

H J Res. 2, Urgent Supplemental Appropriation

H 4796

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

May 24, 1984

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN).

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the final amendment in disagreement in this series.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 34: Page 2, after line 17, insert:

Sec. 113. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the National Park Service shall enter into a contract releasing or transferring any Federal employees or liquidating any equipment or materials for the purpose of complying with the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 as it relates to the 62 activities tentatively scheduled for review by the National Park Service by March 30, 1984, only after the following conditions have been met:

(1) the study supporting that contract required by the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 is completed, including the bidding process and review of bids;

(2) the National Park Service has had 30 days to review the bid results and to transmit recommendations to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, and the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs as to which activities should be contracted; and

(3) 30 days have elapsed since the transmittal required by paragraph (2).

(b) All recommendations to be submitted shall be resubmitted by September 1, 1984.

(c) The National Park Service shall not solicit bids related to other Circular A-76 reviews before January 1, 1985.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

Sec. 113. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, organizations reporting to the Assistant Secretary of Interior for Fish and Wildlife and Parks shall enter into contracts which result in releasing or transferring any Federal employees or liquidating any equipment or materials as a result of complying with the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 for the 62 activities scheduled for review by the National Park Service by March 30, 1984, and the 94 activities scheduled for review by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service by September 30, 1984, only after the following conditions have been met:

(1) the study supporting each contract required by the Office and Management and Budget Circular A-76 is completed, including the bidding process and review of bids;

(2) the organizations have had 30 days to review the bid results and to transmit recommendations to the appropriate House and Senate Committees as to which activities should be contracted; and

(3) 30 days have elapsed since the transmittal required by paragraph (2).

(b) All recommendations to be submitted shall be submitted by October 30, 1984.

(c) The organizations shall not solicit bids related to other Circular A-76 reviews before January 30, 1985.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN).

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate amendment No. 14.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 14: Page 2, after line 17, insert:

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

For activities of the Central Intelligence Agency, notwithstanding any other provision of law, in addition to amounts previously appropriated, not to exceed \$21,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1984: Provided, That \$14,000,000 shall be allocated to the Reserve for Contingencies administered by the Director of Central Intelligence and shall be subject to applicable statutory procedures prior to obligation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN).

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, on this amendment I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BOLAND

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BOLAND moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14 and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

No funds are appropriated herein for the Central Intelligence Agency in fiscal year 1984 for the purpose or which would have the effect of supporting, directly or indirectly, military or paramilitary operations in Nicaragua by any nation, group, organization, movement, or individual.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield our time to my good friend from Virginia (Mr. ROBINSON).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. ROBINSON) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

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

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the issue before the House today should be a familiar one. Twice we have voted to stop funding paramilitary attacks against Nicaragua. When the House finally agreed to appropriate some funds to continue the war, it insisted on a cap on those funds. The administration has spent nearly all of its \$24

million. It now wants \$71 million more—just till the end of the fiscal year.

In conference on the urgent supplemental, the House conferees refused to add \$1 more for the war against Nicaragua. The Senate then proposed that we appropriate a fraction of the \$21 million and only for the purpose of "winding down" the covert action. The House conferees were not sure what "winding down" meant, but we were willing to provide funds to stop the war.

So, we drafted language which very carefully restricted the use of additional funds "solely for the safe and expeditious withdrawal" of Contras from Nicaragua.

We also offered money "solely to provide humanitarian support" to those Contras who left Nicaragua and were disarmed.

The Senate conferees could not come to an agreement on this proposal. They chose to insist on the Senate position—the full \$21 million to continue the war, not to wind down the war. The administration refuses to budge. It refuses to take seriously the will of the people expressed in two votes of this House. So, we must vote again and demonstrate to the other body our unstinting commitment to end this deadly war.

Let me read the language of the motion I have offered. It repeats as clearly as I can state, the position this House should adopt:

No funds are appropriated herein for the Central Intelligence Agency in fiscal year 1984 for the purpose or which would have the effect of supporting, directly or indirectly, military or paramilitary operations in Nicaragua by any nation, group, organization, movement, or individual.

We simply must not appropriate one more penny to wage a war that has caused our allies to wonder at our sense of proportion—that has turned Central America into an armed camp—that has failed to achieve any of its stated, sometimes conflicting, aims—that has only strengthened the resolve of the Sandinistas—and that, in the words of the President of Mexico, poses a "risk of generalized war, the scope and duration of which, no one can foresee."

All to what end? To put pressure on the Sandinistas? To turn them inward? To send a message to Cuba? None of those aims have been achieved. More important, none of them are worth the sacrifice of one more life.

There is not going to be a popular revolution in Nicaragua against the Sandinistas. That should be clear from the 2½-year history of this war. We cannot make it happen—no matter how many Contras we arm, how many oil tanks we blow up, or how many ports we mine.

For over a year now the administration has been on notice that the House was going to insist that this war end.

465

Executive Registry

May 24, 1984

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 4797

Since last November the administration has been on notice that the House was serious about the \$24 million cap. Two months ago 12 of the 14 members of the Intelligence Committee sent a letter to Mr. Casey advising him to adopt contingency plans for the safe withdrawal of the Contras. They have had more than enough time to develop a reasonable plan for the safe and swift withdrawal of every Contra that wants out. And make no mistake about it the Contras possess sufficient arms and supplies to protect themselves on the way out and the CIA has sufficient financial resources available to it to provide humanitarian aid to the Contras once they withdraw. So, let us not hear in this House today that we are pulling the rug out, or setting up a bloodbath, or letting people twist in the wind. That is nonsense.

What we need today is a vote to return commonsense and compassion to this country's foreign policy. What we need today, is a vote that reflects the clear resolve of the U.S. House of Representatives to end this senseless war.

□ 1330

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

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

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Speaker, here we go again, we have the Boland amendment in different language.

I can recall very few instances where a speech or a statement by a Member has changed many votes on this House floor and I am certainly not so naive as to expect the minds of seasoned legislators to be changed after hearing a few comments on the Central American issue from a colleague.

But I would like to have my colleagues attention for a few brief moments to try to frame the issue as it lies before us now.

A vote for this amendment will be a vote against the bipartisan position of the other body. The other body's amendment continues the aid for the Nicaraguan resistance to the extent of \$21 million.

There are no further funds currently available to assist the Nicaraguan resistance. A vote for this amendment amounts to a termination of support for Nicaraguan resistance fighters who pursue democracy for their country with their lives at stake.

The amendment before my colleagues is absolute in its effect. It is a vote to reward the Sandinista regime for its solidarity of purpose to subvert every freely elected government in Central America.

A vote for this amendment means that the Contras will no longer have the wherewithal to hamper the supply of arms and other support the Nicaraguans send to the rebels in El Salvador. Its practical effect is to provide a legislatively engineered victory to the Sandinista regime.

The position of this administration, the position of the Senate and the position of this side of the aisle has always been clear. So long as the Sandinista regime continues support for the export of Communist revolution and aggressively supports the overthrow of the Government of El Salvador and the other freely elected governments in Central America, and does not honor its commitments to the OAS, we will continue to support the Contras of the Nicaraguan resistance. That is the policy and the position of the administration and of the Republicans.

There is no ambiguity in that position. It is clear, it is distinct, and, as I say, it supports the policy that has been set forth by this administration.

Failure to continue it will make it next to impossible to achieve the objectives of the U.S. policy in Central America.

The President set forth very clearly our policy in Central America on April 27, 1983, over a year ago, and it has not changed.

We will support democracy, reform, and human freedom. We will support economic development. We will support the security of the region's threatened nations and we will support dialog and negotiations.

The report of the National Bipartisan Commission, the Kissinger Commission, on Central America, issued just 4 months ago, provided a clear consensus for action to accomplish these objectives and provide a clear blueprint for doing so. Legislation to put into motion the Commission's recommendations for a comprehensive, effective program for peace, stability, and social and economic development in Central America awaits congressional action right now.

The House has before it today one crucial element of our policy in Central America—aid to the Nicaraguan Contras.

The Nicaraguan resistance fights on its native soil for the freedom of its own country and aid to such resistance serves not only the security interests of Nicaragua's neighbors, but those of the United States as well.

The National Bipartisan Commission, again quoting from its report, stated that U.S. strategic interests require the United States: "to prevent hostile forces from seizing and expanding control in a strategically vital area of the Western Hemisphere" and "to ban the Soviet Union from consolidating either directly or through Cuba a hostile foothold on the American continents in order to advance its strategic purposes."

□ 1340

If this House terminates U.S. support for the Nicaraguan resistance, it will be impossible to pursue U.S. interests in the region effectively.

In 1979 the Sandinistas made solemn commitments to the Organization of American States to hold free elections

for a truly democratic government that would guarantee peace, freedom, and justice. Instead, they systematically began eliminating freedom in Nicaragua, repressing trade unions, civic groups, and the press, and slaughtering or interning thousands of Miskito Indians. In the face of this Marxist-Leninist effort to establish totalitarian control of the Nicaraguan people, three Nicaraguan resistance groups—the FDN, ARDE, and the Miskitos—have engaged in armed resistance with our assistance. The Nicaraguan resistance preserves some chance that Nicaraguans may know democracy.

Has America lost concern for the liberties of people who are fighting for democracy on our own continent?

Do we truly believe that it does not matter if the Sandinistas enslave the Nicaraguan people?

Ask the nine Catholic bishops of Nicaragua if it matters to them if the Sandinistas continue unabated in their efforts to censor the church.

Do the American people really want to turn their backs on the one remaining flame of hope for freedom in Nicaragua?

Given the chance, they would say no.

This great Nation should continue aid to the Nicaraguan resistance fighting Soviet-Cuban-Nicaraguan tyranny. To those who would deny it, I say that there is no honor in abandoning friends in the heat of battle. There is no honor in leaving free peoples of Central America as fodder for the Sandinista military machine.

Fidel Castro has repeatedly warned the nations of the Americas that they should never align themselves with the United States because we are unreliable and will not support our friends.

I ask you to vote no on the amendment to recede and concur which is pending, the intended effect of which is to terminate all aid to the Contras in Nicaragua, to abandon our friends who fight for democracy there. Such action would be perceived as another step in the direction of proving that Castro is correct when he calls the United States an unreliable friend.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MAZZOLI), a member of the Intelligence Committee.

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the statement made by our distinguished chairman and the position which is to try to end the secret war.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON), a Member of the Intelligence Committee and also a Member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Executive Registry

H 4798

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

May 24, 1984

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

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has a unique opportunity to stop a war. Stopping the covert action against Nicaragua would represent a significant step toward reducing tensions in Central America.

The Congress has made clear that it is prepared to provide the Government of El Salvador with generous economic and military assistance. However, providing assistance to a duly elected democratic government is different from funding guerrillas whose aim it is to overthrow a government we do not like.

We do not like the Sandinista Government, or its policies internal and external.

But this war should stop for several reasons:

First, the war must stop because it keeps escalating. It is no longer what it was initially intended to be. In December 1981 it was limited solely to the interdiction of Soviet and Cuban arms traveling through Nicaragua to insurgents in El Salvador.

Now it includes efforts:

To destabilize Nicaragua, to force internal political change;

To mine Nicaragua's ports; and

To interfere with international shipping.

Military forces, in excess of 15,000, are equipped, trained, and operating against Nicaragua. There are reports that the Defense Department has been aiding the CIA covert action with equipment and logistics support. There are reports of efforts to try to involve third countries in the funding and support of the covert action as well.

The covert action has escalated dangerously over the last 3 years. This escalation is at the heart of the argument against the continuation of covert action.

See what is happening in Costa Rica. That democratic nation, which has no army, recently requested emergency U.S. military assistance to strengthen its security forces. These forces have clashed frequently with Nicaraguan forces on their common border. The source of the conflict is the attacks launched against Nicaragua from Costa Rica by Contras supported by the United States.

The result of U.S. policy is:

A more aggressive Nicaragua willing to attack an undefended neighbor;

Calls for U.S. arming of Costa Rica; and

An increased U.S. military burden—all directly caused by U.S. action against Nicaragua.

The U.S. policy has split the government and people of Costa Rica into pro- and antimilitary groups and increased, rather than lessened, tensions between Nicaragua and Costa Rica.

The President of Mexico has stated that U.S. policy in Central America risks "A generalized war, the scope

and duration of which no one can foresee."

Second, the war must stop because it has not worked.

It has not:

Brought the Sandinistas to the bargaining table;

Stopped the flow of arms to rebels in El Salvador;

Lessened Nicaragua's support for Salvadoran insurgents;

Forced changes in Nicaraguan policies; and

Turned the Sandinistas inward.

It has:

Strengthened the Sandinista's resolve;

Rallied people to the Nicaraguan Government; and

Given the Sandinistas justification for increasingly repressive policies;

Brought about an increased militarization of life in Nicaragua, and greater Cuban and Soviet involvement in Nicaragua;

Driven the Nicaraguans ever more deeply into the arms of Cuba and the Soviet Union; and

Increased the risk of a full-scale war by Nicaragua against Honduras and Costa Rica.

Two and one-half years of war have not brought us closer to peace in Central America. Two and one-half years of war have not brought us any genuine hope for promising negotiations.

Third, this war must stop because it is against the law.

It is against U.S. laws (the Boland amendment of 1982), and it is against article 18 of the OAS charter, of which the United States is a signatory. The article says:

No state or group of states has the right to intervene directly or indirectly for any reason whatever in the internal or external affairs of any other state.

Today, the legal issue is even clearer. The World Court has held unanimously that the United States should "cease and refrain" from unlawfully mining Nicaraguan harbors. It has also rejected U.S. claims that U.S. action in Nicaragua is consistent with international law.

The administration tried to deny jurisdiction to the Court. The United States has been found guilty in an international court of law while trying to flee the court's jurisdiction. When we fail to obey our own law or international law, it diminishes respect for the United States both at home and in the rest of the world.

The President of Mexico warned against "interventionist solutions of any kind." Rather, he urged "let us apply the principles and rules of international law."

Fourth, the war must stop because the bargain in the 1983 legislation was that the administration had \$24 million—and only \$24 million—to run the war for 1984.

The administration had a clear choice: One, it could live within that limit, two, it could end support for the war, or three, it could spend at its dis-

cretion and ask for more when the \$24 million ran out.

The administration made its choice. It spent the money at an accelerated pace. The \$24 million is nearly all spent and 4¼ months are left in the fiscal year. The administration made its choice, and it should live with it.

It intensified the war. Nicaragua's ports were mined by the CIA. Serious attacks on the Nicaraguan economy—on dams, on oil and electrical facilities, or agricultural cooperatives—were stepped up. More Contras were armed and sent into combat.

Fifth, the war must stop because it is not good for the CIA.

The CIA is in the position of publicly running an undeclared war. CIA capabilities, CIA methods, CIA officials have become topics of public debate, that is unhelpful, both for the CIA and the secrecy of its intelligence activities and for the Nation.

CONCLUSION

Ending the covert action against Nicaragua is a first, necessary step toward reducing tensions in Central America, and improving the climate for meaningful negotiations. The fundamental problems of social and economic deprivation in Central America can only be addressed in the context of a regionwide peace.

So let us end this war that just keeps escalating;

Let us end the war that has not worked;

Let us end the war that is against the law;

Let us end the war that hurts the CIA, and hurts the United States; and

Let us end the war that brings no peace.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP).

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the fine speeches that have been given on this subject by my colleagues on the left, let me say with the same degree of sincerity on this side of the aisle that I do not believe that the resistance in Nicaragua will be terminated by a decision to shut off U.S. assistance to the democratic forces or the Contras, whatever they may be called.

Does anyone really think that you are going to end the efforts of these people to win back some of the rights that they sought when they participated in the original revolution and the promises the Sandinistas made to the OAS to bring pluralism and democracy and some degree of human rights to Nicaragua?

□ 1350

Does anyone think that the Sandinista regime of Nicaragua will stop the war against El Salvador? I say to my distinguished colleagues on the Intelligence Committee, does anyone really think that the Sandinistas will stop their war against little Costa Rica, or

May 24, 1984

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 4799

Honduras, if we withdraw our support?

Some have suggested that the Contadora countries do not support this; I do not know whether they do or do not because frankly you cannot tell what they support given the differences between their public statements and their private understandings. But I will tell you this. I believe in my heart that our allies in Central America are desperately in need of support for some effort to shut off the supply lines to insurgents across their border and the border of Honduras, and of course into El Salvador.

It also disturbs me, Mr. Speaker, to think that members of the Intelligence Committee should support this motion. I have high regard for the gentleman from Massachusetts and high regard for my friend from Virginia and those Members of this Congress who serve on the Intelligence Committee, but it was not so long ago that they identified the fact that the major cause of war in Central America today is not the United States of America; it is not the CIA; it is not the congressional support for the Contras, it is the support and the export of revolution from Nicaragua and Managua and Havana.

Now to shut off support for the Contras when we helped give them the original encouragement to stop the abuse of human rights in Nicaragua seems to me to be pulling the plug on people who came to depend on this country. Instead, it was the Intelligence Committee originally who gave us the information upon which we made the decision to give some support to the Contras.

I think to shut off assistance at this point would be absolutely immoral; without morality. I know that we are not supposed to use *ad hominem* attacks, and this is not one. But, ladies and gentlemen, please recognize that we were the ones that helped start the effort by the Contras to bring a halt to the export of revolution into Costa Rica and El Salvador.

Let me ask a question: Would anybody in this body shut off aid to the Afghan guerrillas who are fighting the Soviets in Afghanistan? Would anybody want to shut off aid to Solidarity if they had come to us for help in throwing off the martial law regime of Jaruzelski in Poland? How about Kampuchea?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) has expired.

(On request of Mr. STRATTON and by unanimous consent, Mr. KEMP was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mr. KEMP. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STRATTON. I just wanted to agree with the gentleman. I cannot get time on either side of the aisle. I agree with the gentleman that it would be immoral for us to shut off this aid,

and I understood that Mr. Duarte said that that was where his problem lay.

Mr. KEMP. Absolutely. How about Albono y Bravo, the Bishop of Nicaragua? How about the 100,000 Christians and campesinos who rallied against Marxism and against the Sandinistas in the central square of Managua on Good Friday? What are we going to say to them, if we just all of a sudden shut off the money that is going to those who want to bring some degree of pluralism and freedom and democracy to Nicaragua? I do not think we could live with ourselves if we pass this motion in the expectation that decision will end this so-called war, because it will not end. Those brave people in Nicaragua will go on fighting for democracy and freedom, and I think the United States of America should stand by them in this hour of need.

Mr. Speaker, with the approval of Congress, the administration has supported the activities of people in Nicaragua whose rights have been denied by the Sandinista government. I support the President's policy in Nicaragua, because I believe it is morally right for the United States to support people who are fighting for democracy.

The spirit of solidarity is growing in Nicaragua, threatening the stranglehold of the Sandinistas over the freedoms of the people. On Good Friday, 100,000 Catholics took to the streets in Managua, in a demonstration of defiance against the Sandinista regime. And their ranks are growing. It is this resurgence of the spirit of freedom that our aid to the freedom fighters helps keep alive.

The Catholic bishops, in a display of courage and leadership, are decrying the abuses of the Sandinista regime, and criticizing the control and guidance it is receiving from Cuba. They are calling for negotiations between the Sandinistas and those opposed to the regime, just as the charter of the FDN—one of the main contra organizations—seeks negotiations to establish free and fair elections. Thus far, the Sandinistas have rejected this appeal, just as they repudiated their promises to the OAS to hold free and fair elections and to respect the rights of the people of Nicaragua.

We have stood by in anguish over our inability to help the cause of solidarity in Poland. Are there any in this Chamber who would have refused to help, if we had the means to do so? Today, in Nicaragua, a country so close to our borders, we do have the power to help. Will this Congress vote to turn our backs on these people struggling for their basic human rights? And if we do turn away, how will we erase our callousness from our conscience?

If you speak with members of the Contra movement, as I have done, they will tell you that they are not seeking a military victory; they only ask that the Sandinista Government

hold free and fair elections, as it promised when it came to power, and respect the human rights of the citizens of Nicaragua. But until the Sandinistas honor their word, the opposition which their totalitarian policies have spawned will continue to fight for democratic goals with whatever means it has at its disposal.

U.S. policy has a similar two-fold thrust. First, we have strongly supported the Contadora process, to find a peaceful solution to the violence in Central America. But our diplomatic overtures have been rebuffed. So long as the Sandinista regime continues to scorn its promises to the OAS, and continues to work for the violent overthrow of neighboring democratic governments, we must help El Salvador and Honduras and Costa Rica and others in the region defend themselves by continuing to bring pressure to bear on the Sandinistas.

We need to put the debate in perspective. Support for the forces of democracy in Nicaragua is an integral part of our support for stability and independence for all the countries in the region. All our efforts to bring peace and democracy to El Salvador will come to naught if we create a sanctuary next door—guaranteed by congressional legislation—for those who bring war and totalitarianism to El Salvador.

Nicaragua continues to be the source of regional subversion and instability. As the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence concluded (May, 1983) "the Sandinista government of Nicaragua is transferring arms and financial support from and through Nicaragua to the insurgents. They are also providing the insurgents bases of operations in Nicaragua. Cuban involvement—especially in providing arms—is also evident."

The facts of Nicaragua's war against its neighbors, of the Sandinistas' persecution of its own people—such as the repeated attacks on thousands of Miskito Indians who have fled for sanctuary across the Honduran border—are well known. Uncertain allegations about U.S. activities, selectively leaked and taken out of context, which cannot be addressed publicly for fear of compromising people who risk their lives to help carry our policy forward, do not negate the fundamental rightness of our support for the Nicaraguan freedom fighters.

We have vital strategic interests in maintaining the security and stability of Central America. And we have a deep and abiding interest in seeing democracy flourish in our own hemisphere. Having visited Nicaragua, having met with many who have fled for their lives, and with others who have remained to fight, I can attest that the people of Nicaragua, like people elsewhere in the region, desperately want the freedoms and quality of life guaranteed only by a democratic form of government.

Executive Registry

36,077

H 4800

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

May 24, 1984

I support the President's policy in Central America, including support for the freedom fighters in Nicaragua. And I endorse what Secretary Shultz and Secretary Weinberger and Director Casey and Mr. McFarlane said in their joint statement of last month:

The real issues are whether we in the United States want to stand by and let a Communist government in Nicaragua export violence and terrorism in this hemisphere and whether we will allow the power of the ballot box to be overcome by the power of the gun. There is no doubt that the Soviet Union and Cuba want to see communism spread further in Central America. The question is: Will the United States support those countries that want democracy and are willing to fight for their own freedom?

Mr. Speaker, our support should be beyond question and it should be demonstrated by a strong vote in favor of the Contras.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FOWLER) who serves on the Intelligence Committee.

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

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take up where the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON) left off.

This motion by the Intelligence Committee ought to be supported, because by any discernable means of military achievement, it has been unsuccessful.

By any measure of military achievement, this operation unilaterally financed by the United States of America, unilaterally organized by the United States of America, has been a failure. The Contras have seized no territory; they have taken no jurisdiction; they have grown; they have escalated; they have cut off no arms. It is a failure by any discernable military criteria.

We have also done something far worse, unfortunately. If there is one thing that we have had bipartisan consensus on the Intelligence Committee, it is that the Central Intelligence Agency should be built as the most crackerjack intelligence-gathering and analytic operation in the world. That the CIA is our first line of defense. Because it gives us warning of enemy activity. Warning of enemy intentions. Unless you have a crackerjack, clandestine collection operation, an analysis operation, then, yes, our Nation's national security in days of missiles and threats is in jeopardy.

We on the Intelligence Committee and your votes have spent billions and billions and billions of dollars over the last 7 years improving that capability. But now in Nicaragua, we have politicized the Central Intelligence Agency. We have made them the instrument of policy when they are prohibited by their charter to be a policymaking arm of our Government. As a result, we are doing under the table, I say to my friend from New York and others, we are doing under the table what we are

not brave enough to go to the American people and say, "We in concert with our allies if the threat is so great, want to do openly."

As a result, our allies in Central America, our allies in Europe are saying your policy is not only a failure, you are compromising your Central Intelligence Agency and help put it out of business, not only in Central America, but other parts of the world, and losing the support of our own citizens who deserve the best, who deserve the best from our intelligence operations.

Oh, my friends, I am in no support of those people who wring their hands and say, "We shall never send American troops anywhere to defend our national security." The question that is belied by this operation, that question that we failed to address in this Congress, is how is our national security threatened at this time in Central America? And if it is threatened, if it is threatened, then we ought to use our forces for what we have forces for: To defend our Nation, to defend our country; and not to be under the table with hired mercenaries under any circumstances.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROOMFIELD).

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am incensed at this procedure which prevents the offering of a substitute and cleverly blocks any effort at reaching a compromise short of a total cutoff of funds for the freedom fighters in Nicaragua.

This action, together with the hasty and ill-advised language the House adopted last night, reinforces the clear message to our adversaries around the world that we are not serious about keeping our commitments or protecting our interests in Central America.

Our action last night and today, we are saying again that we will give our friends in Central America just enough to help to prolong their agony. But if they slip up, we are ready and waiting to pull the rug out from under them.

What good does it do to approve \$62 million to support the cause of freedom and democracy in El Salvador on the one hand, when with the other hand we require that they leave the backdoor open to those in Nicaragua seeking to subvert freedom and democracy?

What good does it do to embrace President Duarte before the TV cameras on Wednesday and then by statute, create a sanctuary for his enemies in Nicaragua the next day?

This congressional action, is hypocritical, contradictory and counterproductive.

The simple truth is that aid to El Salvador and aid to the freedom fighters in Nicaragua are not separate issues. They are both integral parts of what we are trying to accomplish.

The \$21 million we are debating here is not enough to permit the overthrow of the Nicaraguan Government, and that certainly has never been our purpose. But it is enough to help frustrate Nicaragua's efforts to export Marxist warfare outside its borders. It is enough to provide our friend, President Napoleon Duarte, with an increased margin of safety in his struggle to save his nation and build democracy in El Salvador.

The steps we are taking this week give comfort to President Duarte's enemies and make this task much more difficult.

The action last night in announcing to the world that Congress will prohibit the President from sending troops to El Salvador or Nicaragua, regardless of the provocation, must be sending Communist-Marxist military strategists back to the drawing boards all over the world today.

The Cubans, the Soviets, the PLO, the North Koreans, the Bulgarians—all of those who we found actively working against our interests in Grenada—have been put on notice that Nicaragua and El Salvador are off-limits to U.S. troops. We have handed them a guarantee that Nicaragua may be used as a sanctuary free from U.S. intervention for whatever mischief they devise—and we have given it in writing.

We seem determined to fight our battles with one hand tied behind our back and both eyes closed to our past disasters. Is Nicaragua to become for Central America the sanctuary for our enemies that Cambodia and Laos were in Vietnam?

The President has indicated, that without some continued support for the Nicaraguan democratic forces, he will veto this legislation, including the funds for El Salvador.

His logic in doing so is clear. We have to make a choice. Either we have the courage to stand by our policy, our President and our friends in Central America, or we stand aside and watch El Salvador, Costa Rica, Honduras and the others go it alone.

Throughout the history of this House there have been moments that not only decide issues but define the very character of this body. This is one of them. We stand before history and the American people—and, yes, the world—and what we decide will say as much about us as it does about the Contras.

We don't let down our friends—that is a basic truth of the American character. Are we going to forget that truth?

If we do, history will never forgive us. And we will never forgive ourselves.

May 24, 1984

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 4801

I urge a "no" vote on the Boland amendment.

□ 1400

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

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

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

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the position of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROOMFIELD), and I rise in opposition to the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, and in support of the continued funding for covert assistance to the freedom fighters in Nicaragua.

During the visit of President-elect Duarte, he made it clear to us that Nicaragua is the center for command and control and for supplying the guerrillas operating in El Salvador. Without the pressure of the counter-revolutionary groups operating in Nicaragua, President Duarte says the Sandinistas would have free reign to devote their entire military effort in support of the Salvadoran guerrillas.

The House Intelligence Committee has told us that supplies, support for El Salvador guerrillas in El Salvador comes from the Sandanistas in Nicaragua.

The question is clear: Why should we provide a sanctuary to the Sandinistas so they are protected while attacking their neighbors?

As Ambassador Kirkpatrick says:

There can be no question by reasonable persons that Nicaragua is engaged in a continuing, determined, armed attack against its neighbors, and that under the charter of the United Nations, . . . those neighbors have the right of individual or collective self-defense.

It is clear that progress in achieving peace in El Salvador is clearly linked to stopping the Sandinista support for the Salvadoran insurgency. As much as we all wish to see progress on the diplomatic front in Central America, the Contadora Initiative has not yet achieved peace. Even the Los Angeles Times accuses Managua of dragging its feet. The Times editorial states:

The Nicaraguan Government is not bargaining in earnest with its neighbors about reducing the size of its army, eliminating foreign military advisers from the region and giving more freedom to political dissidents.

With the evidence clearly against the Sandinista regime, it is the wrong time to reduce the pressure on them. I urge my colleagues to reject the motion of the gentleman and to continue funding of covert assistance to the counterrevolutionaries in Nicaragua.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MINETA) a member of the Intelligence Committee.

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

Mr. MINETA. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to once and for all end our ill-advised, illegal and unproductive adventures in Nicaragua.

I urge my colleagues to uphold this House's position, and to refuse any additional funding for covert activity in Nicaragua.

Some ideas are born of noble goals, are advanced by people of good intentions, but turn out to be mistakes none the less. The covert program in Nicaragua is one of those tragic mistakes. Let us end it, right now here today.

This administration responds to all international events with the same pattern: Threats and provocative actions. Let us—even if it is only just once—make clear that we in the Congress still have the independent judgement to see a path of a calmness, reason, and diplomacy.

Please join with us in our efforts to end this war. Join with us in our effort to support a regional solution to this problem. There is no reason for us to try and impose our will upon these nations. Let us support their efforts to find a regional solution.

And most of all, let us end this war today.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to a member of the Intelligence Committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Young).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, since just over 4 years ago this Member had the opportunity to present to the House, in a secret session, information that proved beyond a doubt that the Sandinistas were Communists and were associated with Cuba and the Soviet Union, and since that time there has been a lot of debate on the subject, I had not intended to be involved in this debate today because I have been involved in that debate for 4 years now, constantly.

But some of the things that I hear coming from some of my colleagues I think bear response. For example, my friend and colleague on the Intelligence Committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON), said in his debate that our actions in Central America have driven Nicaragua closer to the Cubans and the Soviets. I would say to my colleagues that during the time that the United States was providing \$130 million of aid to the Sandinista forces, that was when they made their deal with Cuba, that was when they signed the agreements, that is when they got closer and closer with the Communists. Not now, and not because there was a covert activity under way, but back then while we were giving them \$130 million.

My distinguished chairman, a man for whom I have the greatest respect,

the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND), in his comments said how we were being criticized because we wage a war that has turned Central America into an armed camp.

I would say to my friend, Mr. BOLAND, and to my colleagues on the floor, it is not any activity of the American people or the American Government that has turned Central America into an armed camp. We had nothing to do with the creation of a 130,000-man force in Nicaragua, far beyond its needs to defend itself. The Americans had nothing to do with the introduction of Mig-23's into the Caribbean/Central American area. We have had nothing to do with building runways that are capable of handling Soviet intercontinental bombers. We have not created submarine bases.

To the contrary, those things were done by the other side, by the Soviet-Cuban axis, with the help of their friends in Nicaragua, the Sandinistas.

I have no objection to the debate, what comes from this side of the aisle or that side of the aisle. The debate is good, because we have a major issue before us and we have to make a decision. We have to decide what we are going to do about the Communist expansion in Central America, our front yard. In my district in Florida, we are closer to a good portion of Central America, Nicaragua and El Salvador than we are to many parts of the United States.

We are concerned about what happens in Central America, but in all these debates—and I say again, debate is good—I hear so many times the implication that the United States is the bad guy; that we Americans are the aggressor; that we are the threat to world peace.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that is not true. We have never been the aggressor and we are not and have never been a treat to the peace of the world.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

Mr. Speaker, we have known this vote was approaching for several days, and yet I have noted that many of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle are uncomfortable with the choice facing them. The Intelligence Committee took us down this road when 3 years ago when no objections were offered to covert operations in Nicaragua. Today it is once again recommending to us a total cutoff of all aid to the Contras, giving us no other choices but to vote "yea" and "nay."

This Member is opposed to funding covert operations in Nicaragua. Certainly it has caused the Sandinista

Executive Registry

H 4802

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

May 24, 1984

regime to reduce its aggressive external actions including the aid to Salvadoran guerrillas flowing through Nicaragua—a fact stipulated by the House Select Committee on Intelligence. But covert aid is counterproductive in changing Nicaraguan internal policies, particularly in a country invaded by the Armed Forces of the United States twice in the last century. The actions of the Contras have served to strengthen the hand of a Sandinista regime which has tightened censorship and repression in their country. The Nicaraguan people should not be forced to choose between an American backed armed group which includes some civil guards of the hated Somoza regime and a government which grows everyday heavier handed, but which claims to be authentically Nicaraguan. Mr. Speaker, we are giving the Sandinistas a way out of their own wrongdoings by our policy of supporting the Contras.

But all of us here today must ask ourselves whether a total cutoff of all aid—suddenly—will not leave the situation worse than before. During the last debate on this issue, both the gentleman from Florida Mr. MICA and this Member offered a "symmetry" approach amendments or substitutes which would assure the Sandinistas of a cutoff in our assistance to the Contras if they, in turn, discontinue their assistance to the Salvadoran guerrillas. This would be monitored by an international organization such as the Organization of American States or the United Nations. Would this not be the more responsible approach? Why are we not given that choice today? Is it wrong to disallow a pragmatic third option?

There have also been press reports about the possibility of a phaseout of our backing of the Contras. That approach too would also have been better than the drastic choices we have before us today, although it has very significant defects.

If today's vote would result in the total cutoff of funds, I can only hope that the "symmetry" approach or a phaseout proposal will reappear in conference with the other body, for there are far better alternatives for moving the United States away from the funding of covert operations in Nicaragua.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. SHANNON).

Mr. SHANNON. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of discussion today about the interests of the United States in this matter and, of course, that is the central question that needs to be addressed. What are our interests in Central America? What are our interests in Nicaragua?

I must say that I think these interests are being too narrowly defined by some who are speaking from this spot. I visited Nicaragua last summer and

met with many people. I am not happy with the Sandinista government. I do not support them. I do not like many of the things that they do.

But I spoke to some Nicaraguan people. I met a man who presented me with this mass card from the funeral of his son, a son who was killed by the Contras. He buried the boy just a week before. He said to me, "Congressman, I would not have this printed just to deceive you. He was killed by the Contras."

Is this what we have come to represent to Nicaragua? Is this what we have come to represent in the Third World? We are the greatest democracy in the history of the world. We have been relegated to this? I hope not.

That is what this question is all about. That is what this issue is all about.

What would you have us do? Should we be willing to invade Nicaragua, send troops, overthrow the Sandinistas? I have not heard anybody urge that, and that is not what we should be doing. And we should not be launching secret wars. We do not have to do that. We do not have to be threatened by Sandinistas. We are not threatened by them.

So what we are saying here today is, not what we think about the Nicaraguans; but rather what we think about the United States and the role that we are going to play in the world. That is what this issue is all about. If we have an interest here, it is in making sure that the country represents the right values around the world, values of peace and justice and freedom and self-determination. This policy that we have launched in Nicaragua flies in the face of those values and that tradition, and that is why the House must stick by its position.

□ 1410

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. COLEMAN).

(Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, we just gave \$62 million to the country of El Salvador, and I suggest it will not be worth a plugged nickel unless we do something to insure that the illegal continuation of terrorist activities from Nicaragua will cease.

The Sandinistas in Nicaragua have said, no, they are not interested in democracy, and, no, they are not interested in ending their illegal fight against the people of El Salvador.

The people we call the Contras, the freedom fighters, are not the only ones with dissenting opinions. On Easter Sunday the nine Catholic bishops of Nicaragua came out with a pastoral letter in which they criticized the close ties of the Sandinistas with the Communist government of Cuba. It might be pointed out at the same time that these bishops did not criti-

cize the U.S. involvement with the insurgent forces and in fact, instead, urged the Sandinistas to sit down and negotiate with the Contras to form a government and to end the violence.

This, of course, means that something good is happening from our efforts with Contras. They are a moderating force. The nine Catholic bishops have unanimously said that they are a factor to be reckoned with and the Sandinistas ought to sit down and talk with them.

Now, what was the response from the Sandinistas? Daniel Ortega said that the bishops were a minority that wants to sell out the country. Cartoons have been written in the official press in Nicaragua portraying the Catholic bishops as fashioning a swastika from the scenes of a cross.

What does the veiled threat mean from the Minister of Agrarian Reform Jaime Wheelock, who said that the time has now come to take stronger measures against enemies of the revolution who are trying to turn back the people's conquest?

Those veiled threats against the Catholic bishops, Mr. Speaker, are very important to what we are doing today. A vote against the Boland amendment, I suggest, is a vote that says the United States will not stand idly by and allow these challenges and criticisms against the Catholic Church to continue.

Mr. Speaker, the Contras are fighting for freedom for their people, they are fighting for rights, they are fighting for freedom of the press, they are fighting for freedom of religion, and I suggest that we stand up with the nine bishops who stood up in Nicaragua.

● Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, after personally meeting with President-elect Duarte of El Salvador as well as the Nicaraguan Ambassador in Washington, I am convinced that totally abandoning the Contras in their struggle with the Sandinista government of Nicaragua would adversely affect El Salvador, precipitate a bloodbath, and stamp the United States as unwilling to make and stand by the tough decisions forced upon us in our own hemisphere.

President-elect Duarte, who is putting his life on the line to try to institute real democracy in El Salvador, said that stopping the aid to the Contras would mean an unchecked flow of arms by way of Nicaragua. He said there are many ways to funnel arms into El Salvador, but that the presence of the Contras impeded the direct acquiescence and help of the Sandinista government and interdicted by far the most direct route for smuggled arms.

Nicaraguan Ambassador Antonio Jarquin told me Wednesday in my Washington office that his government had "no control" over the flow of arms to revolutionaries battling the duly-elected government of El Salvador and declined to offer to attempt such control. For a government which

May 24, 1984

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 4803

has yet to honor its commitment to free elections, the Nicaraguan Ambassador's statement is a flat-out deception.

While I regret that the United States embarked on a covert operation of this type—unlike the Soviets, Cuba, and their allies, we find these methods repugnant to our sense of fair play—I believe that our abandonment of the Contras at this time would stamp us an unreliable ally. I also believe that to deny the Contras even the means of self protection would be disastrous. This does not mean I condone, nor will I support, such actions as the mining of Nicaraguan harbors.

I am chagrined by human rights violations in both El Salvador and Nicaragua. At least, a president has been elected in El Salvador who has pledged to eliminate death squads and bring justice to that country. In Nicaragua, not only have democratic elections been cast aside, but the government persecutes the religious, harasses and censors the news media, and has slaughtered or driven into exile thousands of Miskito Indians.

Neither country has the market cornered on human rights violations. Our only hope is that El Salvador—with our aid which is 80 percent economic—can make the transition to real democracy and prevent a well-orchestrated subversive drive to turn it into another surrogate of the Soviet Union in our hemisphere.●

● Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, aid to the Nicaraguan resistance now is essential if political pluralism is ever to have a chance in Nicaragua.

Aid to the Nicaraguan resistance now is essential if Nicaragua is to be dissuaded from its extensive efforts, under Soviet and Cuban guidance, to subvert the governments of the region.

If the United States abandons the Nicaraguan resistance, it will seal the fate of the Nicaraguan people in Marxist-Leninist totalitarianism.

We are not simply deciding today whether to provide a small amount of assistance to a few resistance groups who need our help.

No, make no mistake about it, we are really deciding whether the United States cares whether the Nicaraguan people are enslaved by the Marxist-Leninists Sandinistas who seized power in Nicaragua.

I believe that the American people have the political will—the courage—to put their money where their mouth is.

We talk all the time in America about how important personal liberties and rights are. We tell the world that we stand for freedom in the world and believe that all oppressed peoples ought share the freedoms we enjoy.

But, I guess we do not really mean it after all if we abandon the Nicaraguan resistance—if we abandon the last chance for a future free Nicaragua.

Well, that is not where the American people stand. When Americans say they stand tall with their friends in

the world for the cause of human freedom, they mean it.

And that is why the United States must continue its support to the free people of the Nicaraguan resistance.●

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARNES), who chairs the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Intelligence Committee for yielding me this time.

My friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROOMFIELD), said a few minutes ago that history, the American people, and the world will judge the decision that we make on this issue that confronts us now, and I agree totally with that comment of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROOMFIELD). History will judge the decision we make this afternoon as to whether or not the United States wants to continue to engage in a covert war against the Government and the people of Nicaragua.

Certainly the American people will judge the decision we make here this afternoon. I do not think there is any question where their judgment lies on this. We are all familiar with the surveys and the polls which indicate that the American people are very strongly opposed to the policy of the Reagan administration carrying on a covert war through the CIA against another government with which we have diplomatic relations. There is no question how the American people will judge the vote that we take this afternoon, and there is no question how the world will judge the vote that we take this afternoon. The world is very clear on it. There is something called the World Court, which rule about 2 weeks ago unanimously that the United States is violating international law by engaging in precisely the kind of activities we are talking about this afternoon.

There are also lots of other ways to judge international opinion and the view of the world on what we are doing. One of them is to talk with world leaders. Many of us in this chamber have the opportunity to do so regularly. Last week we had the opportunity to talk with the President of Mexico, one of the Contadora countries that is engaged in the effort to bring a peaceful resolution to the crisis in Central America.

I had the great privilege of attending a private luncheon over in the other body with the President of Mexico, and I was able to ask him the question: Is what the United States is doing in this covert war, providing assistance to the Contras, helpful to the effort of the Contadora nations to find a peaceful resolution to the crisis in

Central America helpful, or is it harmful?

Everybody in the United States believes, and certainly President Reagan says he wants to support the Contadora process. I have heard so many speeches from both Republicans and Democrats here that I do not know of anyone here who does not want to support the Contadora process. We all say we do.

So I asked the President of one of the Contadora nations: Is this project of the United States, supporting the Contras, helpful to the Contadoras, or is that harmful?

His answer was very direct, that this is part of the problem the Contadora has in trying to find a peaceful resolution of the problems in Central America.

Last week the President of Costa Rica, President Monge of Costa Rica, made a very tough statement, particularly coming from that position, denouncing the United States for the way it is increasing the military tensions within Costa Rica. He singled out our Secretary of Defense, Mr. Weinberger, by name for specific criticism. The Costa Ricans are panicked by what is happening around them in Central America.

If we want to help Costa Rica, if we want to help the Contadoras, there are ways to do it that are lawful, there are ways to do it that are overt, and there are ways to do it that are consistent with the values of our Nation. We are a signatory to the Rio Treaty; we are a member of the Organization of American States. They provide mechanisms for the international community to deal with this kind of problem.

It is not the answer for the United States unilaterally to hire a lot of guerrillas and send them off to invade another country. That is not the way to behave in the international community. This is certainly not the way the United States has historically said people should behave. We have said that people should abide by the decisions of the World Court; we have said that people should abide by their treaty obligations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members to vote for the Boland proposal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair wishes to announce that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) has 8 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. ROBINSON) has 10 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. ROBINSON).

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH).

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, let me say first of all to my friends on the left that this is not a test of patriotism. This is a test of common sense, of realism, of learning from the behavior of our opponents and the results of our policies.

26.079

H 4804

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

May 24, 1984

Today we face the reality that the Nicaraguan Communists are oppressing the Catholic Church, and the bishops are now fighting back. Today we face the reality that the Nicaraguan Communists have expelled all Jews and turned the synagogue into a Palestine Liberation Organization headquarters.

The Nicaraguan Communists today have 20 Libyan pilots and mechanics and 50 Palestine Liberation Organization pilots and mechanics.

The Nicaraguan Communists today have 100 Soviet military advisers, 100 advisers from Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and Poland. The Nicaraguan Communists today have 35 East German secret police advisers establishing a Communist police state.

Our friends on the left responded to this reality with a letter to Commandante Ortega, the Communist Nicaraguan dictator. Now we have his answer to their letter. I have here his answer.

This seven-page letter is a cynical propaganda attack on the United States. It rejects every request of the "Dear Commandante" letter. It specifically rejects the Democrats' appeal to let the freedom fighters' leaders campaign in the election.

Finally, the Communist dictator cynically and contemptuously cites the Speaker of our own House in a letter to Members of our House.

I ask my colleagues on the left, how can you read this cruel, cynical, insulting letter which offers no hope and vote to cut off aid to the freedom fighters?

Will you never learn about the reality of Soviet power, about the reality of the Palestine Liberation Organization-Libyan assault on Israel, about the reality of Communist dictatorship.

Compare today's vote. After an honest and internationally observed El Salvador election, after a trial which brings into court the people who killed the Americans, you can still vote against aid to El Salvador and you can excuse anything the Nicaraguans do and vote against aid to the freedom fighters. And you wonder why we suggest you are blind to the realities of Soviet power.

□ 1420

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OSEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia suggests that an unsatisfactory letter from Mr. Ortega means that we should continue to fund covert military attacks in Nicaragua. I think that makes no more sense than saying that we ought to fund covert military attacks on the Soviet Union because the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRNERICH) has not yet received a satisfactory response from the Soviet Government on the letter that he and I both signed. If the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRNERICH) objects to sending a letter asking Nicaragua to allow Contra leaders to par-

ticipate in elections, that says more about the gentleman than it says about us.

The issue is not whether we should defend our interests. The issue is whether we ought to do it smart or whether we ought to do it stupid.

I am tired of self-styled hard-liners who bungle into policies which are ineffective and enable Marxists and Soviets to exploit those policies to put the United States on the defensive even with our own allies in that region, and then who divert attention from their own bungling by innuendo riddled attacks on our dedication to U.S. interests and our understanding of the seriousness of the sickness of Soviet Marxism.

Do what makes sense for America. Vote for the Boland amendment. That is how you stand up for America and what it really stands for.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I heard the distinguished gentleman from Indiana say we have a unique chance to halt a war. May I correct him. It is half a war, just a war in Nicaragua. The war in El Salvador goes on and on even as we speak.

I heard the gentleman from Maryland say, "Hire guerrillas, hire guerrillas and send them into Nicaragua."

Commander Zero is not on our payroll, has never been an employee of the United States, and the Miskito Indians live in Nicaragua. That is their home that the Sandinistas are driving them out of.

Now, why legitimize the Sandinistas? They came into power on a lie, on fraud in the inducement to the Organization of American States and they stay in power through repression.

Turn your political geography book to Afghanistan and then ask yourselves, where is the high ground?

You moral surveyors, is the high ground helping the people of Afghanistan defend themselves against their Soviet oppressors?

I know they are using rocks, sticks and stones, but the high ground consists of helping them.

Now turn your geography books to Nicaragua. Where is the high ground there? Helping those people who live there defend themselves and their freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. McCAIN).

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

I think it is important to look at the pure military aspect of this. If we continue to provide arms and equipment to the Contras, we will have an opportunity to slow that flow of arms. Any military expert will tell you that if you provide sanctuary to an enemy so that they can arm, supply, train, and equip

guerrillas to go into another country and you give them sanctuary, then your efforts are doomed to failure and all the money that we have just voted for El Salvador will go down the drain if we grant sanctuary to the Nicaraguan Government, which by the judgment of our own Intelligence Committee is supplying, arming, training, and equipping the guerrillas in El Salvador.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, this amendment proves we cannot define our own vital interests, we cannot identify them, and we sure do not know how to protect them.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the chief deputy whip on this side, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ALEXANDER).

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, while we might disagree on the nature of the threat in Central America, all of us will agree that there is a problem. I suggest we recall the words of our friend and neighbor, President de la Madrid who gave us a clue to the solution. He said, and I quote:

A democracy cannot use the arms of tyranny. Reason and understanding are superior to the illusion of the effectiveness of force.

We have heard that our military strategy has failed in Nicaragua. President de la Madrid said that the solutions in Central America lie in economic and social development along with political dialog—not in weapons and military advisers.

What we have done in this country in supporting Mr. Reagan's war is to be perceived in Central America as supporting the old order of poverty, malnutrition, hunger, and ignorance. These are not the values of this country. They should not be the values of our foreign policy.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RITTER).

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

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, let us not make any mistake about what we do here today if we pull out the rug from under the Nicaraguan resistance fighters. We betray them. We betray the people who went into the field, put their lives on the line, because in a bipartisan fashion this Congress, this administration, has supported their efforts because of the findings of our Intelligence Committee.

We betray them, we betray their families, we betray the populations that have given them refuge. We betray the Nicaraguan people and when they decide to come to the United States, I would hope that those Members who vote against aid to the Contras welcome them to their congressional dis-

May 24, 1984

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 4805

tricts when they seek refuge from Communist repression.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time on our side to the Republican leader, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

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

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

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the leader for yielding.

I would simply quote lines from the inaugural speech of John F. Kennedy regarding our commitment in Central America, when he said:

Let all our neighbors know that we shall join with them to oppose aggression or subversion anywhere in the Americas. And let every other power know that this hemisphere intends to remain the master of its own house.

The question I would ask my friends on the other side is, are you at this time abandoning the policies that were laid down by John Kennedy with regard to Central America?

I thank the leader.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his very valuable contribution.

Mr. Speaker, in the House there are always what seem to be two realities. One concerns what we do. The other—equally important—concerns what we are perceived as doing.

That is what worries me about the amendment introduced by my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

Its effect would be clear-cut and simple—it would cut off funding for the Contras. But the perception of what we do in cutting off funds is something we should also consider. Its ramifications could be far-reaching and profound.

What we do today effects not just Nicaragua, but the entire world.

If we cut off funds for the Contras, our allies will perceive us as weakening in resolve in the fight against the Moscow-Havana-Managua axis.

Our adversaries will perceive us as lacking both the will and the endurance for the long twilight struggle John F. Kennedy spoke about.

The people of El Salvador will perceive us as giving aid with one hand—and taking away with the other. Jose Napoleon Durate will certainly feel that way.

To provide aid to El Salvador while cutting off aid to the Contras is like plugging one hole in a dam while you open another.

The unintended consequences of legislation often outlive—and outweigh—the best of motivations.

So it is with this amendment.

There are four reasons why it is wrong to cut off funds to the Contras.

It is geopolitically wrong. Our allies can only wonder at our sense of re-

solve. If we abandon the Contras today, whose turn will it be tomorrow? Korea's? Israel's?

It is geostrategically wrong. The Moscow-Havana-Managua axis wants nothing more than to see the Sandinistas gain a victory by default. This will only whet their appetite for more adventurism.

It is diplomatically wrong. We will lose whatever leverage we have with the Sandinistas if we turn away from the Contras.

Finally—and most important—it is morally wrong to cut off funds. What kind of moral foreign policy is it that suddenly cuts off aid to those we have urged to fight tyranny?