization level.....		48.0	47.5			
Estimated outlays.....		48.0	47.5			

Basis of estimate.—The authorization levels are those stated in the bill. This estimate is based upon the assumption that the bill will be enacted by July 31, 1983, and that the authorization levels shown will be appropriated. Pay raise assumptions for budget function 920 are based upon CBO baseline pay raise assumptions. Outlay rates are based upon historical outlay rates for each sub-function.

It should be noted that payment to the foreign service retirement fund will, under current law, be appropriated in full. The absence of changes in subsequent law affecting retirement benefits and costs would force a reduction of other accounts within the administration of foreign affairs. This cost estimate assumes a reduction in the salaries and expenses portion of the administration of foreign affairs.

6. Estimated cost to State and local governments: None.
7. Estimate comparison: None.
8. Previous CBO estimate: None.
9. Estimate prepared by: Carla Kruytbosch.
10. Estimate approved by:

JAMES L. BLUM,  
*Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.*

#### CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

In compliance with clause 3 of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

#### JOINT RESOLUTION OF JULY 12, 1960

JOINT RESOLUTION To authorize appropriations incident to United States participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, [That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State (a) the sum of \$10,514 for payment by the United States of certain contributions for the support of the International Bureau of Intellectual Property for the period beginning July 1, 1950, and extending through the fiscal year expiring June 30, 1959; and*

*(b) Such sums as may be required for the payment by the United States of its proportionate share of the expenses of said interna-*



tional bureau as determined under article 16(4) of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, as revised, except that in no event shall the payment for any year exceed 4.5 per centum of all expenses of the bureau apportioned among countries for that year.] *That funds appropriated to the Secretary of State for "International Organizations and Conferences" shall be available for the payment by the United States of its proportionate share of the expenses of the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property for any year after 1981 as determined under Article 16(4) of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, as revised, except that in no event shall the payment for any year exceed 5.0 percent of all expenses of the Bureau apportioned among countries for that year.*

#### SECTION 5 OF THE JOINT RESOLUTION OF JULY 11, 1956

JOINT RESOLUTION To authorize participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization

SEC. 5. In addition to the amounts authorized by section 2, there is authorized to be appropriated \$50,000 for fiscal year 1977 to meet the expenses incurred by the United States group in hosting the twenty-second annual meeting of the North Atlantic Assembly. Amounts appropriated under this section are authorized to remain available until expended. *In addition to the amounts authorized by section 2, \$300,000 of the funds appropriated for the Department of State for "International Organizations and Conferences" for fiscal year 1984 shall be for the expenses incurred by the United States group in hosting the thirty-first annual meeting of the North Atlantic Assembly.*

#### STATE DEPARTMENT BASIC AUTHORITIES ACT OF 1956

#### TITLE I—BASIC AUTHORITIES GENERALLY

[SEC. 8. The Secretary of State may, when authorized in an appropriation or other law, transfer to any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government, with the consent of the head thereof, any funds appropriated to the Department of State, for direct expenditure by such department, agency, or independent establishment for the purposes for which the funds are appropriated.]

*SEC. 8. The Secretary of State may allocate or transfer to any department, agency, or independent establishment of the United States Government (with the consent of the head of such department, agency, or establishment) any funds appropriated to the Department of State, for direct expenditure by such department, agency, or independent establishment for the purposes for which the funds were appropriated in accordance with authority granted in this act or*

## ARMS CONTROL UPDATE

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

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the President on his statement yesterday and for what I believe is a change in direction in the area of arms control. We are on the road toward stability, getting away from first strike capacity.

I also want to congratulate the President for his flexibility in his advice and directions that he is giving to his negotiators. This is an awesome responsibility that the President carries to bring sanity and order to the arms race in this world.

This has been a bipartisan effort in this Chamber and in the Senate to work with the President. This bipartisan effort must be sustained, must continue if we are going to achieve real arms control.

The President deserves our congratulations.

## SENOR ALFARO'S COURAGEOUS DECISION

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, there is an ever growing number of Nicaraguans disassociating themselves from the Sandinista regime in that country. We should not be surprised at this; history is replete with examples of the many who seek to leave totalitarian countries to escape the tyrannies of communism.

Yesterday the Nicaraguan consul general in New Orleans, Augustin Alfaro, asked for political asylum in the United States instead of joining his counterparts who are returning to Nicaragua after being expelled by our Government. The Nicaraguan diplomats were told to leave, of course, because their Government expelled three U.S. Embassy officials on Monday.

As one who has the privilege of representing New Orleans in this body, I want to direct special attention to Senor Alfaro's instructive decision. It took great courage, and I hope that my colleagues will take time to consider its meaning, and to ask themselves why he does not want to return to the bosom of the Marxist Sandinista regime.

## MORE PRAISE FOR SENATOR HOLLINGS

(Without objection, Mr. MICHEL was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on April 18 during the 1-minute speeches, I praised Senator ERNEST HOLLINGS of South Carolina for his frank and quite accurate views on the failings of his party.

You may recall what Senator HOLLINGS said about the Democratic Party:

Everytime a special interest appeared, we responded, every time a problem arose, we offered a single solution—money.

At that time I praised Senator HOLLINGS for performing a public service.

He has done so again and I want to share his wise insights with you.

In yesterday's New York Times, speaking of President Reagan, Senator HOLLINGS stated:

The definite perception (among voters) is "Ye Gods, this fellow's got a \$200 billion deficit, but if we let Tip O'Neill and Cranston and Mondale and Hart and that crowd get back in there there'll be \$400 billion deficits."

Mr. Speaker, I thought our colleagues might want to know that Senator HOLLINGS is still willing to tell the truth about his party's flaws and follies. I hope his splendid example is followed on the other side of the aisle in the House.

## A BETTER SCHEDULE FOR THE HOUSE

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

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to salute the leadership of this House, particularly the statement made by our distinguished majority leader an hour ago as to the schedule of this body.

I am sure none of our constituents will ever really understand how great it is for a Member of the House to be able to plan what he or she is going to do clear through next Tuesday. I think this is a step in the right direction. The majority leader alluded to the Congressman who hit the ceiling for missing 16 votes. Well, based on the reasonable expectations of what the schedule would be here, I only missed 8 votes last Friday and was only climbing the walls.

I do not underestimate for a minute the difficulty in scheduling this body. I appreciate the efforts of the majority leader and the Speaker to accommodate the Membership and hope they will have more success in the future.

Next week the U.S. Interparliamentary Group will be leaving to meet in Orlando with our Canadian counterparts. We who have been appointed to this group just hope in the scheduling the leadership will take account of the fact that we will be leaving next Thursday around 2 o'clock. I hope the scheduling of votes would attempt to accommodate the Membership.

## SGT. ROY BENAVIDEZ DOES IT AGAIN

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, I rise to commend Sgt.

Roy Benavidez of Texas. Some of you might remember Sergeant Benavidez received the Congressional Medal of Honor for saving several of his comrades while under fire in Vietnam. He was disabled and recently this administration's policy on social security disability took Sergeant Benavidez off the role. Now in their embarrassment they want Sergeant Benavidez back on. So, he is going to bring with him some 300,000 Americans that were being taken off the roles and so Sergeant Benavidez now is saving 300,000 disabled persons from being taken off the roles. I would recommend that the administration consider giving him the Medal of Freedom for helping in peace as he did in war. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1984 AND 1985

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 198 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 198

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 the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2915) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1984 and 1985 for the Department of State, the United States Information Agency, the Board for International Broadcasting, the Inter-American Foundation, and the Asia Foundation, to establish the National Endowment for Democracy, and for other purposes, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against the consideration of the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344) are hereby waived, and all points of order against the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 5, rule XXI are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule by titles instead of by sections, and each title shall be considered as having been read. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I intend to make a unanimous consent request, but prior to that I would like to explain why.

In the Rules Committee, the Rules Committee gave 1 hour to the bill but



somewhere along the line, either upon leaving the Rules Committee or when it got to the printer, there was a typographical error in which the rule now provides 3 hours. Both sides agree that it is not necessary for us to have 3 hours of general debate.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on page 2, line 15, of House Resolution 198 "three hours" be stricken and "one hour" be inserted in lieu thereof.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TAYLOR) for purposes of debate only, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HALL of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 198 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2915, the Department of State Authorization Act for fiscal years 1984 and 1985.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

In order to expedite consideration of the bill, the rule states that the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute by titles instead of by sections, and each title shall be considered as having been read. House Resolution 198 further provides for one motion to recommit.

It should be noted that the rule waives a point of order against the bill under section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act. Section 402(a) provides that it shall not be in order to consider any bill which authorizes the enactment of new budget authority for a fiscal year unless that bill has been reported by May 15, preceding the beginning of such fiscal year.

This bill contains a supplemental fiscal year 1983 authorization of \$41.8 million for the U.S. Information Agency and the Board for International Broadcasting. Since the bill was not reported on or before May 15, 1982, it would be subject to a point of order under section 402(a) of the Budget Act.

Chairman JONES of the Budget Committee has informed the Rules Committee that a majority of the members of the Budget Committee would support an emergency waiver of section 402(a) in order to permit consideration of H.R. 2915. The Budget Committee advises that this action is based largely upon the declared need for additional funds to carry out international broadcasting programs. Further, the bill authorizes, but does not directly provide, new budget authority. Therefore, the Budget Committee does not

object to this emergency waiver of section 402(a) in the rule.

House Resolution 198 also waives all points of order against the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 5 of rule XXI. Clause 5 of rule XXI prohibits appropriations in a legislative bill. This is necessary because certain provisions of H.R. 2915 might be considered to entail appropriations.

The bill H.R. 2915 authorizes \$3.29 billion in fiscal 1984 and \$3.59 billion in fiscal 1985 for the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, the Board for International Broadcasting, and the Inter-American Foundation. The measure enjoys strong bipartisan support.

I am not aware of any opposition to this open rule on H.R. 2915, and I urge my colleagues to adopt it.

□ 1130

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

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

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 198 is an open rule under which the House will consider authorization legislation for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1984 and 1985.

The rule waives points of order that would otherwise lie against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with the Budget Act, as well as points of order that otherwise lie against the bill for failure to comply with clause 5 of rule XXI.

As the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) pointed out, these waivers have become fairly routine for this legislation and there was no opposition to the waivers during our hearing in the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the consideration of H.R. 2915, and bill which authorizes \$3.29 billion in fiscal 1984 and \$3.59 billion in fiscal 1985 for the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, the Board for International Broadcasting, and the Inter-American Foundation.

The bill also authorizes supplemental requests of \$5 million for the Department of State, \$15 million for the U.S. Information Agency, and \$21.82 million for the Board for International Broadcasting for fiscal year 1983.

The rule waives section 402(a) of the Budget Act because the 1983 supplemental authorizations were not reported on or before May 15, 1982, and would therefore subject the bill to a possible point of order.

In addition, several provisions of H.R. 2915 may constitute appropriations in a legislative bill, and the waiver of clause 5 of rule XXI is provided in order to avoid a point of order against the bill.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to granting these two waivers, the resolution provides that the bill shall be read for amendment by titles instead of by sec-

tions, and it provides for one motion to recommit.

As to the bill itself, H.R. 2915 authorizes appropriations totaling \$3.289 billion for the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, the Board for International Broadcasting, the Inter-American Foundation, and the Asia Foundation, and it establishes the National Endowment for Democracy.

The amounts authorized for fiscal 1984 are almost identical to those requested by the administration. For fiscal 1985, however, the committee bill is approximately \$16 million higher than the administration's request.

In addition to these authorizations, the bill provides for the establishment of a National Endowment for Democracy, which will be a private, nonprofit corporation whose purpose is to promote U.S. private sector participation in democratic development overseas.

Mr. Speaker, I support the rule as reported from the Committee on Rules, and urge the adoption of the resolution so the House can proceed to consider the measure.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as modified.

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

Mr. BLILEY. 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 373, nays 37, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 181]

YEAS—373

Ackerman	Boner	Collins
Addabbo	Bonior	Conte
Akaka	Bonker	Couper
Albosta	Borski	Corcoran
Anderson	Bosco	Courter
Andrews (NC)	Boucher	Coyne
Andrews (TX)	Boxer	Craig
Annuzio	Breaux	Crockett
Anthony	Britt	D'Amours
Applegate	Brooks	Daniel
Aspin	Broomfield	Daschle
AuCoin	Brown (CA)	Daub
Barnard	Broyhill	Davis
Barnes	Bryant	de la Garza
Bartlett	Byron	Dellums
Bates	Campbell	Derrick
Bedell	Carney	Dicks
Bennett	Carper	Dingell
Bereuter	Carr	Dixon
Berman	Chandler	Donnelly
Bethune	Chappell	Dorgan
Bevill	Clarke	Dowdy
Biaggi	Clay	Downey
Bliley	Clinger	Duncan
Boehliert	Coelho	Durbin
Boggs	Coleman (MO)	Dwyer
Boiland	Coleman (TX)	Dyson

Early  
Eckart  
Edwards (AL)  
Edwards (CA)  
Edwards (OK)  
English  
Erdreich  
Erlenborn  
Evans (IA)  
Evans (IL)  
Fascell  
Fazio  
Feighan  
Ferraro  
Fiedler  
Fish  
Flippo  
Florio  
Foglietta  
Foley  
Ford (MI)  
Ford (TN)  
Fowler  
Frank  
Franklin  
Frost  
Fuqua  
Garcia  
Gaydos  
Gejdenson  
Gekas  
Gephardt  
Gibbons  
Gilman  
Gingrich  
Glickman  
Gonzalez  
Goodling  
Gore  
Gradison  
Gray  
Green  
Guarini  
Gunderson  
Hall (IN)  
Hall (OH)  
Hall, Ralph  
Hall, Sam  
Hamilton  
Hammerschmidt  
Hance  
Hansen (UT)  
Harkin  
Harrison  
Hatcher  
Hawkins  
Hefner  
Hertel  
Hightower  
Hillis  
Holt  
Hopkins  
Horton  
Howard  
Hoyer  
Huckaby  
Hughes  
Hunter  
Hutto  
Hyde  
Ireland  
Jacobs  
Jenkins  
Johnson  
Jones (NC)  
Jones (CK)  
Jones (TN)  
Kaptur  
Kastenmeier  
Kazen  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Kindness  
Kogovsek  
Kostmayer  
Kramer  
LaFalce  
Lagomarsino  
Lantos  
Leach  
Leatin  
Lehman (CA)  
Lehman (FL)  
Lent  
Levin  
Levine  
Levitas  
Lewis (CA)

Lewis (FL)  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
Loeffler  
Long (LA)  
Long (MD)  
Lott  
Lowery (CA)  
Lowry (WA)  
Lujan  
Luken  
Lundine  
Lungren  
MacKay  
Madigan  
Markay  
Marlenee  
Marriott  
Martin (IL)  
Martin (NC)  
Martin (NY)  
Matsui  
Mavroules  
Mazzoli  
McCandless  
McCloskey  
McCollum  
McCurdy  
McDade  
McDonald  
McEwen  
McHugh  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Mica  
Michel  
Mikulski  
Miller (CA)  
Mineta  
Minish  
Mitchell  
Moakley  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moody  
Moore  
Moorhead  
Morrison (CT)  
Morrison (WA)  
Mrazek  
Murphy  
Murtha  
Myers  
Natcher  
Nelson  
Nichols  
Nowak  
O'Brien  
Oakar  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olin  
Ortiz  
Ottinger  
Owens  
Oxley  
Packard  
Panetta  
Parris  
Pashayan  
Patman  
Patterson  
Pease  
Penny  
Pepper  
Perkins  
Petr  
Pickle  
Porter  
Price  
Pritchard  
Pursell  
Quillen  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Ratchford  
Ray  
Regula  
Reid  
Richardson  
Ridge  
Rinaldo  
Ritter  
Roberts  
Robinson  
Rodino  
Roe  
Roemer

Rogers  
Rose  
Rostenkowski  
Roth  
Roukema  
Rowland  
Roybal  
Rudd  
Russo  
Sabo  
Savage  
Sawyer  
Scheuer  
Schneider  
Schroeder  
Schumer  
Seiberling  
Sensenbrenner  
Shannon  
Sharp  
Shaw  
Shelby  
Sikorski  
Simon  
Sisisky  
Skean  
Skellton  
Slattery  
Smith (FL)  
Smith (IA)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith, Robert  
Snowe  
Snyder  
Solarez  
Solomon  
Spence  
Spratt  
St Germain  
Staggers  
Stangeland  
Stark  
Stenholm  
Stokes  
Stratton  
Studds  
Stump  
Sundquist  
Swift  
Synar  
Tallion  
Tauke  
Taurin  
Taylor  
Thomas (CA)  
Thomas (GA)  
Torres  
Torricelli  
Towns  
Traxler  
Udall  
Valentine  
Vander Jagt  
Vandergriff  
Vento  
Volkmer  
Vucanovich  
Walgren  
Watkins  
Waxman  
Weaver  
Weiss  
Wheat  
Whitehurst  
Whitley  
Whittaker  
Whitten  
Williams (MT)  
Williams (OH)  
Winn  
Wirth  
Wise  
Wolf  
Wolpe  
Wortley  
Wright  
Wyden  
Wylie  
Yates  
Yatron  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Young (MO)  
Zablocki  
Zschau

## NAYS—37

Archer  
Billirakis  
Brown (CO)  
Burton  
Chappie  
Coats  
Conable  
Coughlin  
Crane, Daniel  
Crane, Philip  
Dannemeyer  
DeWine  
Dreier

Edgar  
Emerson  
Fields  
Forsythe  
Gramm  
Gregg  
Hiler  
Kasich  
Kemp  
Latta  
Mack  
McGrath  
McKernan

Miller (OH)  
Molinari  
Nielsen  
Paul  
Schulze  
Shumway  
Shuster  
Siljander  
Smith, Denny  
Walker  
Weber

## NOT VOTING—22

Alexander  
Badham  
Bateman  
Beilenson  
Cheney  
Conyers  
Dickinson  
Dymally

Frenzel  
Hansen (ID)  
Hartnett  
Hefel  
Hubbard  
Jeffords  
Kolter  
Leland

Lloyd  
Martinez  
McCain  
Neal  
Schaefer  
Wilson

□ 1150

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Cheney for, with Mr. Frenzel against.

Mr. OTTINGER and Mr. LEVITAS changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution, as modified was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BIAGGI). Pursuant to House Resolution 198 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2915.

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2915) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1984 and 1985 for the Department of State, the United States Information Agency, the Board for International Broadcasting, the Inter-American Foundation, and the Asia Foundation, to establish the National Endowment for Democracy, and for other purposes, with Mr. SIMON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, as modified, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2915, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1984 and 1985, and supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1983, for the Department of

State, the U.S. Information Agency, the Board for International Broadcasting, the Inter-American Foundation, the formation of a National Endowment for Democracy, and for other purposes. This bill provides the financial and personnel resources needed to carry out the day-to-day foreign policy obligations and operations of the United States abroad, including the vital services for protection of Americans abroad, and the Nation's traditional and public diplomacy activities.

At this point, I would like to point out some hard realities in connection with the State and USIA budgets. While the figures indicate dollar increases for the fiscal years 1984 and 1985, the reality is that the amounts have not kept up with the value of the dollar overseas—which is where the majority of these agencies' activities take place. More important, the personnel figures tell an even harsher story. Since 1967, the Department of State has lost 10 percent of its personnel, going from 26,162 positions to 23,569. USIA during the same period has decreased personnel strength from 12,484 to 8,886. For comparative purposes, the Department of Commerce—which does not have the responsibility of maintaining 288 posts abroad, as does the Department of State—has increased 50,000 positions between 1978 and 1980 alone. On the other hand, the foreign policy problems and activities of the United States have grown by leaps and bounds. Indeed, the number of countries with which the United States maintains diplomatic relations has increased from 85 nations in 1959 to 146 nations today. During that same period, the number of Foreign Service officers has increased by only 116 positions, from 3,717 to 3,833, yet the quality of their work is consistently high and is constantly improving.

Mr. Chairman, this bill contains fiscal year 1984 and 1985 authorizations, and a fiscal year 1983 supplemental authorization identical to the sums requested by the executive branch, with the exception of a fiscal year 1985 figure of \$16 million for the Inter-American Foundation in place of the open-ended authorization requested by the executive branch. Specifically, the committee has recommended an amount of \$3,289,297,000 for fiscal year 1984 and \$3,590,708,000 for fiscal year 1985 to fund the Department of State, USIA, BIB—which makes grants to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty—and the Inter-American Foundation, and to establish a National Endowment for Democracy. The bill authorizes supplemental requests of \$5 million for the Department of State for a grant to the Asia Foundation, \$15,000,000 for the U.S. Information Agency, and \$21,823,000 for the Board for International Broadcasting, as requested by the executive branch.

Briefly, the funds included in this authorization request will enable these agencies and grantees to:

First, carry out U.S. foreign policy responsibilities and maintain our diplomatic relations with 142 nations and 47 international organizations;

Second, provide U.S. assessed contributions to the United Nations, its specialized agencies, and the OAS;

Third, provide consular services to U.S. citizens traveling abroad, and domestic passport services;

Four, enable those living under totalitarian rule abroad to receive objective news reports through the broadcasts of the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, and Radio Liberty;

Fifth, provide for academic and cultural exchange programs between Americans and students and professionals of other nations to promote international understanding and goodwill;

Sixth, provide for an annual grant by the Secretary of State to the Asia Foundation to insure long-term, stable funding for the Foundation.

H.R. 2915 also makes certain changes in administrative authorities of the agencies. It would also enable the Foreign Service Institute to train citizens of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands—which will undertake a compact of free association with the United States—in order to develop a Foreign Service for these new states. It provides for assistance to local law enforcement entities providing extraordinary protective services for foreign missions in the United States; requires the U.S. Information Agency to notify the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs of all grants for a period of 2 years; provides for formal notice of agency reprogramming requests to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Foreign Relations provides legislative authority for the existing Office of the Coordinator for International Communications and Information Policy which is located in the Department of State; provides that the Director of the Office of Foreign Missions in the Department of State be a member of the Foreign Service with certain administrative and field experience; provides for the release of a USIA film entitled "Thanksgiving in Peshawar"; provides for expenses of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO; provides for participation by the United States as host to the 31st annual meeting of the North Atlantic Assembly; and provides for a limitation on the salaries of future presidents of RFE/RL, Inc.

In addition, the bill provides, in title VI, for support for a National Endowment for Democracy. This provision reflects the recommendations of a report issued by the Democracy Program, a bipartisan group, composed of the two major U.S. political parties, labor, and business, which conducted a study into the ways and means of promoting democracy and democratic institu-

tion building abroad through private sector approaches. The endowment, a private, non-profit corporation, would be provided with funds to promote U.S. private sector initiatives for these purposes. This provision together with other proposals modified and approved by the committee, constitute the Presidential Initiative originally called Project Democracy.

Project Democracy was originally a request by USIA for \$15 million in fiscal year 1983 and \$65 million in each of the fiscal years 1984 and 1985. The committee has reviewed this request and has modified the proposal. Specifically, the committee has approved the expansion of existing USIA education and cultural affairs programming such as the Fulbright and Humphrey fellowship programs, the international visitor program, and the programs carried out by private sector groups such as Partners of the Americas, Youth for Understanding, and the American Council of Young Political Leaders, and other groups which have proved their excellence over the years. The remaining new initiatives were found by the committee to be more appropriate to be carried out by the National Endowment for Democracy.

Mr. Chairman, this bill represents the absolute minimum necessary to carry out vital U.S. foreign policy objectives. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2915.

□ 1200

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

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the full committee.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2915, a bill to authorize supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1983 and appropriations for fiscal year 1984 and 1985 for the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, the Board for International Broadcasting and for other purposes.

At the outset, I want to take this opportunity to commend the distinguished chairman and ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL), and the gentleman from New York, (Mr. GILMAN), for their efforts on this important legislation. The gentleman from Florida has already ably presented the purposes and content of the legislation. I, therefore, take this time to point out briefly some of the features of the legislation which particularly merit the attention of the Members.

First, H.R. 2915 represents the third 2-year authorization for the Department of State and related agencies reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. These multiyear authorizations are a positive contribution to the congressional budget process and

permit the agencies to engage in much needed long-range planning for their operations and afford a better opportunity to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and its subcommittees to conduct more effective oversight over the departments and agencies that fall within their respective jurisdictions.

Second, the bill provides additional funding over the fiscal year 1983 levels for the dissemination of information abroad through the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. These programs are indispensable elements of our foreign policy and deserve the strong support of this body.

Third, the creation of the National Endowment for Democracy in title VI represents, as the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) has already stated, the work of a broad bipartisan group composed of the two major U.S. political parties and American labor and business which concluded a study on and recommendations for new ways and means for promoting democracy and democratic institution building abroad through the private sector. The establishment of the endowment is a modification of the administration's "Project Democracy" initiative and was unanimously supported by the committee.

It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that there may be an amendment to strike this particular section. In my opinion, adoption of this amendment would be a grave mistake. This bill does not provide funds for any political party; it authorizes funds for the purpose of assisting areas or countries to better understand our democracy and how it works—and to benefit from our experience in making that democracy work.

Finally, title VI provides formal recognition of the unique and vital role played by the Asia Foundation in advancing long-term foreign policy interests in Asia and provides a permanent legislative basis for the Foundation's annual funding requirements.

Mr. Chairman, this authorization legislation is essential to the operations of the Department of State and related foreign policy agencies. The amounts authorized are the same as those requested by the executive and are within the guidelines of the House-passed budget resolution.

I urge the adoption of H.R. 2915.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 2915, legislation authorizing appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal year 1984 and fiscal year 1985. As the ranking minority member of the subcommittee on International Oper-

ations, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Florida, the chairman of our subcommittee. I believe the gentleman has provided a concise and effective overview of H.R. 2915 and I commend him for his hard work on this legislation.

I believe it is important to note that H.R. 2915 is the product of 10 days of comprehensive hearings and two markup sessions. During such consideration, our subcommittee had the opportunity to explore thoroughly the many aspects of operations and policies that this legislation addresses. It is my view that H.R. 2915 will enable the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, the Board for International Broadcasting, the Asia Foundation, and the Inter-American Foundation to carry out effectively those authorities, functions, and duties with which they are charged.

I might add also that the total funding levels conform to those amounts requested by the administration.

This measure also establishes the National Endowment for Democracy. As the gentleman from Florida indicated, this proposal emerged from the President's call last year and from earlier recommendations, for a long-range, bipartisan undertaking to promote the growth of democracy and democratic institutions.

The Endowment enjoys the broad-based support of the Republican and Democratic Parties, the AFL-CIO, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. It is my hope that the Endowment, with its emphasis on private sector initiatives, in the form of exchanges with democratic groups abroad, can help our Nation improve significantly its efforts to encourage free and democratic institutions worldwide.

Accordingly, I join with the subcommittee's distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Florida, in requesting that my colleagues support H.R. 2915.

□ 1210

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO).

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

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2915 and particularly for the National Endowment for Democracy which is incorporated in the authorization bill for the State Department and USIA.

Two weeks ago, Congressman MIKE BARNES and I led a delegation of Democratic and Republican Party officials and U.S. Government representatives to Caracas where we met with Venezuelan political party leaders to discuss the international democracy program. From our initial discussions with the Venezuelans, the response was positive and supportive.

The specific objective of the meeting with the Venezuelans was to discuss a working paper developed by the State

Department which outlined the proposal for a regional democratic institute to bring together democratic political parties in the hemisphere for discussions of training and education in support of democratic political development.

Throughout the discussion, it was clear the Venezuelans were enthusiastic about the possibility of opening new contacts with American political parties. They spoke often of the need to strengthen the nongovernmental aspects of United States-Venezuelan relations and commented that this new American party initiative was long overdue.

With the Venezuelans in the midst of a very intense Presidential campaign, they were not in a position to begin detailed discussions for establishing the regional institute, but they encouraged the continuation of bilateral, nongovernmental discussions between the parties looking toward more concrete action following the elections.

The American delegation acknowledged the need also to elicit reactions from other regional democracies as well, like Costa Rica and Jamaica, before proceeding with the actual establishment of a regional democracy institute.

The national endowment for democracy is the natural followup of President Reagan's address to the British Parliament in June 1982, where he announced the U.S. intention to promote democracy in a way which would allow "people to choose their own way, to develop their own culture, to reconcile their own differences through peaceful means."

The idea of the democracy programs is to support those people and institutions committed to democratic government, to build and reinforce ties based on shared values between nations and to counter the spread of totalitarianism through the exchange of ideas and through promotion of democratic institutions.

The democracy program is only in its beginning phases, but the concept has captured the enthusiasm of all those associated with it, and I am confident it will develop into the vibrant force for peace and freedom that all of its supporters anticipate. I urge my colleagues to give the National Endowment for Democracy their strong, bipartisan support.

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

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

Mr. HILER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman explain why the Free Trade Union Institute is getting nearly two and a half times more than either the National Democratic Institute or the National Republican Institute and nearly five and a half times more than the National Chamber Foundation?

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

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I yield to the gentleman from Florida. I think the chairman of the committee can answer the question more accurately.

Mr. FASCELL. First of all, let me state that that was the amount requested by the administration.

Second, we must appreciate that the Labor Institute program has been an ongoing program for many, many years, and this represents a normal budget request.

The Chamber of Commerce Institute, however, is brand new, just getting started, as are the others. Therefore, that accounts for the differential.

Mr. HILER. Has the Labor Institute then traditionally gotten a fairly significant sum of money from the U.S. Government?

Mr. FASCELL. Yes, and has been for years.

If I might add, by the way, it is a very successful program all over, supported by every administration since I have been here.

Mr. HILER. How much has it been getting in the past?

Mr. FASCELL. I do not remember the last appropriation, but we can get that for the gentleman. This is very close to the amount.

Mr. HILER. Will this amount then replace that amount or is it in addition to that amount?

Mr. FASCELL. No, this is the total amount.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, if I might also respond to the gentleman, my understanding is that all the parties involved, the Republican Party, the Democratic Party, the Chamber of Commerce and the AFL-CIO free labor institution, have all agreed on these figures. This is an agreement by all parties.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY).

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

I would like to engage the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) in a colloquy.

Section 108 of this legislation makes permanent a restriction first passed last year restricting U.S. contributions to the United Nations for the PLO or activities that support the PLO. I believe this is an important restriction, and I commend the committee for adopting it.

It has come to my attention during the last year, however, that there is some dispute about the State Department's enforcement of this section, and I would like to get the gentleman's understanding of section 108.

Specifically, should this provision be read to require the withholding of indirect costs allocated to the PLO units of the United Nation as well as direct costs?



I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Yes. That is the intent of this measure.

Mr. BLILEY. I thank the gentleman.

Further, I have information to indicate that the U.N. Special Unit on Palestinian Rights had a series of regional seminars on the question of Palestine, which cost \$2.5 million in both 1982 and 1983; yet the United Nations reported to the State Department direct and indirect costs of only \$1.3 million in 1983 and \$0.7 million in 1983 for the entire special unit. My reading of this section would indicate that the State Department is obligated to withhold the U.S. portion of activities such as these regional seminars. Is that correct?

Mr. GILMAN. That is my understanding of the intent of this provision. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. BLILEY. Does the Department of State have a responsibility to examine U.N. budgets carefully for activities that support the "PLO and withhold appropriate portions of the U.S. contribution?

Mr. GILMAN. Yes, the Department does have such a responsibility and I might add that H.R. 2453 requires a report from the Department of State concerning its implementation of this provision.

Mr. BLILEY. I thank the gentleman and I thank my colleagues for these clarifications. I believe this section is appropriate and again I commend the committee for its fine work.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CROCKETT).

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

Mr. CROCKETT. Mr. Chairman, let me first express my sincere appreciation to the chairman of my subcommittee and my full committee for the strenuous work they have done in bringing this piece of legislation to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I could give my undivided support to the legislation before us today, but I cannot.

There are some elements in this State Department authorization bill that I found disquieting during our consideration in the Foreign Affairs Committee, and which remain in the bill that is being considered now. Two aspects of the funding authorization are particularly troubling to me:

First, the inclusion of almost \$30 million over the next 3 years for Radio Marti, the latest attempt by the Reagan administration to intensify the cold war it is waging with Cuba, this time via a war of the airwaves;

And second, the provision of the bill that authorizes \$62.6 million of public funds for something called the National Endowment for Democracy. For those Members who receive the DSG or other legislative bulletin, you might already have read that this \$62 million

is being given away to the Democratic Party Institute, and the Republican Party Institute, and the AFL-CIO Free Trade Union Institute and the National Chamber of Commerce Foundation, for such specific programs as "to facilitate exchanges between the two major American political parties, labor, and business and democratic groups abroad" and "to encourage . . . democratic development in a manner consistent with the broad concerns of U.S. national interests."

Mr. Chairman, I cannot believe that the same Members who have been chanting balanced budget and cutting spending in this Chamber for the past 6 months are going to vote today to give away more than \$60 million of taxpayers' money for a project that seems at best a boondoggle.

The legislation creating the National Endowment for Democracy was folded into this State Department authorization bill without adequate consideration in either the subcommittee or the Committee of Foreign Affairs.

The board of directors of the National Endowment for Democracy are hand picked and already mandated by this bill—the individuals already selected, with no public or open congressional input. The board, which is self-perpetuating, contains at most two black members, no Hispanics that I can detect, and only two women. And this is the board that will, according to the authorizing legislation, be giving taxpayers money away to other groups to foster democracy.

I would question whether this board can sell democracy to the rest of the world when it does not even come close to reflecting a cross-section of America.

Mr. Chairman, how can we accept the arbitrary selection of two political parties, one labor union and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—to the total exclusion of all other political parties, labor organizations, business groups and other organizations—to control the distribution of some \$60 million of taxpayers' money for the vague purposes outlined above?

I cannot support it. I do not believe the National Endowment for Democracy is a project we should invest our constituents' money in, and I urge my colleagues to give this part of the bill before us a very careful look before we vote this afternoon.

□ 1220

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. SCHROEDER).

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, this bill has frequently been the vehicle for substantial changes in the way the Foreign Service of the United States is managed. Earlier this year, there was a package of amendments to the Foreign Service Act of 1980 which the administration tried to get at-

tached to this bill. I am pleased that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) resisted their entreaties.

A number of amendments to the Foreign Service Act of 1980 are needed. When that bill was first written, it was written jointly by the Subcommittee on International Operations of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and by my Subcommittee on Civil Service of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Amendments to the act should be developed in the same cooperative way.

I intend to introduce legislation this summer to provide for certain needed changes in the Foreign Service Act. Among the needed changes are:

Better mechanisms to make the demands of the Foreign Service and the demands of family and children more compatible. We cannot continue to operate the Foreign Service as if no member had any family commitments.

Clarification of employee rights. Although we thought we had fairly clear understandings of how the rights of employees would be protected, the U.S. Information Agency has been acting in utter ignorance of the legislative history of the act and has been refusing to recognize legitimate employee rights. Rather than forcing time-consuming litigation, which USIA has routinely lost, it would be better to make the law so clear that it could not be misinterpreted.

A stronger grievance mechanism. The current grievance system is far too limited in scope and far too dependent on the cooperation of management. We should provide Foreign Service personnel with a real internal grievance mechanism to protect their rights.

Benefits for former spouses who were not covered by the pension-sharing amendment we added to the Foreign Service Act. While we do not want to reduce the retirement benefits of people who divorced or retired before the effective date of the 1980 act, we should entitle their former spouses to the same benefits as those who were so covered. This affects some 150 former spouses, some of whom are in the most destitute circumstances.

Permanent law to provide compensation to employees who are held prisoner or hostage, as happened in Iran. After the Iranian hostage episode ended, we passed ad hoc legislation to cover that situation. At that time, the administration promised to submit permanent legislation. Since they have not done so, we need to write it ourselves.

I am glad this bill is unencumbered by major changes in the personnel system. At the same time, I plan to be working closely with the chairman of the subcommittee to develop needed legislation later this year.

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. I appreciate the gentlewoman's comments. Having worked with my colleague for such a long period of time on the Foreign Service Act, I will say that we would not undertake to make any changes without the knowledge and leadership of the gentlewoman from Colorado. We look forward to working with her and making corrections that are obviously necessary.

But I agree with the gentlewoman this should be done separately. So I look forward to working with her on those matters.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am gratified that my committee has moved forward responsibly to authorize full funding for the Voice of America's vital fiscal year 1984 request. Hopefully, the full House will follow suit today.

I am proud of this subcommittee chairman, DANTE FASCELL, who has the deep understanding of the Voice's mission that is required and I am gratified that my full committee chairman, CLEMENT ZABLOCKI, has also remained a longtime friend of this vital tool in the arsenal of freedom.

The USIA is seeking an overall figure of \$48 million for its radio construction account. This includes \$3.2 million for expansion of VOA broadcasts to Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, an enhancement that will involve 55 positions. The budget you consider today also includes \$2.5 million for the modernization of the Voice's Washington studios and \$6.3 million for long-overdue maintenance and repair of existing worldwide broadcast facilities.

The Voice, its facilities and capabilities have become a "baling wire" operation. Thirty-five percent of its transmitters predate the Korean war. Some of its equipment was captured from the Germans in World War II. It requires its own fabricating shop to manufacture spare parts no longer commercially obtainable.

While the VOA has six 500KW superpower transmitters—patched-up affairs, the Soviets have 37 modern counterparts. While VOA broadcasts 956 hours per week, the Soviets broadcast 2,158—even Taiwan broadcasts 1,008. The Soviets are stealing a march in the war of ideas all over the world. While Radio Moscow is broadcasting in 20 languages to the Middle East and Africa, VOA can respond to the challenge only with 8.

Mr. Chairman, Poland's Communist government recently filed protests that VOA broadcasts have served to "destabilize" the Warsaw regime by in-

citing protest and "encouraging destructive elements working against Poland's constitutional order." What better proof that VOA is an effective truth weapon on the side of free men and women.

Mr. Chairman, may I urge now that the full House respond in kind? Let me cite some of the important ingredients of VOA's pending request:

First. New language positions are needed, especially a 25-percent increase in the undermanned Polish and Baltic languages services;

Second. VOA's news, features, special programs and editorial services must be upgraded;

Third. We must fill discontinued correspondent positions in such key locales as Rome, Islamabad, Geneva and Mexico City. It is unbelievable that budgetary restraints have denied America's voice in these critical areas;

Fourth. New engineering positions are required so that VOA can raise its technical capability to at least the level of BBC and Deutsch Welle;

Fifth. Computerization of VOA's antiquated and inefficient program distribution system for its 41 language services must proceed;

Sixth. Replacing 30-plus-year-old ancient transmitters in Tangiers, Morocco, and Munich, Germany—vital links in our broadcasts to Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union—is a vital step;

Seventh. Finally, the VOA must construct new transmitter sites and fund leasing arrangements to improve its signal strength.

That Voice, Mr. Chairman, must be heard by freedom-seeking people everywhere. Recently, the VOA received a letter which asked "Why a country whose astronauts can easily speak to Earth is not able to transmit her own voice across the world".

□ 1230

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. LANTOS. I am delighted to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. KEMP. I just wanted to rise and identify myself with the gentleman's remarks. I particularly appreciated his effort on behalf of the Voice of America. I particularly want to compliment the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) as well as my friend from New York (Mr. GILMAN) for shepherding through this extremely important initiative.

I compliment the gentleman from Florida and my friend from California as well as from New York, all three corners of this country being represented in a project that holds such potential for the future of democracy and those people all over the world who look to this country for hope.

The one thing, perhaps above all, it seems to me, this country does represent is hope. And if we can broadcast

that message through the Voice of America as the gentleman pointed out, if we can support an effective project for democracy, which is incredibly timely, as Mr. LANTOS has emphasized here on the floor; there are folks not only in Poland but throughout the Eastern Block nations, Africa, throughout the world, who will be inspired by that message, who need to know that this country still stands for those Jeffersonian principles to which we all aspire.

When Jefferson said, "The God who gave us life gave us freedom" he was not talking about only the American people, he was talking about those people around the world, the members of the human family, who desire for themselves, their neighbors and their children exactly what we want: freedom, and dignity, and individual rights.

I thank my friend from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) for helping get this money for the Voice of America, which is doing so much with all the problems they face, with antiquated transmitters, equipment and broadcasts: This response by the House to their request is not only a timely proposition, it is critical.

I want to take a moment to discuss Project Democracy, an initiative I have strongly supported, which is encompassed in this bill.

For the first time since President Truman's administration, an American President is laying out an active political agenda for our foreign policy that goes beyond weapons systems and economic interests. A central feature of President Reagan's new strategy is Project Democracy. The goal of this project is to promote free elections, opposition parties and competition, free press and trade unions—the institutions of democracy. Its focus, I believe correctly, will be in areas where democracy is fragile or nonexistent, like East Europe, Latin America and East Asia, but where our efforts stand a chance of success.

I believe democracy is rapidly moving forward worldwide, its influence spreading into all of Western Europe, most of Latin America, as well as the largest nation of Africa (Nigeria) and into Asia as well. Its progress has become so rapid and formidable that it challenges oligarchs from all part of the political spectrum.

Promoting democracy will reflect the internal nature of the American order, give a sense of purpose to American foreign policy, as well as promote America's strategic interests by encouraging new and defending old democratic allies. This should be done in a nonpartisan way, unconstrained by the divisions of liberal versus conservative, left versus right. I am very pleased to see business and labor, Republicans and Democrats involved in this project, and hope its base of



support and participation will continue to expand.

Having said that, however, I have certain concerns about the allocation of funds and the institutional guidelines contained in the committee bill.

First, I am concerned about the administration of the National Endowment that the committee bill would establish. As Project Democracy was originally proposed, the project would be under the auspices of USIA. I believe this is entirely proper. USIA is the natural existing organization, fully staffed and qualified, to manage Project Democracy.

By contrast, the committee bill would remove Project Democracy from USIA control, and set up an independent board of directors. This board would be self-perpetuating, exempt from Executive control or Congressional confirmation procedures. I do not think that the creation of an autonomous bureaucracy serves the purposes of the project.

Second, while organized labor would receive a generous allocation of funds, the committee bill would short change small business. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce may be a designated recipient, but small businesses are entirely overlooked under the committee's plan. I believe that small businesses are the heart of America's free enterprise system; surely they have a contribution to make to the promotion of democratic institutions.

I do not intend to oppose funding for the project, but I do hope that some of these concerns will be addressed and rectified as the legislation proceeds through the Congress. If these shortcomings are retained, I reserve the right to reconsider my support for continuation of the project.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I too, want to commend Mr. GILMAN from New York, my distinguished chairman Mr. FASCELL, for their outstanding work. Let me just say that I am proud to stand with my dear friend from New York (Mr. KEMP) because there is no more eloquent or dedicated champion of free ideals around this globe.

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

I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) for his remarks and leadership that he has given as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

America telling its story abroad is a very important component of our survival. We have struggled through many administrations to get sufficient commitment in terms of priority and in funding to do an adequate job.

The gentleman from California has detailed all that which is in the record in our committee hearings and in the hearings of other committees on how sadly lacking we are as a great nation to be so far behind even in the facilities that we use—even in the facilities. Why it is that we cannot seem to get the commitment to build what has to

be built to get our message across. I do not know any Member of this House who would give up his media in the effort to get his message across to his constituents. Yet, we as a nation have consistently for years insisted on tying one hand behind our back as we talk to the rest of the people of the world.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) is absolutely right. This committee was delighted to support the initiative of this administration as we did the initiative of the last administration, and as much as the commitment has been made, I am here to tell my colleagues it still is not enough.

There may be complaints from our colleagues about how much money went into increasing the budget for USIA. My goodness, it is a drop in the bucket compared to what we are facing across the world from our principal adversary, and from others.

So, I would hope that our colleagues would understand that this has a high priority, not just in the administration but in the Congress in a very strong bipartisan sense, totally supported by the American people.

● Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, and particularly in support of the authorization for the Board for International Broadcasting which provides grants to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty broadcast in 21 languages of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe for an average of 1,025 hours weekly from one medium-wave and 45 short-wave transmitters, 23 of which have been installed since 1975. Radio Free Europe broadcasts to five East European nations, while Radio Liberty broadcasts to the U.S.S.R. in Russian and 14 other languages. Broadcasts are news-oriented with analyses based on expert research. While the Voice of America concentrates on projecting American society and institutions, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty programs concentrate on the interests of East Europe and Soviet audiences.

These institutions are vital tools in our foreign policy and in our support for freedom and human rights throughout the world. There is perhaps no greater human right than the right of freedom of information, freedom of thought, freedom of expression—in short, the freedom to know.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to share a letter I had the pleasure to receive recently from our former colleague, Ed Derwinski, who is now counselor to the Department of State. We all remember his expertise in foreign affairs and his devotion to a bipartisan consideration of foreign policy issues. His words on Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are important and instructive, and I would like to read his letter into the RECORD:

The letter follows:

THE COUNSELOR.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

Washington, D.C., June 1, 1983.

Hon. BOB LIVINGSTON,  
Cannon House Office Bldg.,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: When I was a member of the House, I was a strong supporter of the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, consistently voting for their authorizations and appropriations.

In my new duties at the State Department, I have had the occasion to visit Munich and inspect the operations of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty. I have also been working closely with Ken Tomlinson of the Voice of America, and in my travels I have learned the opinions of both government leaders and average citizens abroad concerning the radios.

The reports and observations I have received are very positive on the role the U.S. radios play. They are listened to, and a special effort is made by listeners to overcome jamming techniques. The news content of the radios provides listeners with material very often denied them by their own governments, especially in totalitarian states.

In directing my views to your attention, I am naturally aware of the fact that you will soon be processing authorization and appropriations bills for the radios. I can reaffirm from my personal experience that our investment in VOA and RFE/RL is a sound, responsible adjunct to our foreign policy.

I hope you will share my view on the value of the radios and give them your strong support.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. DERWINSKI.●

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FASCELL. I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Clerk will designate title 1.

The text of title 1 is as follows:

H.R. 2915

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

#### TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

##### SHORT TITLE

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "Department of State Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985".

##### AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 102. The following amounts are authorized to be appropriated for the Department of State to carry out the authorities, functions, duties, and responsibilities in the conduct of the foreign affairs of the United States and other purposes authorized by law:

(1) For "Administration of Foreign Affairs", \$1,474,418,000 for the fiscal year 1984 and \$1,563,829,000 for the fiscal year 1985.

(2) For "International Organizations and Conferences", \$902,342,000 for the fiscal year 1984 and \$645,978,000 for the fiscal year 1985.

(3) For "International Commissions", \$23,207,000 for the fiscal year 1984 and \$27,503,000 for the fiscal year 1985.

(4) For "Migration and refugee Assistance", \$344,500,000 for the fiscal year 1984 and \$326,400,000 for the fiscal year 1985.

(5) For "United States Bilateral Science and Technology Agreements", \$1,700,000 for the fiscal year 1984 and \$1,700,000 for the fiscal year 1985.

#### PROTECTIVE SERVICES

Sec. 103. Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for "Administration of Foreign Affairs" by section 102(1) of this Act, \$6,000,000 for the fiscal year 1984 and \$6,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985 may be used for the provision of protective services directly or by contract in locations for which funds are not otherwise available to provide such services, to the extent deemed necessary by the Secretary of State in carrying out title II of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (relating to foreign missions), except that amounts used under this section shall not be subject to the provisions of section 106(b) of that Act.

#### PIRACY IN THE GULF OF THAILAND

Sec. 104. Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for "Migration and Refugee Assistance" by section 102(4) of this Act, \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year 1984 and 1985 shall be used for assistance to combat piracy in the Gulf of Thailand.

#### WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION

Sec. 105. The joint resolution entitled "Joint Resolution to authorize appropriations incident to United States participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property", approved July 12, 1969 (22 U.S.C. 2697) is amended by striking out all after the resolving clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "That funds appropriated to the Secretary of State for 'International Organizations and Conferences' shall be available for the payment by the United States of its proportionate share of the expenses of the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property for any year after 1981 as determined under article 16(4) of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, as revised, except that in no event shall the payment for any year exceed 5.0 per centum of all expenses of the Bureau apportioned among countries for that year."

#### NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY

Sec. 106. Section 5 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint Resolution to authorize participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization", approved July 11, 1956 (22 U.S.C. 1928e), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "In addition to the amounts authorized by section 2, \$300,000 of the funds appropriated for the Department of State for 'International Organizations and Conferences' for fiscal year 1984 shall be for the expenses incurred by the United States group in hosting the thirty-first annual meeting of the North Atlantic Assembly."

#### ALLOCATION AUTHORITY

Sec. 107. (a) Section 8 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2675) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 8. The Secretary of State may allocate or transfer to any department, agency, or independent establishment of the United States Government (with the consent of the head of such department, agency, or establishment) any funds appropriated to the Department of State, for direct expenditure by such department, agency, or independent establishment for the purposes for which the funds were appropriated in accordance with authority granted in this act or under authority governing the activities of such

department, agency, or independent establishment."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall not apply with respect to funds appropriated to the Department of State before the date of enactment of this Act.

#### RESTRICTIONS RELATING TO PALESTINAIAN RIGHTS UNITS AND PROJECTS PROVIDING POLITICAL BENEFITS TO THE PALESTINE LIBERATION ORGANIZATION

Sec. 108. (a) Funds appropriated for the Department of State for "International Organizations and Conferences" may not be used for payment by the United States, as its contribution toward the assessed budget of the United Nations for any year, of any amount which would cause the total amount paid by the United States as its assessed contribution for that year to exceed the amount assessed as the United States contribution for that year less—

(1) 25 per centum of the amount budgeted for that year for the Committee on the Exercise for the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People for any similar successor entity; and

(2) 25 per centum of the amount budgeted for that year for the Special Unit on Palestinian Rights (or any similar successor entity); and

(3) 25 per centum of the amount budgeted for that year for projects whose primary purpose is to provide political benefits to the Palestine Liberation Organization or entities associated with it.

(b) Funds appropriated for the Department of State for "International Organizations and Conferences" may not be used for payment by the United States, as its contribution toward the assessed budget of any specialized agency of the United Nations for any year, of any amount which would cause the total amount paid by the United States as its assessed contribution for that year to exceed the amount assessed as the United States contribution for that year less 25 per centum of the amount budgeted by such agency for that year for projects whose primary purpose is to provide political benefits to the Palestine Liberation Organization or entities associated with it.

(c) The President shall annually review the budgets of the United Nations and its specialized agencies to determine which projects have the primary purpose of providing political benefit to the Palestine Liberation Organization. The President shall report to the Congress on any such project for which a portion of the United States assessed contribution is withheld and the amount withheld.

(d) Subsections (a)(3) and (b) shall not be construed as limiting United States contributions to the United Nations, or its specialized agencies, for projects whose primary purpose is to provide humanitarian, educational, developmental, and other nonpolitical benefits to the Palestinian people.

#### COUNSELOR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Sec. 109. (a) Section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to strengthen and improve the organization and administration of the Department of State, and for other purposes", approved May 26, 1949 (22 U.S.C. 2653), is amended by striking out "Counselor of the Department of State and the Legal Adviser who are" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Legal Adviser who is".

(b) (1) Section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after the item relating to the Under Secretaries of State the following:

"Counselor of the Department of State."

(2) Section 5315 of such title is amended by striking out "Counselor of the Department of State."

(3) The amendments made by this subsection shall take effect on October 1, 1983.

#### NATIONAL COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL COOPERATION

Sec. 110. (a) Section 5 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint Resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, and authorizing an appropriation therefor", approved July 30, 1946 (22 U.S.C. 287q), is amended by repealing the eighth sentence.

(b) Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for "Administration of Foreign Affairs" by section 102(1) of this Act, \$250,000 for each of the fiscal years 1984 and 1985 shall be available only for the expenses of the secretariat of the National Commission on Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Cooperation.

#### ATTENDANCE OF CITIZENS OF THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS AT THE FOREIGN SERVICE INSTITUTE

Sec. 111. Section 701 of the Foreign Service Act of 1950 (22 U.S.C. 4021) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Training and instruction may be provided at the Institute for not to exceed sixty citizens of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in order to prepare them to serve as members of the foreign service of the Federated States of Micronesia, the Marshall Islands, and the Island of Palau. The authority of this subsection shall expire when the Compact of Free Association is approved by the Congress.

#### DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF FOREIGN MISSIONS

Sec. 112. (a) Section 203(a) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 4303(a)) is amended—

(1) in the second sentence by striking out "appointed by the Secretary" and inserting in lieu thereof "appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Director shall have the rank of ambassador. The Director shall be an individual who is a member of the Foreign Service, who has been a member of the Foreign Service for at least ten years, who has significant management experience, and who has served in countries in which the United States has had significant problems in assuring the secure and efficient operations of its missions."

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to any Director of the Office of Foreign Missions who is appointed after the date of enactment of this Act.

#### REPROGRAMMING NOTIFICATIONS

Sec. 113. Title I of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 is amended by redesignating section 34 as section 35 and by inserting the following new section 34 after section 33:

"Sec. 34. Unless the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate are notified fifteen days in advance of the proposed reprogramming, funds appropriated for the Department of State shall not be available for obligation or expenditure through any reprogramming of funds—

"(1) which creates new programs;

"(2) which eliminates a program, project, or activity;

"(3) which increases funds or personnel by any means for any project or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted by the Congress;

"(4) which relocates an office or employees;

"(5) which reorganizes offices, programs, or activities; or

"(6) which involves a reprogramming in excess of \$250,000 or 10 per centum, whichever is less, and which (A) augments existing programs, projects, or activities, (B) reduces by 10 per centum or more the funding for any existing program, project, activity, or personnel approved by the Congress, or (C) results from any general savings from a reduction in personnel which would result in a change in existing programs, activities, or projects approved by the Congress."

#### FOREIGN NATIONAL EMPLOYEES

SEC. 114. (a) Section 408(a)(1) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3968(a)(1)) is amended in the last sentence by inserting "(A)" immediately after "provision for" and by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ", and (B) payments by the Government and foreign national employees to a trust or other fund in a financial institution in order to finance future benefits for foreign national employees, including provision of retention in the fund of accumulated interest for the benefit of covered foreign national employees".

(b) Section 5944 of title 5, United States Code, is repealed.

(2) The chapter analysis for chapter 59 of such title 5 is amended by striking out the item relating to section 5944.

#### CODIFICATION OF MERESMAN CASE

SEC. 115. Section 2103(f) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4153(f)) is amended in the last sentence by striking out "determined in accordance with chapter 8 of title I of this Act" and inserting in lieu thereof "on the same basis as a member retired from the Senior Foreign Service under section 607(c)(1), and section 609(a)(2)(B) shall be deemed to apply to such officer".

#### INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION POLICY

SEC. 116. Title I of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, as amended by section 113 of this Act, is amended by redesignating section 35 as section 36 and by inserting the following new section after section 34:

"Sec. 35. (a) The Secretary of State shall assign responsibility for international communications and information policy matters within the Department of State to an appropriate Under Secretary of State (hereafter in this section referred to as the 'Under Secretary'). Such responsibilities shall include—

"(1) directing the formulation and coordination of executive branch policy on international communications and information issues;

"(2) overseeing and coordinating the functions of executive branch agencies concerned with international communications and information policy;

"(3) exercising, on behalf of the Secretary of State, the authority with respect to telecommunications assigned to the Secretary by Executive orders, determining United States positions and the conduct of United States participation in negotiations with foreign governments and in international bodies, and coordinating with other agencies as appropriate, including the Federal Communications Commission;

"(4) chairing the Senior Interagency Group on International Communications and Information Policy; and

"(5) serving as principal adviser to the Secretary of State and the Deputy Secretary of State on the conduct of foreign policy in the area of international communi-

cations and information, and coordinating as appropriate with the other Under Secretaries of State on matters relating to the responsibilities of those officers.

"(b) The Secretary of State shall establish, within the Department of State, an Office of the Coordinator for International Communications and Information Policy, headed by a Coordinator who shall be responsible to the Under Secretary. The Coordinator shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall have the rank of ambassador. The Coordinator shall be responsible, on behalf of the Under Secretary, for formulation, coordination, and oversight of international communications and information policy assigned to the Under Secretary pursuant to subsection (a), and for overseeing and coordinating the activities of the Department of State and other executive branch agencies concerned with international communications and information policy. On behalf of the Under Secretary, the Coordinator shall—

"(1) maintain continuing liaison with the bureaus and offices of the Department of State and with other executive branch agencies concerned with international communications and information policy;

"(2) chair such agency and interagency meetings as may be necessary to coordinate actions on pending issues to ensure proper policy coordination;

"(3) supervise and coordinate the activities of the Senior Interagency Group on International Communications and Information Policy;

"(4) coordinate the activities and assist as appropriate interagency working level task forces and committees concerned with specific aspects of international communications and information policy;

"(5) maintain liaison with the members and staffs of committees of the Congress concerned with international communications and information policy and provide testimony before such committees;

"(6) maintain appropriate liaison with representatives of the private sector to keep informed of their interests and problems, meet with them, and provide such assistance as may be needed to ensure that matters of concern to the private sector are promptly considered by the Department or other executive branch agencies; and

"(7) assist in arranging meetings of such public sector advisory groups as may be established to advise the Department of State and other executive branch agencies in connection with international communications and information policy issues."

#### DANGER PAY

SEC. 117. Section 5928 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The presence of nonessential personnel or dependents shall not preclude payment of an allowance under this section."

#### EXTENDED VOLUNTARY DEPARTURE STATUS FOR CERTAIN EL SALVADORANS

SEC. 118. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) ongoing fighting between the military forces of the Government of El Salvador and opposition forces is creating potentially life-threatening situations for innocent nationals of El Salvador;

(2) it has been estimated that more than sixty thousand nationals of El Salvador have fled from El Salvador and entered the United States since January 1980;

(3) currently the United States Government is detaining these nationals of El Salvador for the purpose of deporting or otherwise returning them to El Salvador, thereby irreparably harming the foreign policy image of the United States;

(4) deportation of these nationals could be temporarily suspended, until it became safe to return to El Salvador, if they are provided with extended voluntary departure status; and

(5) such extended voluntary departure status has been granted in recent history in cases of nationals who fled from Vietnam, Laos, Iran, and Nicaragua.

(b) Therefore, it is the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of State should recommend that extended voluntary departure status be granted to aliens who are nationals of El Salvador and that such status should be granted to those aliens until the situation in El Salvador has changed sufficiently to permit their safely residing in that country.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title 1?

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FASCELL

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to title 1.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FASCELL: Page 12, beginning in line 16, strike out "Such responsibilities shall" and all that follows through the end of line 15 on page 13.

Page 13, line 25, strike out "pursuant to" and all that follows through "information policy" in line 4 on page 14.

Page 14, line 10, immediately after "(2)" insert "in accordance with such authority as may be delegated by the President pursuant to Executive order,".

Page 14, line 13, immediately after "(3)" insert "in accordance with such authority as may be delegated by the President pursuant to Executive order,".

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. This amendment reflects agreement between the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Energy and Commerce. It is perfecting in the sense that there was some concern expressed by that committee with respect to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce and the possibility of infringing on his duties and responsibilities.

By agreement with the leadership of that committee we offer this amendment.

I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Colorado, who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Telecommunications of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. WIRTH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. DINGELL, the chairman of the full committee and the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. BROYHILL, the ranking minority member and I have worked with the gentleman from Florida. We greatly appreciate being able to work this out in such an expeditious and non-

controversial fashion. I support the amendment.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman very much.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, the administration has no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DE LA GARZA

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DE LA GARZA: Page 3, after line 3, insert the following new section 103:

IMPROVEMENT OF CONSULAR FACILITIES IN MEXICO CITY

SEC. 103. In addition to the amounts authorized to be appropriated by section 102(1) of this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated for "Administration of Foreign Affairs" for the fiscal year 1984 \$1,000,000 to be used for the purchase of land for and the construction of additional consular facilities and for certain improvements in existing consular facilities at the United States embassy in Mexico City, Mexico.

Redesignate subsequent sections of title 1 of the bill accordingly; and on page 12, line 9, strike out "113" and insert in lieu thereof "114".

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, first let me begin by apologizing to the chairman of the subcommittee and to the ranking member for having to do this in this manner. But I was recently in Mexico on other matters and found out there is a terrible situation in our Embassy complex, as far as the facility is concerned, for security and also the terrible problem that they have with the air quality.

The ambient air, for example, in Mexico City they get in 1 day the allowable levels that we have in the United States for 1 year. This could be corrected by changing the filtration system in the building.

Therefore, I have, working with the staff, prepared an amendment that would increase the authorization by \$4 million to the overall administration of foreign affairs facilities; and that would be utilized. Of course, after due studies by the committee and the Department, which I would have no objection to. As a matter of fact, I would so recommend.

I would hope that we might be able to convince our colleagues that this is a proper first step because you have seen what has happened in Teheran and what happened recently in Beirut,

Lebanon. And Mexico City can be a decision as far as safety is concerned because of the location of the Embassy.

□ 1240

Buying this property, which is a very good bargain, would be an investment for the United States because it is high value property that will increase in value in the years to come.

I would recommend to my colleagues favorable action on this amendment.

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman for his amendment, particularly for that portion which is directed to giving some type of an air-conditioning system or air-filtration system to our Embassy in Mexico which houses about 600 Americans.

It is my understanding and I understand the gentleman has reviewed the pollutant level that currently exists, it is a tremendous health hazard to those people who are serving us there.

I commend the gentleman for this amendment.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Yes; I have personally checked into it and it is either that or give them hazardous pay, because they go through there in 1 day what we allow for in 1 year.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague to provide for a air-conditioning and filtration system for the U.S. Embassy in Mexico City and to provide for the acquisition of property adjacent to the Embassy. As you may be aware, Mexico City is subject to extreme air pollution, which poses grave health risks for the Americans working there. At a time of important policy decisions in Mexico and Central America, I feel that it is imperative that our Embassy personnel have adequate, safe working conditions.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a question of comfort and luxury. Rather, it is a question of allowing our diplomats to work in an environment which is not hazardous to their health. Mexico City is recognized as the most polluted capital in the world. The pollution is not seasonal, but exists 24 hours per day, year round. Merely by breathing the air on an average day, our personnel inhale the equivalent pollutants of two packs of cigarettes. On bad days, when large amounts of dust are in the air, people get viral infections simply by walking outside.

Let me cite a few statistics to give you a clearer picture of the extreme health hazards of working in Mexico City: 248 tons of human waste evaporate into the atmosphere per day. There are high incidences of pollution-related skin rashes; intestinal ailments; eye, ear, nose, and throat infections; insomnia; and cardiopulmonary diseases such as asthma, bronchitis, and emphysema among Embassy staff.

This situation would never be tolerated in a Government building in this country. The U.S. national standard for total suspended particulates require that an individual not be subjected to more than an average of 75 micrograms per cubic meter. The average in Mexico City is 258 micrograms per cubic meter, some 3½ times the legal limit. In other words, Embassy personnel are subjected on a daily basis to air which the U.S. Government says is extremely hazardous to their health.

As the recent example of the bombing in Beirut indicates, American personnel abroad are extremely vulnerable to terrorism. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the health risks posed by the environment in Mexico City are an equally dangerous threat to the health and lives of American diplomats.

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Texas for his concern about our Embassy in Mexico and I know that he has spent a great deal of time in promoting cooperation between our Nation and the Government of Mexico.

Has the gentleman discussed his proposal with the State Department?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I have discussed it with the Embassy in Mexico City and they inform me that the State Department had no objection if we took this route. They would not want for us to disrupt their priorities in the allowable funding that has already been worked out, but that if additional funds—which is the reason for this amendment—were secured, they would look favorably to buying the property and working on the other facility to preserve and protect the health of our employees there.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, the minority has no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague from Texas bringing this matter to the attention of the committee. We have discussed it informally and he felt it was essential to offer an amendment. And I can understand his feelings in that regard.

It is a matter which the committee is interested in, obviously, and we will explore it both at the staff level and otherwise in trying to deal with a rather serious situation in Mexico City.

The committee has urged the Department and the executive branch and we do it again in this report to increase its budget with respect to the needs of the Department of State for its facilities. There is a great need that we just cannot meet for budgetary rea-



sons. This amendment is an effort, obviously, to point out that need. But right now, there are a total of unfunded projects that would be extremely useful if not necessary—I am separating that from security matters—of \$344,140,000 in places all over the globe where the United States is represented. You can see the magnitude of the problem that the Department of State Foreign Buildings Office has, and why they could not give our distinguished colleague from Texas immediate help with respect to the priority involved—they have less than half the money they need.

Suffice it to say, I cannot guarantee that there will be a specific allocation by law either in appropriation or otherwise for the Mexican problem, but we are very much aware of it and we will pursue the matter further.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DE LA GARZA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GREGG

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GREGG: Amend title I, page 16, line 21 by adding the following new section:

REPORT ON VOTES OF THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND SECURITY COUNCIL

SEC. 119. The Secretary of State through the Offices of the United States Representative to the United Nations and Representative to the Security Council shall on or before February 1st of each year report to the Speaker of the House and President of the Senate all votes of the Membership of the General Assembly and Security Council. Such report shall include a comparison with the votes cast by the United States.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, this amendment requires that the Secretary of State through the offices of the U.S. Representative to the United Nations and Representative to the Security Council report to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate the votes cast at the General Assembly by the other member nations of the General Assembly and the Security Council and also report them in relationship to the votes cast by the United States.

The purpose and the thrust of the amendment is to allow the Congress in a more formal manner to track what is happening at the United Nations in the area of the votes cast by the member nations and the member nations of the Security Council.

This, I think, becomes important to us as a body because of the fact that many of the members who are participating in the U.N. General Assembly

are also nations which we deal with on other levels, such as foreign aid, such as trade activities. And things which are done at the United Nations should not be allowed to be separated from the overall dealings with these various nations. We should have an ability to integrate the decisions which occur at the United Nations with the decisions which we make in other areas here on the floor of the House.

Thus, I think it is important that we have a sense of what the membership of the United Nations is doing in their voting activities.

Ambassador Kilpatrick, in a recent speech, made this point to Members of Congress who were in the audience when she stated essentially that she would like the Congress to more closely monitor what is happening at the U.N. She thinks that one of the best ways that the Congress can affect activities in the U.N. is to have the member states at the U.N. be sensitive to the fact that the Congress is actually watching what is going on and is sensitive to what they are doing and how they are casting votes. She made the interesting point that Zimbabwe votes with the United States 12 percent of the time while the Soviet Union votes with the United States 20 percent of the time. As a Member of Congress I certainly was not aware of that and I think that is information we need in coming to our decisions in areas of trade or aid or just alliance activity.

So this amendment, which is really not dramatic, it does not cost any money, it simply requires that the Secretary of State report to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate the actual voting records and how they are related to the American voting record.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from New Hampshire for submitting this amendment. We now have a copy of his amendment and have no objections on our side of the aisle.

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

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

Mr. HILER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman for his amendment. I think it is, as he mentioned, not a major change from what already happens. It probably formalizes the procedure somewhat more and it will give this Congress a chance to better understand the actions of all the nations in the United Nations and how they act relative to positions the United States takes.

I think this would be invaluable information for the Congress as it deliberates a variety of bills and a variety of actions.

erates a variety of bills and a variety of actions.

I applaud the gentleman and compliment him for his actions.

Mr. GREGG. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for his comments.

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

Mr. GREGG. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GEKAS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, just as a matter of information, does the context of the amendment that the gentleman offers compel the voting records to be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or simply to be reported to us in another manner?

Mr. GREGG. It compels that they be reported to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate. And I would assume that if any Member wished to put them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that would be the prerogative of the Member.

□ 1250

They would be available to us through the Speaker's office or, if you are in the Senate, through the President of the Senate's office.

Mr. GEKAS. I would feel better about it—and I support the amendment—if it contained language that would automatically place the voting record at a designated time in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. But if we can find other ways and means to do so, I will be satisfied.

Mr. GREGG. That would be an available option for the Member upon obtaining a copy of the report.

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

Mr. Chairman, we have seen the amendment on this side. We do not have any objection to the amendment.

I must say, however, that it is worth trying. My last recollection, having served at the United Nations, was when we had the annual tabulation on votes, it was a document inches high. It is going to be rather difficult. I am not sure about the expense. But the spirit of the amendment is fine, and therefore we have no objection to it. There may be some practical way, without it being too burdensome or expensive, to get the idea across that the gentleman wants to get across in this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG).

The amendment was agreed to.

Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in support of H.R. 2915.

(Ms. FERRARO asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Chairman, section 103 of this bill provides needed Federal funds for extraordinary protective services for foreign diplomats

in the United States. As the committee report makes clear, under international law the Federal Government is responsible for the safety of foreign diplomats and foreign missions in this country. Yet too often, the financial burden of actually providing these protective services falls on State and local governments.

As a representative from New York City, which has the largest foreign diplomatic community of any U.S. city, I have taken an active interest in this issue. Last December, Congress passed a bill I had sponsored to double the authorization level from \$3.5 million to \$7 million for Federal reimbursements to local governments, and to authorize \$17 million for backlogged claims on services already provided. I am pleased to report that the Appropriations Committee has approved \$15 million pursuant to that authorization.

The additional \$6 million provided in this bill will help to ease the burden on strained local police forces in cities like New York, Los Angeles, and Boston, and it will underscore our determination that we will not tolerate terrorist activities such as those which have claimed the lives of Turkish diplomats in recent years.

By concentrating on protecting foreign officials resident in the United States, this bill expands Federal involvement in an area of clear Federal responsibility. I want to commend the Committee on Foreign Affairs for its leadership on this issue, and I urge support for this bill.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I had an amendment printed in the RECORD last week which provides for danger pay for American Government civilian employees serving in Lebanon and El Salvador. In mid April, a car bomb exploded outside the American Embassy in Beirut, killing as many as 16 Americans. In late May, a Navy lieutenant commander was gunned down in El Salvador. Both places are clearly quite dangerous. As the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) well remembers, we added a provision to the Foreign Service Act of 1980 to establish a danger pay allowance which may be granted to employees in a foreign area "on the basis of civil insurrection, civil war, terrorism, or wartime conditions which threaten physical harm or imminent danger to the health or well-being of the employee." If El Salvador and Lebanon do not qualify, I do not know what does. The amount of money involved is really quite small since we have only 47 civilian employees in Beirut and 65 in San Salvador.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield, I thoroughly agree with you that danger pay should be provided to American civilian per-

sonnel in both places and perhaps others, such as Belfast, as well. The problem we have run into is that the State Department has interpreted the legislative history surrounding the passage of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 to mean that danger pay could not be granted where nonessential personnel or dependents remained at post. I must confess that they have some basis for this view. Up until last November, danger pay was granted in Beirut. When the dependents were allowed back in, however, the State Department ruled that danger pay could no longer be allowed. To make it clear that we believe that danger pay should not rest on the absence of dependents, we adopted an amendment in committee, offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) to say, "The presence of nonessential personnel or dependents shall not preclude payment of an allowance under this section." I think this language should handle the situation and I have assurances from the State Department that danger pay will be provided in both circumstances.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. If I may reclaim my time, given what you have said, do you object to the amendment which I published in the RECORD?

Mr. FASCELL. If the gentleman will yield, I do not object to the purpose of the amendment. I do object, however to doing it by legislation. We have provided the administration with the authority to grant danger pay and we should lean on the administration to provide that benefit when it is appropriate. If we mandate the payment, we have to vote to cut it off when the danger has passed. Your amendment would cut it off in 2 years or when American troops are withdrawn. I am not certain that either of these dates has much to do with the level of danger at either post. In any case, I have assurances that danger pay will be granted, I think the amendment is unnecessary.

The gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. SCHROEDER) is the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service and worked jointly with my Subcommittee on International Operations to write the Foreign Service Act. She has taken the lead on this issue by sending around a letter to the President requesting him to grant danger pay to American civilians and hostile fire pay to military personnel in Lebanon and El Salvador. I have signed this letter and urge my colleagues to do likewise. When I spoke a minute ago about keeping pressure on the administration, I was thinking of letters like the one being circulated by the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the distinguished chairman for that endorsement. Because of his assurances and my respect for him, I shall not offer the amendment printed in the RECORD. I do, however, have with me the letter to the President which the gentleman mentioned. It urges the President to

provide danger pay and hostile fire pay to American personnel in Lebanon and El Salvador. I think that the least we ought to do for Americans ordered to serve in places where they might get killed is to provide a little pay supplement. We ought to do whatever we can to minimize the risk as well. I urge my colleagues to sign this letter and use this as a vehicle to do right by our people in dangerous foreign lands.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title I?

The Clerk will designate title II.

The text of title II is as follows:

#### TITLE II—UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

##### SHORT TITLE

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "United States Information Agency Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985".

##### AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 202. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated for the United States Information Agency \$701,427,000 for the fiscal year 1984 and \$861,039,000 for the fiscal year 1985 to carry out international communication, educational, cultural, and exchange programs under the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, and Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1977, and other purposes authorized by law.

(b) Of the authorizations of appropriations contained in subsection (a), authorizations of \$47,959,000 for the fiscal year 1984 and \$179,426,000 for the fiscal year 1985, for the acquisition and construction of radio facilities, shall remain available until the appropriations are made, and when those amounts are appropriated they are authorized to remain available until expended.

##### FUNDS FOR THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY

SEC. 203. Of the amounts appropriated for the United States Information Agency for each of the fiscal years 1984 and 1985, not less than \$31,300,000 shall be for a grant to the National Endowment for Democracy (established pursuant to title VI of this Act) for use in carrying out its purposes.

##### FISCAL YEAR 1983 SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 204. Section 302 of the United States Information Agency Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1982 and 1983, is amended by striking out "\$559,000,000 for the fiscal year 1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$574,000,000 for the fiscal year 1983".

##### NOTIFICATION OF REPROGRAMINGS AND GRANTS

SEC. 205. Title VII of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (22 U.S.C. 1476-1477b) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 705. (a) Unless the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate are notified fifteen days in advance of the proposed reprogramming, funds appropriated for the United States Information Agency shall not be available for obligation or expenditure through any reprogramming of funds—

- "(1) which creates new programs;
- "(2) which eliminates a program, project, or activity;
- "(3) which increases funds or personnel by any means for any project or activity for

which funds have been denied or restricted by the Congress;

"(4) which relocates an office or employees;

"(5) which reorganizes offices, programs, or activities; or

"(6) which involves a reprogramming in excess of \$250,000 or 10 per centum, whichever is less, and which (A) augments existing programs, projects, or activities, (B) reduces by 10 per centum or more the funding for any existing program, project, activity, or personnel approved by the Congress, or (C) results from any general savings from a reduction in personnel which would result in a change in existing programs, activities, or projects approved by the Congress.

"(b) The United States Information Agency may award program grants for the fiscal years 1984 and 1985 only if the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate are notified fifteen days in advance of the proposed grant."

#### DISSEMINATION OF USIA-PREPARED INFORMATION TO FOREIGN DIPLOMATS IN THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 206. Section 501 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (22 U.S.C. 1461) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 501"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), information described in that subsection (whether or not prepared for dissemination abroad) may be made available, within the United States, its territories and possessions, to foreign diplomatic and consular officials accredited to the United States Government or to the United Nations or any of its related organizations. Any such official who receives information under this subsection shall not make or allow the further dissemination of such information within the United States, its territories or possessions, except to other foreign diplomatic or consular officials who are so accredited."

#### DISTRIBUTION WITHIN THE UNITED STATES OF THE USIA FILM ENTITLED "THANKSGIVING IN PESHAWAR"

SEC. 207. (a) Notwithstanding the second sentence of section 501(a), as so redesignated by section 206 of this Act, of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (22 U.S.C. 1461(a))—

(1) the Director of the United States Information Agency shall make available to the Administrator of General Services a master copy of the film entitled "Thanksgiving in Peshawar"; and

(2) upon evidence that necessary United States rights and licenses have been secured and paid for by the person seeking domestic release of the film, the Administrator shall reimburse the Director for any expenses of the Agency in making that master copy available, shall deposit that film in the National Archives of the United States, and shall make copies of the film available for purchase and public viewing within the United States.

(b) Any reimbursement to the Director pursuant to this section shall be credited to the applicable appropriation of the United States Information Agency.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title II?

If not, the Clerk will designate title III.

The text of title III is as follows:

#### TITLE III—BOARD FOR INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING

SEC. 301. This title may be cited as the "Board for International Broadcasting Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985".

##### AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 302. Subparagraph (A) of section 8(a)(1) of the Board for International Broadcasting Act of 1973 (22 U.S.C. 2877(a)(1)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

"(A) \$120,140,000 for the fiscal year 1983, \$115,702,000 for the fiscal year 1984, and \$121,371,000 for the fiscal year 1985; and"

##### SALARY OF THE RFE/RL PRESIDENT

SEC. 303. (a) The Board for International Broadcasting Act of 1973 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

##### "SALARY OF THE RFE/RL PRESIDENT

"SEC. 12. Funds made available under this Act to the RFE/RL, Inc., may not be used for the salary of the President of RFE/RL, Inc., at an annual rate in excess of the rate payable for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code."

(b) The amendment made by this section applies with respect to funds used for the salary of any President of RFE/RL, Inc., who is appointed after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman that the bill is being considered title by title, pursuant to the rule.

Are there amendments to title III?

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to title II, and I ask unanimous consent to return to title II of the bill for that purpose.

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I must object to returning to title II. I tried to open up this bill and I was stopped. Now that we have passed the title, the gentleman wants to go back.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I fully understand. I was here on the floor. I was asked as a courtesy to go out to speak in the hall to people from the White House who were opposed to my amendment. I did that for a second, and while I was gone the opportunity to offer my amendment was eliminated.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman's amendment to title II? I do not understand.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. My amendment is to title II. It relates to the funding.

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, but I have no idea what the amendment is, and I just hesitate.

Mr. Chairman, I must object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Are there amendments to title III? The Clerk will designate title IV. The text of title IV is as follows:

#### TITLE IV—INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION

##### SHORT TITLE

SEC. 401. This title may be cited as the "Inter-American Foundation Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985".

##### AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 402. Section 401(s)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969 (22 U.S.C. 2901(s)(2)) is amended in the first sentence by striking out "\$12,000,000 for the fiscal year 1982 and \$12,800,000 for the fiscal year 1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$16,000,000 for the fiscal year 1984 and \$16,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title IV?

The Clerk will designate title V.

The text of title V is as follows:

#### TITLE V—THE ASIA FOUNDATION

##### SHORT TITLE

SEC. 501. This title may be cited as "The Asia Foundation Act".

##### FINDINGS

SEC. 502. The Congress finds that—

(1) The Asia Foundation, a private non-profit corporation incorporated in 1954 in the State of California, has long been active in promoting Asian-American friendship and cooperation and in lending encouragement and assistance to Asians in their own efforts to develop more open, more just, and more democratic societies;

(2) The Asia Foundation's commitment to strengthening indigenous Asian institutions which further stable national development, constructive social change, equitable economic growth, and cooperative international relationships is fully consistent with and supportive of long-term United States interests in Asia;

(3) The Asia Foundation, as a private organization, is able to conduct programs in response to Asian initiatives that would be difficult or impossible for an official United States instrumentality, and it is in a position in Asia to respond quickly and flexibly to meet new opportunities;

(4) in recognition of the valuable contributions of The Asia Foundation to long-range United States foreign policy interests, the United States Government has, through a variety of agencies, provided financial support for The Asia Foundation; and

(5) it is in the interest of the United States, and the further strengthening of Asian-American friendship and cooperation, to establish a more permanent mechanism for United States Government financial support for the ongoing activities of The Asia Foundation, while preserving the independent character of the Foundation.

##### GRANTS TO THE ASIA FOUNDATION

SEC. 503. (a) The Secretary of State shall make an annual grant to The Asia Foundation with the funds made available under section 504. Such grants shall be in general support of the Foundation's programs and operations. The terms and conditions of grants pursuant to this section shall be set forth in a grant agreement between the Secretary of State and The Asia Foundation.

(b) If funds made available to The Asia Foundation pursuant to this title or pursuant to any other provision of law are, with the permission of the head of the Federal agency making the funds available, invested by the Foundation or any of its subgrantees pending disbursement, the resulting interest is not required to be deposited in the United



States Treasury if that interest is used for the purposes for which the funds were made available.

#### FUNDING

SEC. 504. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of State \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year 1983, \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year 1984, and \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985 for grants to The Asia Foundation pursuant to this title.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title V?

The Clerk will designate title VI.

The text of title VI is as follows:

#### TITLE VI—NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY

##### SHORT TITLE

SEC. 601. This title may be cited as the "National Endowment for Democracy Act".

##### ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY

SEC. 602. (a) There is authorized to be established a nonprofit corporation to be known as the National Endowment for Democracy (hereafter in this title referred to as the "Endowment").

(b) The Endowment will not be an agency or establishment of the United States Government.

(c) The Endowment shall be subject to the provisions of this title and, to the extent consistent with this title, to the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act.

(d) The Endowment shall have its principal offices in the District of Columbia.

##### PURPOSES OF THE ENDOWMENT

SEC. 603. (a) The purposes of the Endowment are—

(1) to encourage free and democratic institutions throughout the world through private sector initiatives, including activities which promote the individual rights and freedoms, including internationally recognized human rights and fundamental freedoms, which are essential to the functioning of democratic institutions;

(2) to facilitate exchanges between United States private sector groups (especially the two major American political parties, labor, and business) and democratic groups abroad;

(3) to promote United States nongovernmental participation, especially through the two major American political parties, labor, business, and other private sector groups, in democratic training programs and democratic institution-building abroad;

(4) to strengthen democratic electoral processes abroad through timely measures in cooperation with indigenous democratic forces;

(5) to support the participation of the two major American political parties, labor, business, and other United States private sector groups in fostering cooperation with those abroad dedicated to the cultural values, institutions, and organizations of democratic pluralism; and

(6) to encourage the establishment and growth of democratic development in a manner consistent both with the broad concerns of United States national interests and with the specific requirements of the democratic groups in other countries which are aided by programs funded by the Endowment.

(b)(1) The Endowment may only provide funding for programs of private sector groups and may not carry out programs directly.

(2) The Endowment may provide funding only for programs which are consistent with the purposes set forth in this section.

(c) The Endowment and its grantees shall be subject to the appropriate oversight procedures of the Congress.

##### INCORPORATION OF THE ENDOWMENT

SEC. 604. (a) The following individuals shall serve as incorporators of the Endowment and shall take whatever actions are necessary to establish the Endowment under the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act: Honorable Dante B. Fascell, Honorable Charles Percy, Louis E. Martin, Sally Shelton, Olin Robison, John Richardson, Jr., Charles T. Manatt, Polly Baca Barragan, Frank Fahrenkopf, Lane Kirkland, Albert Shanker, William Brock, Charles H. Smith, Jr., Jay Van Andel, and Mrs. Legree Daniels.

(b) The Honorable Dante B. Fascell shall serve as chairman of the incorporators and as interim chairman of the Endowment until such time as a chairman is elected in accordance with the bylaws of the Endowment.

##### BOARD OF DIRECTORS

SEC. 605. (a) The Endowment shall be governed by a Board of Directors (hereafter in this title referred to as the "Board") composed of fifteen members. The initial members of the Board shall be the incorporators designated in section 604; and thereafter the Board shall be self-perpetuating, with members to be elected in accordance with the bylaws of the Endowment.

(b) Vacancies in the membership of the Board shall not affect its powers.

(c) The members of the Board shall not, by reason of their membership on the Board, be deemed to be officers or employees of the United States. They shall, while attending meetings of the Board or while engaged in duties relating to such meetings or in other activities of the Board pursuant to this title, be entitled (except in the case of members of the Board who are Members of Congress or officers or employees of the United States Government) to receive compensation at the daily equivalent of the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code, and, while away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, equal to that authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

##### OFFICERS OF THE ENDOWMENT

SEC. 606. (a) The chief executive officer of the Endowment shall be a president appointed by the Board. The president of the Endowment shall administer the daily operations of the Endowment, reporting to the Board under guidelines and procedures to be established by the Board.

(b) The Endowment shall have such other officers and employees as the Board may determine.

(c) Officers of the Endowment shall be appointed on such terms, and for such terms or at the pleasure of the Board, as the Board may determine.

(d) Officers of the Endowment may not receive any salary or other compensation from any source other than the Endowment during the period of their employment by the Endowment.

##### NONPROFIT NATURE OF THE ENDOWMENT

SEC. 607. (a) The Corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock, or to declare or pay any dividends.

(b) No part of the assets of the Corporation shall inure to the benefit of any member of the Board, any officer or employee of the Endowment, or any other individual, except as salary or reasonable compensation for services.

##### RECORDS AND AUDIT OF THE ENDOWMENT AND THE RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE

SEC. 608. (a)(1) The accounts of the Endowment shall be audited annually in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by independent certified public accountants or independent licensed public accountants certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State or other political subdivision of the United States. The audits shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the Endowment are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the Endowment and necessary to facilitate the audits shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audits; and full facilities for verifying transactions with any assets held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

(2) The report of each such independent audit shall be included in the annual report required by section 609. The audit report shall set forth the scope of the audit and include such statements as are necessary to present fairly the Endowment's assets and liabilities, surplus or deficit, with an analysis of the changes therein during the year, supplemented in reasonable detail by a statement of the Endowment's income and expenses during the year, and a statement of the application of funds, together with the independent auditor's opinion of those statements.

(b)(1) The financial transactions of the Endowment for each fiscal year may be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with such principles and procedures and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. Any such audit shall be conducted at the place or places where accounts of the Endowment are normally kept. The representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the Endowment pertaining to its financial transactions and necessary to facilitate the audit; and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with any assets held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians. All such books, accounts, records, reports, files, papers, and property of the Endowment shall remain in possession and custody of the Endowment.

(2) A report of each such audit shall be made by the Comptroller General to the Congress. The report to the Congress shall contain such comments and information as the Comptroller General may deem necessary to inform Congress of the financial operations and condition of the Endowment, together with such recommendations with respect thereto as he may deem advisable. The report shall also show specifically any program, expenditure, or other financial transaction or undertaking observed in the course of the audit, which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, has been carried on or made without authority of law. A copy of each report shall be furnished to the President and to the Endowment at the time submitted to the Congress.

(c)(1) Each recipient of assistance under this section shall keep such records as may be reasonably necessary to fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and



such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

(2) The Endowment, or any of its duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to assistance received under this title. The Comptroller General of the United States or any of his duly authorized representatives shall also have access thereto for such purpose.

#### REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

SEC. 609. Not later than December 31, of each year, the Endowment shall submit an annual report for the preceding fiscal year to the President for transmittal to the Congress. The report shall include a comprehensive and detailed report of the Endowment's operations, activities, financial condition, and accomplishments under this title and may include such recommendations as the Endowment deems appropriate. The Board members and officers of the Endowment shall be available to testify before appropriate committees of the Congress with respect to such report, the report of any audit made by the Comptroller General pursuant to section 608, or any other matter which any such committee may determine.

#### FUNDING FOR THE ENDOWMENT

SEC. 610. (a) The Director of the United States Information Agency may make grants to the Endowment with funds appropriated to the Agency for the "Salaries and Expenses" account.

(b) Funds so granted may be used by the Endowment to carry out the purposes of this title, and otherwise applicable limitations on the purposes for which funds appropriated to the Agency may be used shall not apply to funds granted to the Endowment.

#### ALLOCATION OF FUNDS

SEC. 611. Of the amounts made available to the Endowment for each of the fiscal years 1984 and 1985 to carry out programs in furtherance of the purposes of this Act—

(1) not less than \$5,000,000 shall be for the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs;

(2) not less than \$5,000,000 shall be for the National Republican Institute for International Affairs;

(3) not less than \$13,800,000 shall be for the Free Trade Union Institute; and

(4) not less than \$2,500,000 shall be to support private enterprise development programs of the National Chamber Foundation.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title VI?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF COLORADO

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Colorado: On page 26, line 1, strike: "TITLE VI—NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY" and all that follow through page 35, line 9.

□ 1300

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, title VI deals with a very fine institution called the National Endowment for Democracy. It is a new idea and it has the potential to do a number of things. I think every Member of this body will strongly identify with the goals that are set forth. Most of us will be comfortable with the goals that they hope to advance.

I rise to object to the measure and urge this body to reject the spending of \$31.3 million in that effort for these reasons:

First of all, I am concerned about the cost. Our country has an enormous deficit. This is not the time to be adding programs of this kind.

Second, and I think far more important, I have some real concerns about this country taking public tax money and using it to subsidize the Republican and the Democratic Parties. Our democracy is a marvelous system. It is one that is tenuous. It is one that has not flowered everywhere in the world. To subsidize it with Federal funds, as this attempts to do, is a real danger to the whole concept of democracy itself.

True enough, our purpose is to advance democracy, but when you begin to have the political parties of this country dependent upon public dole, they become answerable to the Government. I think there is a real problem with subsidizing the various labor unions in their activities, not that they are not worthy enterprises, not that they are not important, not that they will not advance some important goals, but there is a real problem on making them dependent upon public funds and making them eventually become answerable to the Government.

Third, I am very concerned about the impact this has on the United States abroad. I would freely confess to my colleagues that other countries are involved in activities that are somewhat similar to this bill. One of the things that can make the activities of our labor unions overseas so effective in speaking out for democracy and free enterprise and for union rights is that they are not instruments of the Government but can be instruments of American workers.

To make the political parties and the labor unions and the others that will benefit from this largess instruments of the Federal Government will help to destroy their effectiveness. I am all for their involvement. I am all for their stated purpose. I am all for the development of democracy overseas, but this is not the way to do it. This is a way that will harm their effectiveness, harm the advancement of democracy, harm the speaking out for free enterprise by reducing the effectiveness of those instruments that we choose to subsidize.

I urge this body to reject this \$31.3 million attempt to interject the Federal Government into the private sector. There is great danger for the future of our own democracy if we choose these tools.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I am glad that the gentleman supports the concepts and the purposes for which the language is in the bill, and I hasten to add that it is certainly in response to an administration initiative and very important. It has strong bipartisan support. I will say to the gentleman.

I need to clear up, however, some statements on the record. One is that the labor institute program has been an ongoing program for a long time. They have been receiving grants from the U.S. Government for over 30 years that I know of. For whatever reasons, and I think good ones, this administration wanted to show that allocation of funds and grants to American labor to be part of Project Democracy.

We agreed with that in the committee. We think that was a wise idea. And we also agreed, therefore, because this was a new concept for private enterprise through the chamber of commerce with their institute, that they would be part of Project Democracy in the manner in which the administration has also suggested.

As a matter of fact, we allocated even more money than the administration had first proposed for that purpose because we think it is absolutely essential to show to the world that private enterprise and labor are hand in hand in supporting overseas the concepts of free labor unions, private enterprise and market economy, and the things that we all believe in.

So we gave strong support to the administration on this matter.

Now, with respect to the political parties, I do not know whether the gentleman was on the floor when the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO) reported on his recent trip to Latin America and Venezuela and other places where they explored with counterpart groups the concept of the political parties engaging in Project Democracy on a regional basis. He reported that they were so enthusiastic that at long last a mechanism had been found whereby the political parties of the United States would be able to undertake, similarly to the political parties of other democracies, either individually or collectively with other organizations, as this regional concept seeks to do, the furtherance of the whole idea of a pluralistic political process, participation by parties, and whatever it is that we can contribute.

We think that is a very encouraging sign. In no way does it indicate that political parties domestically will in any sense draw on those funds. That is why there are separate institutes for that purpose, monitored very carefully. Mr. Chairman, in addition to other groups and organizations who have already indicated valuable ideas for the growth and the encouragement of democratic institutions abroad under Project Democracy which we think need to be encouraged and nurtured. That is the concept in here.

If title VI is stricken out, as the gentleman suggests, we do away with all of that. For the first time since I have been here, 28 years in the Congress, I had the golden opportunity to sit in a committee hearing and see the heads of both political parties, the leader of the American labor movement, and

representatives of the executive branch and the private sector sit down and testify on behalf of the program that is laid out in title VI, the result of a Presidential initiative, and a thorough bipartisan study. They were unanimously behind this.

I can understand the gentleman's concern, but I think there is sufficient oversight both in the Congress and otherwise to insure that the gentleman's concerns will be thoroughly answered.

I would hope, therefore, that having had this colloquy, that he would be willing at this point to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his remarks and I think he is an eloquent spokesman for the goals that I share.

It does seem to me that the subsidies by the Federal Government to the groups, albeit they are very good groups, is a problem. Part of my concern is the funding aspect, not so much the institute.

Mr. FASCELL. They were all in the budget, I will say to the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this proposal is the result of a lengthy, 6-month non-governmental research study by two major U.S. political parties, the Republican Party and the Democratic Party, by labor and business—it involved Democrats, Republicans liberals, moderates and conservatives—to try to come up with a new private sector approach that will foster and strengthen our democratic values and institutions abroad.

Our Nation is engaged in a battle of ideas with authoritarian governments, and this is one of the better ways of highlighting what our Nation stands for. The Washington Post recently commented in an editorial on April 26, 1983, in which they highlighted "A Good Way to Export Democracy," and I quote from the last portion of that editorial:

But it is even more right and necessary to proceed. The endowment the sponsors have in mind is an incremental program of long-term institution-building, conducted out in the open and run not by government officials, but rather by the American private sector groups themselves. European political parties have long been in the business of helping their foreign counterparts. The record of effective international activity by the AFL-CIO and by many private foundations demonstrates that Americans can engage in it usefully, too.

□ 1310

I have a letter before me that was sent to the Members of Congress by the Democracy Program signed by Bill Brock and joined in by Charles T. Manatt, Lane Kirkland, and Frank J. Fahrenkopf, in which they state, and I quote:

The National Endowment for Democracy will fund recently-created separate Democratic and Republican party Institutes for International Affairs, the AFL-CIO supported Free Trade Union Institute, a Center for International Private Enterprise which would function under the auspices of the National Chamber Foundation, and other grantees. The AFL-CIO has a track record of three decades of providing assistance to democratic trade unionists abroad, and the business community has begun designing its Center to strengthen such international programs with its counterparts. As for the party Institutes, we note the Post's comment: "The most intriguing of these programs would help the American political parties reach out to their democratic allies abroad."

Mr. Chairman, I commend the President for initially suggesting this proposal when he spoke before the Parliament in London not too long ago. I commend the leaders of business, labor, and the political parties who have joined together in this effort, and I urge my colleagues to support Project Democracy, an idea that will not only help strengthen our own institutions but will also present them in the most favorable light abroad. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to oppose the Brown amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. Brown).

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

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Chair announces that pursuant to clause 2, rule XXIII, he will vacate proceedings under the call when a quorum of the Committee appears.

Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

□ 1320

## QUORUM CALL VACATED

The CHAIRMAN. One hundred Members have responded. A quorum of the Committee of the Whole is present. Pursuant to clause 2, rule XXIII, further proceedings under the call shall be considered as vacated.

The Committee will resume its business.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. Brown) for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 215, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 182]

## AYES—194

Andrews (TX)	Hansen (UT)	Ottlinger
Anthony	Harkin	Oxley
Applegate	Keefe	Packard
Archer	Hightower	Panetta
AuCoin	Hiler	Patman
Barnard	Hillis	Patterson
Bartlett	Hopkins	Pease
Bates	Hughes	Rahall
Bedell	Hunter	Ratcliff
Bethune	Jacobs	Ray
Bevil	Jenkins	Regula
Boner	Johnson	Roberts
Breaux	Jones (OK)	Romer
Brown (CA)	Jones (TN)	Rovers
Brown (CO)	Kaptur	Rowland
Broyhill	Keach	Rudd
Burton	Kastenmeier	Savage
Byron	Kennedy	Schroeder
Carney	Kindness	Schroeder
Carper	Kogovsek	Seiberling
Chappie	Kramer	Seisenbrenner
Clay	LaFalce	Shannon
Coats	Leach	Sharp
Coleman (TX)	Leath	Shumway
Conable	Leland	Shuster
Courter	Levine	Sisisky
Craig	Levitas	Skeen
Crane, Daniel	Loeffler	Slattery
Crane, Philip	Long (LA)	Smith (NE)
Crockett	Lott	Smith, Denny
D'Amours	Lowery (CA)	Smith, Robert
Daniel	Lowry (WA)	Snowe
Dannemeyer	Lujan	Snyder
Daschle	Lungren	Spratt
Daub	Mack	Staggers
Dellums	MacKay	Stark
DeWine	Madigan	Stenholm
Dickinson	Marlenee	Studds
Dorgan	Martin (IL)	Stump
Dreier	Martin (NC)	Sundquist
Duncan	Martin (NY)	Swift
Durbin	McCain	Synar
Early	McCandless	Tauke
Edgar	McCloskey	Tauzin
Edwards (AL)	McCollum	Taylor
Edwards (CA)	McCurdy	Thomas (GA)
Emerson	McDonald	Traxler
English	McEwen	Vento
Erdreich	McGrath	Volkmer
Evans (IA)	McKernan	Vucanovich
Feighan	Mikulski	Walgren
Fields	Miller (CA)	Walker
Flippo	Miller (OH)	Watkins
Florio	Mineta	Weaver
Forsythe	Molinar	Weber
Frank	Montgomery	Weiss
Glickman	Moody	Whittaker
Gradison	Moore	Whitten
Gramm	Moorhead	Winn
Gregg	Morrison (CT)	Wirth
Guarini	Myers	Wise
Hall, Ralph	Nichols	Wortley
Hall, Sam	Nielson	Wyden
Hamilton	Oskar	Zschau
Hammerschmidt	Olin	

## NOES—215

Ackerman	Broomfield	Dymally
Addabbo	Bryant	Dyson
Akaka	Campbell	Eckart
Albosta	Carr	Edwards (OK)
Alexander	Chandler	Erlenborn
Anderson	Chappell	Evans (IL)
Annunzio	Clarke	Fasell
Aspin	Clinger	Pazio
Earnes	Coebo	Ferraro
Bennett	Coluns	Fiedler
Bereuter	Conte	Fish
Berman	Cooper	Fuchsella
Baker	Corcoran	Foley
Bilakis	Coughlin	Ford (TN)
Biley	Coyne	Powder
Boehlert	Davis	Frost
Boys	de la Garza	Frqua
Bonior	Derrick	Garcia
Bonker	Dicks	Gaydos
Borski	Dingell	Geldenson
Bosco	Dixon	Gras
Boucher	Donnelly	Gephardt
Boxer	Dowdy	Gibbons
Britt	Downey	Gilman
Brooks	Dwyer	Gingrich

Gonzalez	McNulty	Sabo
Goodling	Mica	Sawyer
Gore	Michel	Scheuer
Gray	Minish	Schneider
Green	Mitchell	Schulze
Gunderson	Moakley	Schumer
Hall (IN)	Mollohan	Shaw
Hall (OH)	Morrison (WA)	Shelby
Hance	Mrazek	Sikorski
Harrison	Murphy	Siljander
Hatcher	Murtha	Simon
Hawkins	Na'cher	Skelton
Hertel	Neal	Smith (FL)
Holt	Nelson	Smith (IA)
Horton	Nowak	Smith (NJ)
Howard	O'Brien	Solarz
Hoyer	Oberstar	Solomon
Huckaby	Obey	Spence
Hutto	Ortiz	St. Germain
Hyde	Owens	Stangeland
Ireland	Parris	Stokes
Kazen	Pashayan	Stratton
Kemp	Penny	Tallon
Kildee	Pepper	Thomas (CA)
Kostmayer	Perkins	Torres
Lagomarsino	Petri	Torricelli
Lantos	Pickle	Towns
Latta	Porter	Udall
Lehman (CA)	Price	Valentine
Lehman (FL)	Pritchard	Vander Jagt
Lent	Pursell	Vandergriff
Levin	Quillen	Waxman
Lewis (CA)	Rangel	Wheat
Lewis (FL)	Reid	Whitehurst
Lipinski	Richardson	Whitley
Livingston	Ridge	Williams (MT)
Long (MD)	Rinaldo	Williams (OH)
Luke	Ritter	Wolf
Lundine	Robinson	Wright
Markey	Rodino	Wylie
Marriott	Roe	Yates
Matsui	Rose	Yatron
Mavroules	Rostenkowski	Young (AK)
Mazzoli	Roth	Young (FL)
McDade	Roukema	Young (MO)
McHugh	Roybal	Zablocki
McKinney	Russo	

## NOT VOTING—23

Andrews (NC)	Ford (MI)	Jones (NC)
Badham	Franklin	Kolter
Bateman	Frenzel	Lloyd
Beffenson	Hansen (ID)	Martinez
Boland	Hartnett	Paul
Cheney	Hefter	Wilson
Coleman (MO)	Hubbard	Wolpe
Conyers	Jeffords	

## □ 1340

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Badham for, with Mr. Frenzel against.

Mr. Bateman for, with Mr. Franklin against.

Messrs. HOYER, DONNELLY, CHANDLER, LATTI, LENT, LEWIS, of California, PASHAYAN, and THOMAS of California changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. SYNAR, Mrs. JOHNSON, and Messrs. WEAVER, BARTLETT, KINDNESS, ERDREICH, PATTERSON, FEIGHAN, VOLKMER, LELAND, COLEMAN, of Texas, WIRTH, MOODY, MacKAY, BROWN of California, McCURDY, WYDEN, MORRISON of Connecticut, JONES of Oklahoma, STUMP, EARLY, CRAIG, and HEFNER changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title VI?

## □ 1350

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out something about this bill that I think is rather important and unfortunately rather unique. I commend the committee very much for this.

This bill contains appropriations for fiscal year 1985. That means it will be up to date come September. It will be one of the very few authorizations around here that will be enacted on schedule, most of the authorizations now being proposed for enactment are for the 1984 fiscal year starting in October. The appropriations proposal for 1984 was presented to the Congress as required by the Constitution last January and there were no authorized guidelines in place upon which these proposals had to be based. If the authorization for 1985 is not enacted before October 1, the Department does not have an authorization to go by as a guideline. They can send up appropriation requests based upon imaginary authorizations that they are asking for and make their appropriations based on a program that does not exist and that is a principal reason we are getting into the mess we are in here now.

I want to commend the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Wisconsin and others who worked on this bill for putting 1985 appropriations into this bill and being one of the few proposals to be on time.

Now this bill also contains 1983 authorizations. It is too late for 1983 authorizations. Not only 1983 authorizations, but 1984 authorizations should have been enacted last September.

Had the 1984 authorization been passed by last October 1, the Department submitting appropriations requests for 1984 would have had to submit the request based upon that authorization, instead of some phony request based upon an imaginary authorization they are requesting.

So this bill contains a very important principle, and it will be one of the very few that really is on time.

Seventy-seven percent of the appropriation bill that the subcommittee I chair has pending is not reauthorized. Think of that, 77 percent of the money in that bill came up here in requests from the administration without an authorization. Some of those programs and Departments such as the Justice Department have not been authorized for 2 years. It is not always the fault of the authorizing committees. In the case of the Judiciary Committee, for example, the bill passed the House, but it was not passed in the Senate. Unless we require these authorization bills to carry 1985 authorizations this year and to get at least up to date, we are never going to catch up.

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We certainly appreciate the gentleman's comments. As the gentleman knows, this is the third time we have had a 2-year authorization. As I stated in earlier debate, this is certainly the proper way for the Congress to operate. It gives the Foreign Affairs Committee a better opportunity for oversight and certainly the Appropriations Committee, dealing with the funding, has a better opportunity to act expeditiously and under the guidelines set forth in authorizing legislation.

I thank the gentleman for his comments.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF COLORADO

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Brown of Colorado: On page 27, line 4, strike "especially the two major American political parties," and on page 27, line 15, strike "the two major American political parties."

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, the amendment simply strikes the money going to the two political parties. My feeling is that it is inappropriate for us to use taxpayer money in that regard.

I will not belabor the House' time any further with an argument on that point. I think it is a very straightforward issue. Should we end up funding the political parties in this manner?

I would urge the House to adopt the amendment and save the money involved.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is essential that political parties be involved in this process. That is what the President's foreign policy initiative is all about, to bring about direct relationships between labor and private sector groups.

Chairman Fahrenkopf, the Republican national chairman, when he appeared before our House subcommittee on this measure in April of this year—

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

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

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make sure that the gentleman is talking now in the context of domestic operations by the political parties in any sense. The language of the legislation does not provide any funding for any domestic operations by political parties. We are talking here about a capability overseas, through a separate organization of political parties in an in-

ternational institute in both cases. These institutes would give them a capability similar to what other political parties now have, to discuss, to meet, and to exchange ideas on the processes of a republican form of government or a democratic form of government or a pluralistic society with the right of political participation.

We are not talking about any kind of domestic participation.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the chairman for clarifying the extent of the involvement of the political parties.

Mr. Chairman, for my colleague's edification, permit me to read Republican Chairman Fahrenkopf's brief statement when he appeared before our subcommittee. He said:

For its part the Republican Party anticipates and supports fully the creation of the National Endowment for Democracy and its related institutions. We believe that we as Republicans have a message for the world, both the developed and non-developed regions. We stand by our basic principles and philosophy as our guide to the vision of a better America and a freer and more prosperous world. Where appropriate we hope to express that vision abroad while at the same time recognizing that ours is not the only voice to be heard.

I appeal to my colleagues to support Project Democracy and to vote in opposition to the Brown amendment.

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

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. EMERSON. In all reality let me say to the gentleman that in a time when we are trying to balance budgets and have great concern for the tremendous deficits that we are experiencing that this is a priority that could wait a year or two until we are in better shape.

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

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

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for his statement and that of the gentleman from Florida.

It seems to me that this is perhaps the most important thing in this bill. I mentioned in my remarks in general debated that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARNES) and I, representing our political parties a couple of weeks ago, went down to Venezuela and met with our counterparts in the two major political parties in Venezuela. They were very interested in this program. They thought it could be very helpful throughout this hemisphere, indeed, throughout the world. The only question they had was, "Why are you waiting so long to do this? Other countries have been doing it for a long time. The West Germans, the French, many other countries are doing it now."

And as the gentleman from New York pointed out, this is something that is very, very high on the agenda,

very, very high in the priorities of both of our major political parties.

I would hope that if we really mean what we say, and I am sure we do, about trying to create and build democracy, to maintain it where it exists, to help it along in places like El Salvador where it is off to a slow, but I think a sure start, we do have to have this kind of program, this kind of encouragement and certainly with not turning down the funding for the AFL-CIO and for the chamber of commerce and private industry I think it is even more important that the political parties be recognized in this way that this work can be carried on.

I hope the amendment is defeated.

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

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

□ 1400

Mr. RITTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I simply would like to point out that, for a nation that spends \$230 billion on the capacity to destroy, the idea of spending \$30 million to build people's capacity to create and to create free societies is a darn good one, and I submit that we have waited far too long for the effort.

I commend the gentleman on this program and the administration and the Republicans and the Democrats who support this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GILMAN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. GILMAN. I am pleased to yield to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. ZABLOCKI.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Is it not true that this program is to provide democratic training programs and democratic institution building abroad? And the purpose is to strengthen democratic electoral processes abroad through timely measures and cooperation with indigenous democratic forces?

So the question is: Do we want countries that are developing democracies to be assisted, or do we want totalitarian governments in these countries that we are interested in?

Is that not the point?

Mr. GILMAN. That is precisely the point and I commend the gentleman for stressing this program's objective.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. And if the Members vote for the gentleman's amendment, they will be supporting totalitarian, undemocratic, nondemocratic countries.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for his supportive remarks.

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

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the gentleman's amendment would carry and that it could be expanded to take out the AFL-CIO, because the last time they sent people to El Salvador to promote democracy, they were murdered, and the government still has not prosecuted the case.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out to my colleagues that the political foundations in West Germany, which now collectively receive over \$150 million, have been engaged in a democracy program for several years. We have a lot of catching up to do.

I urge my colleagues to vote in opposition to this amendment.

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

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

Mr. BARNES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO) said earlier, I had the privilege of representing the Democratic Party of the United States, and the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO) represented the Republican Party of the United States in recent discussions with political leaders.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) has again expired.

(On request of Mr. BARNES and by unanimous consent, Mr. GILMAN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BARNES. As I was saying, the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO) represented the Republican Party, represented Chairman Fahrenkopf, and I represented Chairman Manatt at recent meetings with representatives of political parties in Caracas, Venezuela.

As my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO) said a few moments ago, the questions that we were asked about this program by our friends in democratic parties throughout the hemisphere was not, "Why are you doing this? How are you going to do it?" The questions were, really, "Why have you not done this sooner? Why has not the United States, the bastion of democracy in the world, been promoting democracy through contacts with friendly political parties around the world, the way the Germans have been doing, the French and others have been doing quite successfully?"

It is far past time that our country undertakes this kind of effort.

I say to my friends on the Democratic side that this has the total support of the Democratic National Committee. I talked to Chairman Manatt about this just within the last 3 or 4 days. He is totally supportive of this



effort. I am sure if he were here on the floor of the House, he would urge all Democrats, just as Chairman Fahrenkoph would urge all Republicans, to defeat this amendment.

There is a lot of work that has gone into this program already by the Democratic National Committee, as by the Republican National Committee, and it is important that the amendment be defeated and that we get forward with the program.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for his support and his remarks.

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that when we in the United States talk about democracy, we understand what that concept means. We have a two-party system. We have had it for many, many hundreds of years. We understand not only the terms but the practical effect. But when you talk about democracy in the rest of the world, they do not understand it in the same way. They have not had it. Their education has not been such that they understand it.

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief. I think what we have here is really an abuse of judgment.

Political parties are not governments. I think everyone in this room ought to understand the predicament that this society of ours is going to be placed in. If, for instance, you take the Republican National Chairman, a Senator from our side and, let us say, Senator HELMS goes and says, "Let's give \$100,000 or \$200,000 to Mr. D'Aubisson in El Salvador." And let us say that someone else on our side comes and says, "Let's give \$100,000 or \$200,000 to Mr. Durarte in El Salvador."

They are going to be making foreign policy judgments. This is a predicament that our national chairmen should not be placed in.

As far as the Venezuelan model that has been suggested to us, does anyone in this room know how much money Venezuela spends on politics? They spend more than the United States of America. They do not need United States money. We are going to be placing ourselves in political jeopardy in this country by identifying with one side or another in foreign disputes. That is nutty.

What happens, for example, if the Republican Party gives to one party in a foreign country. The other party wins the elections, the Republican Party wins here, suddenly you have got the President of the Republican Party dealing with an opponent that he tried to defeat. That is nuts. That is why we have government-to-government relations. We should not be get-

ting involved in political parties in foreign countries. At least we should not be getting involved in a party-to-party sense.

I think the gentleman from Colorado has a very sensible amendment. I certainly urge its adoption.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I would just like to take a short time to speak in opposition to the amendment.

I have just heard the worst case scenario of anything I have ever heard in my life, in terms of setting up straw men, scares, and concern. And I know they are serious, I know they are genuine, because I know my colleague on the committee, and I have worked with him for a long time.

But for his scenario to actually occur, you would have to assume that the Congress has given up all oversight. You would have to assume that the executive branch, whatever administration is in power, has no concept and cares less about what is going on, because this money is not automatic. It has to be budgeted, it has to go through the agency, it has to be authorized, it has to be appropriated. And there is continual oversight. It assumes that nobody will know what is happening.

In other words, to carry out the worst case scenario which was just presented, you would have to assume that everybody in the whole governmental process in the United States suddenly went bananas and closed down everything and decided to go off on their own.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that that is impossible under the constraints of our own Government and under our society as we know it.

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa. I know the gentleman is very much concerned about this.

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, let me just say that I personally do not know of any expertise that either the Republican or the Democratic National Committees have in dealing with foreign affairs.

Mr. FASCELL. Well, I will say to the gentleman, in response to just that aspect, I am not sure they are experts either. But they represent our two major political parties in this country. They have some expertise. They either help the administration get elected or they help the administration get unelected. They have some reason for being.

I just cannot understand why anybody would want to denigrate either political party. I do not think they have all the wisdom in the world, but I do not think that both political parties are totally composed of idiots.

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. If the gentleman will yield further on that point, the next problem we have in this issue

is that clearly there is going to be an overhead expense.

What happens if the Democratic Party takes \$1 million, the Republican Party half, or vice versa? You have got a real problem there with suddenly the Congress funding money for four parties.

1410

Beyond that, we have the issue of oversight. The gentleman mentioned that Congress will have oversight. Does the gentleman mean to tell me that a Democratic chairman should have oversight over Frank Fahrenkopf, or vice versa? I mean, we are looking at individual judgments. If we are going to give these people money, we have to give them the right to expend their money. If we are not going to give them money, then we do not have that problem.

Mr. FASCELL. We are going to give them the right to expend the money, I will say to the gentleman, within the framework of the guidelines that are laid down in the bill and only for the purposes therein. They are subject to internal audit, they are subject to external audit, they are subject to GAO review, and they are subject to review by Congress.

If they do not want to do that, they do not have to take the money. If the Government, any administration, does not want to come forward with the amount of money in the budget, they do not have to do it. This is not automatic. If the Committee on Appropriations does not want to appropriate the money, they do not have to appropriate the money.

I think we have plenty of safeguards in it and I can draw up as many scarecrows as anybody, but I am going to assume that, despite the strong spread in the difference of the political spectrum which is obvious in this House from right to left, there is a majority of reasonable people in any part of the political spectrum who will see to it that this thing is going to work properly for the benefit of the country, not for the benefit of a political party.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. Certainly; I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell my Republican colleagues, first of all, that Bill Brock, when he was national chairman of our party, went over to Europe and studied the European system that this is based on. If any of my colleagues have ever had any contact with members of the German Bundestag or the parliaments over there, they know that they come over here or meet with us and they send people to be able to discuss foreign affairs under the umbrella of organizations like this. They have less public hassle because of it.



If we want to put our heads in the sand and pretend that foreign affairs is unimportant, then vote for this amendment. But if Bill Brock was right, and if President Reagan, who told the Parliament in England when he was there, that this is the thing that he supports, then you should forget about them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) has expired.

(On request of Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri and by unanimous consent, Mr. FASCELL was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Our present chairman testified in favor of this, and I would suggest that we just pause and consider exactly the effect of the amendment.

The reason we are having trouble in the world and the understanding of the American people, and even our own political parties is, we do not know anything about it in most cases. I hear a lot of opposition coming from people on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which has this before them every day. The rest of us do not. The rest of the people back home do not. The local and State officials do not have the opportunity of serving on the Committee on Foreign Affairs and knowing all that.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that we vote this amendment down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BROWN).

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

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 267, noes 136, not voting 29, as follows:

## [Roll No. 183]

## AYES—267

Akaka	Chapple	Edwards (AL)
Albosta	Clay	Edwards (CA)
Anderson	Coats	Edwards (OK)
Andrews (NC)	Coleman (TX)	Emerson
Andrews (TX)	Collins	English
Anthony	Conable	Erdreich
Applegate	Cooper	Evans (IA)
Archer	Craig	Feighan
AuCoin	Crane, Daniel	Fiedler
Barnard	Crane, Philip	Fields
Bartlett	Crockett	Flippo
Bates	D'Amours	Florio
Bedell	Daniel	Foglietta
Bereuter	Dannemeyer	Foley
B-thune	Daschle	Forsythe
Bevill	Daub	Frank
Boehert	Davis	Frost
Boner	DeLums	Gaydos
Bonior	DeWine	Gekas
Borski	Dicks	Gephardt
Breaux	Donnelly	Glickman
Brown (CA)	Dorgan	Gore
Brown (CO)	Dowdy	Gradison
Brownhill	Downey	Gramm
Bryant	Dreier	Green
Burton	Duncan	Gregg
Byron	Durbin	Guarini
Carney	Dwyer	Hall (IN)
Carper	Dyson	Hall (OH)
Carr	Eckart	Hall, Ralph
Chandler	Edgar	Hall, Sam

Hamilton	McDade
Hammerschmidt	McDonald
Hansen (UT)	McEwen
Harkin	McGrath
Harrison	McHugh
Hatcher	McKernan
Hawkins	McNulty
Hefner	Mikulski
Hertel	Miller (CA)
Hightower	Miller (OH)
Hiler	Mineta
Hillis	Minish
Hopkins	Mitchell
Hughes	Molinari
Hunter	Montgomery
Jacobs	Moody
Jenkins	Moore
Jones (OK)	Moorhead
Kaptur	Morrison (CT)
Kasich	Mrazek
Kastenmeier	Murphy
Kazen	Murtha
Kennelly	Myers
Kildee	Natcher
Kogovsek	Nichols
Kramer	Nielson
LaFalce	Oakar
Latta	Olin
Leach	Ottlinger
Leath	Oxley
Lehman (CA)	Packard
Leland	Panetta
Levine	Patman
Levitas	Patterson
Loeffler	Pease
Long (MD)	Penny
Lott	Perkins
Lowery (CA)	Porter
Lowry (WA)	Rahall
Lujan	Ratchford
Luken	Ray
Lundine	Richardson
Lungren	Ridge
Mack	Roberts
MacKay	Roe
Madigan	Roemer
Markey	Rogers
Marlenee	Rose
Martin (IL)	Roukema
Martin (NC)	Rowland
Martin (NY)	Royal
Matsui	Savage
Mazzoli	Sawyer
McCain	Schaefer
McCandless	Schroeder
McCloskey	Schumer
McColium	Seiberling
McCurdy	Sensenbrenner

## NOES—136

Ackerman	Fazio	Moakley
Addabbo	Ferraro	Mollohan
Alexander	Fowler	Morrison (WA)
Annunzio	Fuqua	Neal
Aspin	Garcia	Nelson
Barnes	Gejdenson	Nowak
Bennett	Gibbons	O'Brien
Berman	Gilman	Oberstar
Biaggi	Gingrich	Obey
Bilirakis	Gonzalez	Ortiz
Bliley	Goodling	Owens
Boggs	Gunderson	Parris
Bonker	Hance	Pashayan
Bosco	Holt	Pepper
Boucher	Horton	Petri
Boxer	Howard	Pickle
Britt	Hoyer	Price
Brooks	Huckaby	Pritchard
Broomfield	Hutto	Quillen
Campbell	Hyde	Rangel
Chappell	Ireland	Reid
Clarke	Johnson	Rinaldo
Clinger	Jones (NC)	Ritter
Coelho	Kemp	Robinson
Coleman (MO)	Kindness	Rodino
Conte	Kostmayer	Rostenkowski
Corcoran	Lagomarsino	Roth
Coughlin	Lehman (FL)	Rudd
Courter	Lent	Russo
Coyne	Levin	Sabo
de la Garza	Lewis (CA)	Scheuer
Derrick	Lewis (FL)	Schneider
Dickinson	Lipinski	Schulze
Dingell	Livingston	Shaw
Dixon	Long (LA)	Siljander
Dymally	Marricott	Simon
Erlenborn	McKinney	Smith (FL)
Evans (IL)	Mica	Smith (IA)
Fascell	Michel	Smith (NJ)

Solarz  
St Germain  
Stangeland  
Talion  
Thomas (CA)  
Torres  
Torricelli

Udall  
Vander Jagt  
Waxman  
Wheat  
Whitehurst  
Whitley  
Williams (MT)

Wolf  
Wright  
Wylie  
Zablocki  
Zschau

## NOT VOTING—29

Badham  
Bateman  
Beilenson  
Boland  
Cheney  
Conyers  
Early  
Fish  
Ford (MI)  
Ford (TN)

Franklin  
Frenzel  
Gray  
Hansen (ID)  
Hartnett  
Hefbel  
Hubbard  
Jeffords  
Jones (TN)  
Kolter

Lantos  
Lloyd  
Martinez  
Mavroules  
Paul  
Pursell  
Regula  
Williams (OH)  
Wilson

## □ 1420

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Badham for, with Mr. Frenzel against.  
Mr. Bateman for, with Mr. Franklin against.

Mr. DERRICK and Mr. RUDD changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. ALBOSTA, PERKINS, SCHUMER, RICHARDSON, STARK and KILDEE, Ms. FIEDLER, and Messrs. MATSUI, BEVILL, BONIOR of Michigan, HERTEL of Michigan, AKAKA, CARR, and LATTI changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## □ 1430

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WHITTEN was allowed to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask my colleagues to give me their attention?

I would like to tell you some of the problems that I see and to commend the Foreign Affairs Committee for the 2-year authorization recommended in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I think this committee has made a significant forward step by its action for good legislation and orderly procedure.

I have spoken for many years about the advantages of 2-year or multiyear authorizations. I know in recent years, we have had to rely to a great extent on continuing resolutions. One of the contributing factors has been the growth in the number of annual authorization bills and the lack of enacted authorizations.

A continuing resolution is a hybrid. It can be both an authorization and an appropriation.

Of course, another contributing factor in the need for all encompassing continuing resolutions has been the delays in the budget resolutions.

But if you do not have an authorization, both sides of every controversy and every committee will come to our committee and insist their side is going to win out and that their side is right.

So I am saying that unless we authorize for 2 or more years, each year it will be more difficult for the average legislative committee to get its bills through in time for us to bring up appropriations in time for us to meet our obligations as a Congress and avoid reliance on continuing resolutions.

I say again that each side in controversy in a legislative committee thinks they are going to win and it leaves us trying to decide what to do. In a continuing resolution, in particular, if there is no authorization, we are subject to pressures from both sides to take sides on the issue.

Talk to officials in the executive branch and they will urge you to provide 2-year authorizations so they can do some forward planning. May I say to you that right now in the executive branch they are busy working on 1985 appropriations, next year's programs, when we have not even got many 1984 authorization passed yet.

So I just hope that with the support of the leadership we can persuade you, our friends on the legislative committees, to authorize for 2 years at a time.

We want guidelines. We want the benefit of having the authorizations enacted before we move on appropriation bills. We do not want the country looking at us like we are in chaos.

So the answer to it, I think, is the action taken by this committee—the multiyear authorization. I hope more committees, all the legislative committees, will take notice of this action and follow suit. If so, we will do more to straighten out the operations of the Congress than anything else I can think of.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I want to strongly support his statements with respect to the problem that we face, both in the Appropriations Committee and the authorizing committees. There is not any question about it, that under the situation we now find ourselves, if we continue with the annual appropriation process, because of the annual authorization process, rather, we will always be behind. The very dynamics of the budget situation the way it is now, we will never be on time. We will always be faced with the problems of appropriation bills prior to authorization bills and we will always be a year behind.

The only satisfactory solution from an authorizing standpoint is the one that we bring here today, in our judgment, which is a 2-year authorization bill.

In order to complete that cycle, I might say to the chairman, that is the reason I asked the gentleman to yield, not only to indicate my agreement, but to say that what we will probably have to do is come in next year with another 2-year bill to just one time get ahead of the cycle. If we can once do that, this whole process will fall into place. If we do not do that, we are going to be plagued with the kind of troubles that we have at the present time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, I say to my colleague, he has certainly set an excellent precedent that all other legislative committees should follow, and I hope will.

May I say, we welcome authorizations, because it makes our job far more simple, far more effective, and the effect on the executive branch of the Government will be tremendous in that they will have legislative guidance for forward planning for future operations and future budgets.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman can get the suggestion across to the Budget Committee where we can get a 2-year budget, we will have it whipped.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank my friend.

□ 1440

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF COLORADO

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Colorado: On page 35, strike lines 1 through 4.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, this is a technical amendment. It should have been included in the first amendment. All it does is remove the reservations of the money for the Democratic and Republican Parties. We have already voted on the substance of this issue.

This really should have been included in the previous amendment and I ask unanimous consent for its adoption.

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

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is far from technical.

The first amendment simply removed reference out of the statement of purposes with respect to political parties.

Now what the gentleman seeks to do is eliminate the earmarking.

It is one thing to limit the political parties to whatever it is people want to limit them to. It is quite another thing to strike out the earmarking of the funds for the program.

I would suggest that what we need to do is vote this amendment down.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not mean to mislead the body in any way. My impression was when we voted last time we voted on the issue before the body of whether or not we wanted this public funding to go to the political parties.

The chairman, of course, is correct. I do not mean to mislead him in any way. If he wishes a vote I will withdraw my request for unanimous consent. I really was trying to save the time of the body.

This amendment simply removes the earmarking of money and the language simply is not less than \$5 million for the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs and not less than \$5 million for the National Republican Institute for International Affairs.

Mr. FASCELL. If the gentleman will yield, I understand the gentleman's intention. I just simply wanted the record to be clear.

I think our colleagues know what they are voting on and I do not have to explain it to them. But I just wanted the record to be clear that the first amendment simply dealt with the reference to the political parties and the purposes of the organizations.

What this amendment does is strike out the earmarking of the funds which is an entirely different matter.

I would urge a no vote on this amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. I thank the chairman. He is absolutely correct, and I urge an aye vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BROWN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTON: On page 34, strike out line 22 and all that follows through line 9 on page 35.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, we have cut the funds for the Democratic Institute for International Affairs and the Republican Institute for International Affairs, and I think that the Free Trade Union Institute as well as the National Chamber Foundation will be viewed by our friends around the world as an extension or an arm of the Federal Government.

While I am very much in favor of them being involved in selling democracy around the world as individual institutions, I, like my colleague, who voted to cut the previous funding, feel like it is improper for Federal funds to be used for this purpose.

For us to be consistent I believe that we must also cut the funds for the Free Trade Union Institute as well as the National Chamber Foundation. I think that this amendment should pass to be consistent with the previous amendment.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.



Mr. Chairman, sometimes it is fun when the blood begins to flow to let it flow freely. But I want to be sure that my colleagues understand exactly what this amendment does in terms of removing the earmarking.

The American Free Labor Institute, a program which has been operating for some 30 years, is one of the most effective programs speaking for the United States that this country has. They have been grantees of the U.S. Government for a long period of time.

They are grantees. They are not an arm of the Government. The gentleman is incorrect. They are totally independent.

Mr. BURTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I will be glad to yield. Mr. BURTON. My question is: If the funds of U.S. taxpayers are used and we are involved in some kind of an action some place in the world, whether it is the Chamber Foundation or the Labor Institute, would that not be viewed as an action of the Federal Government, just as though it were from the Republican Institute or the Democratic Institute that we talked about earlier?

Mr. FASCELL. It might be viewed that way by the gentleman who speaks, and that is unfortunate, in my judgment. I suppose that overseas there are a lot of people who look at everything and assume that it is the U.S. Government, whether it is a private corporation, a university, or some other institute.

But it just so happens that the American Free Labor Institute is not a governmental agency. It has been operating a long time, and yes, it does get funds from the U.S. Government.

Mr. BURTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. Not right now. Let me just finish my statement. The gentleman has had his shot.

I just want to make sure that everybody understands what they are voting on and then they can have their field day. If you want to knock out the money for labor, that is fine, and if you want to sacrifice the Chamber of Commerce because you think you are getting at labor, so be it. Those are the politics of it. You can play it any way you like.

The fact is you will be destroying an outstanding program under the American Free Labor Institute.

On the other side, the administration thought it would be valuable, and the committee agreed almost unanimously that it would be worthwhile to have a similar institute for the private sector and the free enterprise concept.

I want to tell you that that was not an easy thing to do in light of the number of people who said that we should not do this kind of thing. But eventually their hesitancy was overcome because they could see the benefit of this of encouragement of a private sector effort, including the free enterprise concept, in the United

States. The distance that would remain would be this: that the organizations that would do it would be from the private sector, yes, the private sector institute would be a grantee of the U.S. Government. But it would be a grantee at arms' length. I think that makes a great, big difference.

I think that to vote for this amendment and destroy those two programs, one of which has been in operation for 30 years, another which has an outstanding potential, would be a sheer disaster. I hope my colleagues will vote against the amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, we pride ourselves as being consistent in this body, at least most of the time. I believe for us to strike the funding for the Democratic Institute for International Affairs and the Republican Institute for International Affairs and leave in there at taxpayers' expense funding for these other two institutes is completely inconsistent. If we are going to strike funding for the first two institutes the only logical thing to do would be to strike funding for the latter two institutes as well.

Mr. Chairman, I am very supportive of both the Free Trade Union Institute and the National Chamber Foundation and I support their efforts to export democracy and freedom. While I am in favor of these organizations and their efforts in this area, I do not feel we should be using our tax dollars to achieve their goals under the guise of private organizations.

I views this as counterproductive and believe this leads to the view that these organizations would be an extension of the U.S. Government and they would then possibly lose their effectiveness.

It would be far superior to allow the free trade unions to do what they did in Poland to help Solidarity. Had they been using Federal Government funds it would have looked like the U.S. Government was imposing its will upon Poland.

We must remember that we have a \$200 billion deficit for this year alone. Funding these two institutes will add \$16.3 million in new expenditures.

I wholeheartedly support President Ronald Reagan's efforts to export freedom and democracy around the world, but I do not believe we should be funding private organizations with tax dollars to do it.

These organizations should use private funds to accomplish these objectives. They will then be viewed as concerned organizations trying to promote freedom and democracy instead of tools of the U.S. Government which our adversaries could discredit.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of

words and I rise against the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to participate in the debate on this issue for many reasons. One is that I have enough problems dealing with agriculture.

But the previous vote and this vote that will be coming have me greatly concerned because I have been privately telling my colleague from Florida of my support for the endeavor which he and the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee have initiated in this Endowment for Democracy.

□ 1450

Mr. Chairman, I just came home and almost everything that was mentioned to me was related to Central America, to what is happening in El Salvador. Well, I hate to tell you this, but we may have lost El Salvador 20 years ago; but now our concern is are we going to send troops? Are we going to send military assistance? This is the answer to that.

We could be saving ourselves tremendous headaches; we could be saving ourselves millions of dollars; we could be saving lives in this country, if we but plant a small seed of democratic institutions, of appealing from an irresponsible government, of, yes, union work, chamber of commerce work.

What this is intending to do is bring our concept of 200 years, thank God that it caught 200 years ago. But we are dealing with countries 25 years old, 40 years old, 50 years old, where the seed did not sprout like it did in our country.

The other camp spends \$30 million in 1 month, in one country, my colleagues. They send hundreds of teachers, doctors, lawyers, pharmacists, all indoctrinated in their philosophy, their ideology. It pains me and shames me to think that we are playing here with \$30 million that could save countless thousands of lives. Our system for other people in the world; let the democratic institutions tell it; this is a mystery to them how we can differ in our country, how we can have a Republican President, a Democratic House, a Republican Senate; this is the mystery. This is what they want explained. How can you make it work? Well, how can you make it work but send the people who make it work? Not the CIA, not the bureaucrats, not the State Department; send the chamber of commerce, the doctor, the lawyer, the engineer, the university professor. Do not let the CIA disseminate what democracy is. Let the people who make it work do it. Here, \$30 million; \$30 million; they spend \$30 million in one country, in the time we blink an eye. So, please, I know there are other amendments to come, but let me tell you from one who has been there, from one who talks to them, from one who talks to them in their language, the mystery to them is how does this American system work?



I say teach them, let them know by the people who are making it work.

All we are doing is giving them a few dollars, a few dollars to assist them in that effort.

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I want to salute the gentleman for the remarks he has made. They are right on target. I want to suggest that the glory of this country is that it gives the lie to the Marxist theory that labor and management are in a class struggle, when both of those important elements of our society and our economy and political system can work together to advance the cause of a free democracy in those countries where they are being besieged by Marxism and Marxist dogma that the class struggle is the only way for progress.

I think it is very important that these private agencies of both labor and management present a common front and spread the message that democracy and capitalism work together hand in hand to elevate the improvement and change.

I think this amendment, though well-intentioned, is wrong and moves in the wrong direction.

(On request of Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma and by unanimous request, Mr. DE LA GARZA was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. I want to congratulate the gentleman on his statement.

Mr. Chairman, I understand very well the purpose of the amendment and I sympathize with the motives that prompted the Member to offer this amendment. But it is very unfortunate.

Labor unions in particular have been very staunch and effective advocates of freedom in opposition to international communism around the world. In the international arena, organized labor has been an effective ally of everything that we are trying to do to protect the security of this country and our allies.

I understand the gentleman's frustration, but I believe if you are really concerned about the spread of international communism, this amendment would be counterproductive and I urge its defeat.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I yield to the gentleman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for raising this issue on the floor and stressing the importance of bringing home to those areas where they do not have an understanding of

democracy the important principles that we admire so much here and adhere to. What better way to do this, than through a partnership of business and labor working together to stress the important aspects of the free enterprise system. I urge my colleagues to vote in opposition to the amendment and to help foster a very important foreign policy initiative that has been started by our President.

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I commend him on his statement also. It seems to me all we have to do is look to a country that we are very much interested in now, El Salvador, to see what the Free Labor Institute can do and has been doing, against tremendous odds, by the way.

Several of their people were murdered in cold blood not long ago. That did not discourage them. They stayed with it. I daresay had it not been for the Free Labor Institute and their activities in El Salvador, that country might well have already fallen to the Marxist-Leninists.

(On request of Mr. LAGOMARSINO and by unanimous consent, Mr. DE LA GARZA was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. They were the ones who by organizing the Compepinos were able to persuade the constituent assembly to extend the agrarian reform law.

I think they have done good work there and in lots of other places. I am certainly not saying that because they support me or I support them, otherwise. You can look at my voting record. But I think in this case they are right. They deserve our continued support. They have had it before.

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman for his statement and associate myself with his remarks. This very debate is an excellent example of democracy at work. There are conservatives and liberals on both sides of this debate. So, I do not think you can really judge this as an issue of ideological division. But just from the standpoint of our democratic institutions, if labor in the United States is as conservative a movement as the chamber of commerce and should not be criticized for being part of this project. Indeed the AFL-CIO is integral to the success of this overall project and I hope my colleagues can put aside whatever differences they may have with labor in general and defeat this amendment.

We should be grateful for labor in this country, as it is a bastion of anticommunism and patriotic free enterprise and is uniquely qualified to help expand democracy in a world looking for hope and light of freedom.

(On request of Mr. LIVINGSTON and by unanimous consent, Mr. DE LA GARZA was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. KEMP. If the gentleman will yield further, in this country, with these two democratic institutions, labor and business, whatever faults we might find with them on different issues, they are institutions which can be effective in helping spread democratic principles so eloquently testified to by the gentleman in the well. I voted no on the previous amendment and I am going to vote no again and urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment and send a signal to the people of the world who yearn for free enterprise and free labor that we mean what we say when we give speeches in support of democracy, human rights, and movements such as Solidarity in Poland and democracy in Central America or wherever.

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman on his stand.

It was my observation when I was in El Salvador to observe those elections a year ago that one of the most effective institutions down there was in fact the AFL-CIO and the labor movement. If we lose the votes of labor in El Salvador, we will lose El Salvador.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I thank the gentleman.

I yield to the gentleman (Mr. BROOMFIELD).

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DE LA GARZA) on his statement and join him in his opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

I think it is important that we continue to support the efforts of labor organizations such as the American Institute for Free Labor Development which has worked so effectively in promoting democracy and combating communism in Latin America, while similar institutes work toward the same objectives in Africa and Asia. The advocates of communism are untiring in their zeal to spread communism throughout the globe. If we want our children to live in freedom, we must be untiring in our efforts to promote democracy and combat the spread of communism. I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment and support retaining funds to promote democracy.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, my great concern is that we can undo

here what can save us countless millions of dollars, can save countless lives and actually we are making democracy work. What the Constitution has; we are doing what we are supposed to be doing. To undo it with a vote, emotionally for or against labor, for or against chambers of commerce, is not the way to make the system work. I would hope you would vote against this amendment and other amendments which sought to undo the great seed that this committee and its members are trying to plant, to bring to other countries that which the good Lord has blessed us with for over 200 years.

□ 1500

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take near that amount of time. I would just like to point out to the Members that share the sentiments that have been voiced about the strong value for the Free Trade Union Institute. I would certainly echo the comments that have been made that they have done some fine work in the past. I believe that. I share that. I endorse that.

The point is that we have not had this subsidy. We have had help to them before, but they have done that fine work without this program. This is a new program. The work we have talked about has been done without this program.

I think the point is where we spend American dollars. How they are best spent. Is it appropriate to subsidize the chamber of commerce and the unions in their efforts, be they good or bad.

I would urge an "aye" vote on this amendment because I think it speaks to our financial problem, but more importantly than that, it speaks to the efficacy of subsidizing these groups in this manner.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps the time has come to inject some history into this historic debate.

We fought World War I to make the world safe for democracy. Oh what a lovely war. That was pretty expensive. It cost more than \$60 million.

The most recent time I know of when the U.S. taxpayers were forced to put up money for this kind of activity was during the tenure of our late colleague, Joseph R. McCarthy, when a man name G. David Schine and another man named Roy Cohn tramped around Europe using U.S. tax dollars to establish what they in their day called a demiform. It was supposed to be the answer to the commiform.

Now here we go again. A foundation on democracy. All you have to do is go to El Salvador, a couple of junketeers, step out on the battlefields, the sol-

diers on both sides will lay down their guns and listen to a few American speeches. And we can insert democracy into El Salvador.

Well, I suppose you could sum up this legislation very simply: What this country needs is a good \$60 million junket.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just want to take 1 minute to say that last session of Congress I served on the committee with the gentleman from Florida and I can say that we are going to spend some \$250 billion in defense this year, but the most powerful weapon in our arsenal, if we really believe it, is the idea of freedom.

Now we have \$30 million and people get up and say we are going to do something with our deficits, we are going to do something with our budget because we are going to save \$30 million.

This is the most powerful weapon we have, an idea. An idea is divine. And if we are not willing to stand behind what we believe in, the principles of democracy, then I think we can close up shop here.

I certainly hope that we stand behind the gentleman from Florida and all of the other people who have worked so hard on this legislation, because it is the best investment we can make for America, not only today, but also tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments?

If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker, having resumed the chair, Mr. SIMON, 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. 2915) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1984 and 1985 for the Department of State, the United States Information Agency, the Board for International Broadcasting, the Inter-American Foundation, and the Asia Foundation, to establish the National Endowment for Democracy, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 198, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. 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.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2915, DEPARTMENT OF STATE AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1984 AND 1985

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 2915, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, and cross references and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending the bill.

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

There was no objection.

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1590, EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE AND COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION ACT OF 1983

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules. I call up House Resolution 207 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

### H. Res. 207

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 the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1590) to provide emergency food assistance to low-income and unemployed persons and to improve the commodity distribution program, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against the consideration of the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of section 303(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344) are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Agriculture now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule, each section of said substitute shall be considered as having been read, and all points of order against said substitute for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 5, rule XXI and section 303(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344) are hereby waived. It shall be in order to consider the amendment to said substitute printed on page E2450 of the Congressional Record of May 23, 1983 by Representative de la Garza of Texas, and all points of order against said amendment for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 5, rule XXI and section 303(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344) are hereby waived. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopt-