

August 9, 1982

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 10011

ic river entrance to Washington from the west. (Senate hearings 96-108, page 9.)

The U.S. Fine Arts Commission also has voiced strong official support for the maintenance of the waterfront land as a park. After careful and repeated review, the Commission rejected the proposed construction plans and voted last year to withhold a building permit for the project.

In the report which accompanies S. 901, the Secretary of the Interior is on record with the administration's position favoring preservation and protection of the Georgetown waterfront for the recreational use of the public. He states in a letter to Chairman McCLURE that, "We would support enactment of S. 901." The Office of Management and Budget concurs in this support. Let me review the reasons for the need to pass this legislation. First, since the 1930's the National Park Service has planned for inclusion of the Georgetown waterfront in the National Capital Park System.

Second, the Georgetown waterfront is the only portion of the Capital's main Potomac River shoreline not protected by inclusion in that system.

Third, the entire area of the Georgetown waterfront is needed as a public waterfront park that would provide energy-efficient, close-to-home, water-oriented recreation for residents of the National Capital area, and would serve visitors from across the country.

Fourth, the entire waterfront is located within a high-hazard floodplain where construction of buildings would go against both prudent land management and sound public policy.

Fifth, the waterfront could be an appropriate location for a future memorial—I trust our Nation will continue to be blessed with men, women, and acts of providence worth memorializing.

Sixth, the District of Columbia, which owns a portion of the waterfront, has expressed willingness to convey its land free of charge to the National Park Service.

Seventh, the use of the waterfront for public park purposes is being threatened by the proposed construction of a large commercial/residential complex on privately owned land within the waterfront.

Lastly, on two occasions the U.S. Commission on Fine Arts disapproved plans for the proposed development.

I thank the leadership for agreeing to take up this matter and welcome the consideration of the issues surrounding it by my colleagues. Finally, I hope that the Department of the Interior will be moved to perform its proper function in regard to the waterfront and assist the public in efforts to maintain the city of Washington for the enjoyment of all the people of the Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on engrossment of the bill and third reading.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary"), in cooperation with other public agencies, is authorized to acquire by donation, exchange, or transfer the following described lands and improvements comprising that area within the District of Columbia which is generally bounded on the north by K Street, on the east by Rock Creek, on the south by the Potomac River, and on the west by a line four hundred feet west of Key Bridge, and is generally depicted on the map entitled "Potomac River Shoreline" dated September 1980; and numbered 80,000.

(b) Upon completion of the acquisitions authorized in subsection (a), such area shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), and the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461-467), as part of the park system of the National Capital, in a manner so as to assure the preservation and protection of the Potomac River shoreline and for recreational and other compatible purposes. The Secretary shall promulgate such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(c) Exchanges shall be on the basis of equal value, and either party to the exchange may pay or accept cash in order to equalize the value of the property exchange, except that if the Secretary determines it is in the public interest, such exchanges may be made other than equal values.

SEC. 2. Effective October 1, 1982, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCIES AUTHORIZATION — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on S. 1193 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1193) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1982 and 1983 for the Department of State, the International Communication Agency, and the Board for International Broadcasting, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by all of the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of Aug. 3, 1982, p. H4999.)

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support the conference report on S. 1193, a bill authorizing appropriations for fiscal years

1982 and 1983 for the Department of State, the International Communication Agency, and the Board for International Broadcasting.

For fiscal year 1982, the conference substitute authorizes appropriations totaling \$2,873,760,000, which is \$250 million less than the bill which passed the Senate and only \$4.5 million more than the executive branch request.

For fiscal year 1983, the conference substitute authorizes appropriations totaling \$2,923,244,000, which is \$86 million more than the bill which passed the Senate, but \$80.5 million less than the executive branch request.

The decrease in the fiscal year 1983 executive branch request contained in the conference substitute is due largely to the reluctance of the conferees to fund a construction program for the International Communication Agency, the costs of which will not be obligated until fiscal year 1984 and fiscal year 1985.

The total amount authorized in this conference report for fiscal year 1983 is essentially within the guidelines set for this purpose in the first concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1983.

A ask unanimous consent that two tables setting forth the amounts authorized by the conference substitute be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I.—BUDGET ISSUES: FISCAL YEAR 1982

(In thousands of dollars)

	Executive branch request	Senate bill	House amendment	Conference
Department of State:				
Administration of foreign affairs	1,245,637	1,318,754	1,245,637	1,245,637
International organizations and conferences	503,462	523,806	503,462	503,462
International commissions	19,808	22,508	19,808	19,808
U.S. bilateral science and technology agreements	3,700	3,700	3,700	3,700
Asia Foundation	4,500	4,500	4,500	4,500
Migration and refugee assistance	504,100	560,850	504,100	504,100
Subtotal, Department of State	2,276,707	2,434,118	2,276,707	2,281,207
International Communication Agency	494,034	561,402	494,034	494,034
Board for International Broadcasting	86,519	98,317	86,519	86,519
Inter-American Foundation	12,000	12,000	10,560	12,000
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	16,768	18,268		
Total	2,886,028	3,124,105	2,867,820	2,873,760

* In providing a separate authorization for the Asia Foundation for fiscal years 1982 and 1983, the conferees expect the executive branch to request separate authorizations for this purpose in succeeding fiscal year.

** Includes an earmarking of \$12,500,000 for Soviet and Eastern European refugees resettling in Israel, and an earmarking of \$1,500,000 for the "political detainee" program of the International Committee for the Red Cross (ICRC).

TABLE II.—BUDGET ISSUES: FISCAL YEAR 1983

(In thousands of dollars)

	Executive branch request	Senate bill	House amendment	Conference
Department of State:				
Administration of foreign affairs	1,248,059	1,248,059	1,248,059	1,248,059
International organizations and conferences	514,436	514,436	514,436	514,436
International commissions	22,432	22,432	22,432	22,432

S 10012

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 9, 1982

TABLE II.—BUDGET ISSUES: FISCAL YEAR 1983—Continued

	Execu- tive branch request	Senate bill	House amend- ment	Confer- ence
U.S. bilateral science and tech- nology agreements.....	3,700	3,700	3,700	3,700
Asia Foundation.....				4,500
Migration and refugee assist- ance.....	460,000	467,750	460,000	460,000
Subtotal, Department of State.....	2,248,627	2,256,377*	2,248,627	2,252,127
International Communication Agency.....	644,000	482,340	482,340	* 559,000
Board for International Broadcast- ing.....	98,317	98,317	98,317	98,317
Inter-American Foundation.....	12,800		12,800	12,800
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.....	19,942	(^a)		
Total.....	3,023,686	2,837,034	2,842,084	2,923,244

* Includes an earmarking of \$16,875,000 for Soviet and Eastern European refugees resettling in Israel, and an earmarking of \$1,500,000 for the "political detainees" program of the International Committee of the Red Cross.

^a The executive branch request, including supplemental, totals \$644,000,000. The Senate bill and the House amendment recommended \$482,340,000. However, since both the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee subsequently reported supplemental authorization legislation (H.R. 5998 and S. 2581), the conferees agreed to the lower Senate combined level of \$559,000,000. This amount includes earmarkings of \$84,256,000 for grants for the Fulbright Academic Exchange Program and the International Visitor Program, \$3,248,000 for grants for the Humphrey Fellowship Program; \$8,906,000 for grants to certain private nonprofit organizations.

^b The Senate bill authorized "such sums as may be necessary" for fiscal year 1983.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, in addition to the authorization of appropriations, the conference substitute retains various identical or modified policy and administrative provisions which were contained in either the Senate or House version of the bill. I urge my colleagues to review the Statement of Managers which explains in great detail all of these issues.

One of these issues of particular concern to both the House and Senate conferees was the title dealing with the Foreign Missions Act. After many days of debate, the conferees finally adopted a compromise which I believe adequately protects both Federal and local interests. I ask unanimous consent that the following excerpt from the Statement of Managers be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN MISSIONS ACT

The House amendment (the "Foreign Missions Act") established a new "Office of Foreign Missions" within the Department of State and authorized the Secretary of State to review and control the operations of foreign missions in the United States and the benefits available to them. "Benefit" was broadly defined to include any type of service or supply, including real property transactions, available from the public or private sources. It empowered the Secretary to set terms and conditions upon which benefits may be provided; set forth the mechanism and criteria under which issues relating to the location of foreign missions in the District of Columbia are to be decided; provided for the preemptive effect of the exercise of Federal jurisdiction regarding the conferral or denial of benefits under this legislation; provided administrative authorities to enable the Office of Foreign Missions to operate under the direction of the Secretary of State, but not subject to control by the bureaus responsible for the day-to-day operations of the Department; granted authori-

ty to the Secretary to apply the foreign missions provisions to international organizations or official missions thereto; and limited to two persons per foreign mission any certification for purposes of issuance of diplomatic license plates.

The Senate bill contained no comparable provision. S. 854, passed by the Senate, is similar to the House amendment, but contained no provision on the location of foreign missions in the District of Columbia.

The conference substitute is similar to the House amendment with the following changes which were drawn primarily from provisions in S. 854: It adds language preserving the authority of the Secret Service to provide protective services; requires the Secretary of State to advise those proposing to enter into transactions with foreign missions whether the proposed transaction is prohibited by any regulation or determination of the Secretary under this legislation; broadens the definition of "international organization" to include those in which the United States does not participate; clarifies that the authorities of the bill shall be exercised in accordance with procedures and guidelines approved by the President; sets forth procedures and criteria under which issues relating to the location of foreign missions in the District of Columbia are to be decided; clarifies the preemptive effect of the exercise of Federal jurisdiction regarding the conferral or denial of benefits under this legislation; and provides that only amounts transferred or credited to the working capital fund of the Department of State may be used in carrying out the functions under the Foreign Missions Act.

Among those House provisions deleted by the conference substitute were the provision granting authority to the National Capital Planning Commission to settle chancery issues and the provision establishing the Foreign Missions Act as the exclusive law governing foreign missions in the District of Columbia. The original preemption provision was replaced with more limited language, which does not require State or local authorities to take any affirmative action.

The conference substitute also deletes the House provision concerning diplomatic license plates. The committee of conference took careful note of past abuses by foreign diplomatic personnel stemming from their special status and immunity. Such abuse was especially prominent in the area of diplomatic license plate issuance. Careful note was also taken of an exchange of letters between Representative William S. Broomfield and Under Secretary of State Richard T. Kennedy on this matter. The committee of conference is reassured by the Department's forthright response and its commitment to pursue this matter in the future. Specifically, the Department has indicated its intent to scrutinize the issuance of diplomatic license plates; assist local jurisdictions, as appropriate, with their collection of parking fines and the pursuit of other motor vehicle violations; and to monitor generally the number of diplomatic license plates issued. The committee of conference notes that these matters come within the purview of the new Foreign Missions Act and that the Department therefore will be able to remove this problem from the Office of Protocol and turn it over to the Office of Foreign Missions for handling.

With respect to the location of chanceries in the District of Columbia, the conference substitute contains a provision replacing that contained in section 206 of the House amendment. This new section retains the existing D.C. zoning structure composed of the National Capital Planning Commission, the D.C. Zoning Commission, and the D.C. Board of Zoning Adjustment. For purposes

of considering chancery issues, the substitute provides that the President may designate the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Interior, or the Administrator of General Services to serve as the Federal representative on the Zoning Commission in lieu of the Director of the National Park Service, and that the individual so designated will also serve on the Board of Zoning Adjustment, as the Zoning Commission representative when the Board considers chancery matters. The substitute also provides for chanceries to be treated similarly to, and no less favorably than, office and institutional uses, and sets forth criteria for use in determining the chancery issues which take into consideration international obligations and the need to balance municipal and Federal interests.

ANALYSIS OF CERTAIN FOREIGN MISSIONS PROVISIONS

Chanceries in the District of Columbia

Section 206 affects chancery locations only in the Nation's Capital and, therefore, is set apart from other sections of the Foreign Missions Act which are of general application. Section 206(a) states that the location, replacement, or expansion of chanceries in the District of Columbia shall be subject to this section.

Section 206(b)(1) permits chanceries to locate as a matter of right in any area zoned commercial, industrial, waterfront, or mixed-use, but not in medium-high or high-density residential zones. This means that a chancery wishing, for example, to locate in a mixed-use (commercial-residential) zone, may do so if it meets the same standards as to building height, bulk, et cetera, and acquires the necessary permits, as do other property users within that zone. Additional administrative steps would not be required. The principal change from the current situation is the inclusion of lower density commercial areas as a matter of right. These areas are often desirable for chancery uses, as they are for certain office and institutional uses. Indeed, the majority of chancery uses are small scale and lower density and therefore suitable for such areas, or in some cases require placement in such areas for security reasons. This subsection also includes the commercial-residential mixed-use areas and waterfront areas, which is not a change from current law, and adds industrial areas. The section does not authorize the location of chanceries as a matter of right in areas zoned residential.

Section 206(b)(2) permits chanceries, upon application, to locate, as at present, in areas zoned medium-high or high-density residential, as well as in other areas which include office and institutional uses, including mixed-use diplomatic and special purpose districts. All locations within these areas are subject to disapproval under the District of Columbia zoning process as provided in this section. This subsection will not permit chanceries to be located in any area which is essentially a residential use area.

Section 206(b)(3) precludes the imposition of limitations or conditions on chanceries greater than those placed on other office or institutional uses. This insures treatment for chancery uses equal to that accorded comparable uses in the same area.

Section 206(c)(1) provides for filing with the D.C. Board of Zoning Adjustment and public notice of all applications for chancery use or appeals by chancery applicants from adverse zoning determinations. This is consistent with current law.

Section 206(c)(2) provides for appropriate public participation in proceedings under this section. The D.C. Zoning Commission

August 9, 1982

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 10013

will have the responsibility for issuing the regulations governing public participation.

Section 206(c)(3) provides a limitation of 6 months for proceedings involving chanceries under this section. This is intended to insure an expeditious process which will avoid the extensive and overlapping proceedings which are required under existing law and regulations. A time limit of 6 months should, in most cases, be more than sufficient to complete the decisionmaking process. It is expected, however, that final decisions will, to the extent possible, be made in a shorter period.

Section 206(d) sets forth the criteria to be applied in the determination of chancery issues, which are intended to balance the municipal and Federal interests. In brief, these criteria include: (1) Recognition of the international obligation of the United States concerning the location of chancery facilities in the Nation's Capital; (2) historic preservation; (3) adequacy of parking and public transportation; (4) availability of Federal security; (5) the municipal interest, as determined by the Mayor of the District of Columbia, which includes matters such as traffic, height, bulk, area impact, among others; and (6) the Federal interest, as determined by the Secretary of State, which includes matters such as national security, foreign relations concerns, and the reciprocal impact on U.S. missions abroad.

Section 206(e)(1) provides that regulations, proceedings, and other actions of the National Capital Planning Commission (NCP), the D.C. Zoning Commission, and the Board of Zoning Adjustment of the District of Columbia, shall be consistent with the provisions of this section, including the criteria described above, in order to assure consistency among actions of the several bodies administering this section.

Section 206(e)(2) provides for referral to NCP for review and comment of proposed actions of the Zoning Commission, as is required under existing law.

Section 206(f) provides that proceedings concerning chanceries under this section would be conducted under a rulemaking and not an adjudicatory procedure. This will provide a process compatible with the conduct of diplomatic relations between the sovereign nations involved, and the participation of their diplomatic representatives in these proceedings. Such rulemaking procedures are currently employed by the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia in some of its proceedings.

Section 206(g) directs the Secretary of State to require substantial compliance with building and related codes by foreign missions, which is stricter than current practice under which these codes are not enforced with respect to foreign missions because of diplomatic immunity. This subsection permits the Secretary of State to accommodate special building requirements, generally involving security, communications, and related needs, which are often required to be adjusted in a similar manner for U.S. missions abroad.

Section 206(h) provides grandfather rights for existing chancery locations and uses, so that such issues need not be reopened.

Section 206(i)(1) authorizes the President to adjust Federal representation on the D.C. Zoning Commission for purposes of proceedings under this section, in order to reflect, as appropriate, national security and foreign policy concerns. Under existing law, one Federal agency representative is now a member of the Zoning Commission. The Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia is composed of three representatives appointed by the Mayor of the District, one Federal agency representative (currently the National Park Service), and the Archi-

tect of the Capitol. This authority neither increases the Federal representation nor affects the District majority thereon appointed to the Commission by the Mayor of the District of Columbia.

Section 206(d)(2) provides that for purposes of chancery issues, the Federal agency representative (who may be the existing official or one designated under the preceding subsection (i)(1)) shall also be the Zoning Commission representative on the Board of Zoning Adjustment. The Board of Zoning Adjustment of the District of Columbia is composed of three persons appointed by the Mayor of the District, one representative of the Zoning Commission, and one representative of the National Capital Planning Commission. Under existing law and practice, one member of the Commission currently serves on the Board on a rotating basis. This provision therefore assures that the Federal interest will always be appropriately reflected in the performance of the Board's functions under this section. It does not affect the District majority appointed to the Board by the Mayor of the District of Columbia. This subsection also provides that in chancery proceedings, the NCP representative serving on the Board shall be the Executive Director of the Commission, which conforms to the existing NCP practice of appointing a staff member for such purposes.

Section 206(j) provides that other provisions of law shall apply to chanceries in the District of Columbia only to the extent they are consistent with this section. This is in lieu of the House provision which made the Foreign Missions Act the exclusive law governing foreign missions in the District.

Preemption

Section 207 expresses the preemptive effect of the right of the Federal Government, through the Secretary of State, to preclude the acquisition of any benefits by a foreign mission within the United States. A denial by the Secretary, for example, of a right of a particular foreign government to open or maintain a mission within the United States, or a condition limiting the number of their personnel or other factors relating to the mission, would be controlling. This is consistent with current practice and reflects the policy of Federal preemption in foreign relations. This subsection does not otherwise affect State or local law or regulations. Nothing in this section would require any State or local authority to take any affirmative action. The principal impact of its terms is to preclude reliance on local law, regulation, or practice by a foreign mission in an effort to secure benefits contrary to limitations imposed by the Secretary. This limited preemption is necessary in order to assure that the purposes of the Foreign Missions Act are carried out.

Of course, State and local governments are obliged to respect the rights of foreign missions to be granted certain benefits under international law and international agreements in force. The views of the Secretary of State on the requirements of international law are authoritative in this regard. Should a State or local governmental entity wish to deny benefits which it is not obliged to grant, contrary to a determination by the Secretary of State that such benefits should be granted, the matter would, as under present practice, be subject to resolution through discussions between the Department of State and the State or local governmental entity. The committee of conference notes that the interests of the Department in promoting foreign policy and national security interests and the interests of State and local governments in protecting

local citizen interests are not necessarily incompatible and therefore looks forward to a productive working relationship between the Department of State and State and local authorities.

This section also requires coordination among Federal agencies, under the leadership of the Secretary of State, in order to achieve an effective policy of reciprocity so as to fulfill the purposes of this legislation by precluding any Federal agency from taking any action inconsistent with the Foreign Missions Act. The provision has the effect of rendering unenforceable any rules or regulations of any Federal agency, to the extent that such rules or regulations would confer or deny benefits contrary to this title.

The committee of conference notes that the Foreign Missions Act is a new and unique piece of legislation which grants the Secretary of State significant authority over the activities and operations of foreign missions in the United States—authority which is long overdue. In order to carry out this authority effectively, the Office of Foreign Missions will need adequate numbers of trained personnel, as well as sufficient resources for the job. The committee of conference expects the Department of State to establish an effective and aggressive operation with the bureaus and offices of the Department, as well as with other interested agencies, but which maintains its distance from the day-to-day operations of the Department. In addition, the committee of conference cautions that a clear distinction must be made and maintained between the Office of Foreign Missions and the Office of Protocol, since their responsibilities may often be conflicting. The committee of conference expects, in particular, that certain responsibilities will be moved from the Office of Protocol to the Office of Foreign Missions, including such matters as: (1) the determination of eligibility and issuance of credentials of diplomatic, consular, and other foreign government officers and employees with respect to rights, privileges, and immunities; (2) advising and acting as liaison to State and local government authorities on diplomatic privileges and immunities and related matters; (3) providing certifications of the immunity status of individuals for use in court cases; (4) requesting waiver of immunity in appropriate cases; (5) assisting in the negotiations of consular conventions and other treaties and agreements involving rights, privileges, and immunities of foreign government missions and personnel; and (6) providing advice and assistance to diplomatic missions.

In certain areas, the Secretary may find it appropriate to permit sharing of responsibilities between the two offices, but the committee expects the new office to resolve the inherent conflict between protocol duties and those duties involving regulation of foreign mission activities. Appropriate liaison between the officer should assure that conflicts are minimized.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, in conclusion, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act is by its nature a long and complex bill. The committee of conference resolved more than 40 differences between the two Houses. The managers on the part of the Senate were diligent in their efforts to uphold the Senate position and were, I believe, rather successful in that effort. It is the belief of the Senate conferees that the compromises in the conference substitute were reasonable solutions to

S 10014

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 9, 1982

some very difficult issues. Therefore, I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, passage of the conference report on S. 1193 will provide authorization for fiscal years 1982 and 1983 for the State Department, the International Communication Agency—redesignated by the bill as the U.S. Information Agency—and the Board for International Broadcasting. Although the total funding authorized for these three agencies is relatively modest as compared to the Department of Defense budget—\$2,873,760 for fiscal year 1982 and \$2,923,244 for fiscal year 1983—these agencies have an absolutely vital national security role. Diplomacy, be it the Government-to-Government representation of the State Department or the public diplomacy of USIA and BIB, is the most cost-effective way, in terms of money and lives to protect and promote U.S. national interests.

S. 1193 includes several important provisions to strengthen our representation abroad. The conference substitute mandates the reopening of seven closed consulates and earmarks funds for that purpose. This will enhance our visible presence overseas. The bill also includes a provision, initiated by Senator GLENN, to exempt the inter-American organizations—OAS, PAHO, IICA—from the debilitating effects of the administration's deferral plan.

S. 1193 also incorporates two provisions, of which I am proud to have been the author, to strengthen our public diplomacy. The first provision mandates a doubling of exchange-of-persons programs in real terms over the next 4 years and specifically earmarks increases in fiscal year 1983 of 37 percent to 46 percent over the fiscal year 1982 levels in the Fulbright academic exchange program, the international visitor program, the Humphrey fellowship program, and the private sector program, all programs with a proven record of effectiveness. This provision reverses a long-term decline in U.S. exchange programs which has left us outsped by the Soviet Union in this area by more than 10 to 1.

Second, this bill strengthens the Federal oversight over Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty by requiring that the Directors of the RFE/RL Board be the same as the Presidentially appointed Directors of the Board for International Broadcasting. This provision, which in no sense federalizes the radios, will insure more effective use of the U.S. tax dollars in providing a source of reliable information on Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union to the people of those countries.

Passage of the conference report on S. 1193 will lead to strengthening of the diplomatic arm of our Government. This strengthening is being accomplished, I would note, with slightly less than the amounts requested in the President's budget for fiscal year 1982 and fiscal year 1983.

In the long run, however, the Congress must address itself to the problems caused by the real decline in resources devoted to our foreign affairs agencies. I note that since 1960 the number of State Department Foreign Service Officers has declined from 3,717 to 3,564 while the number of missions overseas has increased from 165 to 224. In the same period, consular loads have increased 900 percent and Washington's demand for reporting cables has increased 400 percent. A comparable situation exists at USIA, which the mandated increase in exchanges will only partially correct. Again let me emphasize that the failure to provide adequate resources to these vital tasks will over time undermine our national security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY

RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in recess until the hour of 10 a.m. on tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR THE RECOGNITION OF VARIOUS SENATORS ON TOMORROW

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent after the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order, that the following Senators be recognized on special order for not to exceed 15 minutes each: Senators CHILES, HEFLIN, LEVIN, and HUMPHREY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR PERIOD FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS ON TOMORROW

Mr. BAKER. Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the execution of the special orders there be a brief period for the transaction of routine morning business to extend not past the hour of 11:30 a.m. in which Senators may speak for not more than 3 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, there is provision for a period for the transaction of routine morning business, is there not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is.

Mr. BAKER. I yield back my time, Mr. President, so that the Chair may put the Senate in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, the Federal Election Commission is so often the subject of criticism that it is far too easy to overlook and slight the valuable services performed by that agency.

It is refreshing to receive favorable comment regarding the FEC from an organization as involved in the conduct of Federal elections as the International Institute of Municipal Clerks, many members of which are regularly involved in the administration of Federal elections.

Recently I received a letter from that organization in support of full funding of the FEC. In particular, the institute praised the assistance and information provided by the programs of the clearinghouse to State and local election officials—services which are not available from any other agency.

In both its letter and a resolution adopted by IIMC, the institute makes note of the savings to the local officials as a result of the information provided by the FEC's clearinghouse, and its State and local workshops for local election administrators. It should be noted that the clearinghouse functions of the FEC have had very little funding during the past year, and that the present budget for next year will provide for very little as well—less than \$175,000, in fact. That this agency can continue to function with so little, and still provide services that cut costs for those local agencies that administer our Federal elections is a remarkable feat, and deserves commendation.

The clearinghouse, however, cannot continue to provide so many support services to the States in the future without adequate funding. It would be shortsighted and a false economy on our part to continue to restrict the funding of this agency in view of the savings it has been able to make possible for local election officials in the administration of Federal elections throughout the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter and resolution of the IIMC be included in the RECORD in full immediately following this statement.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows: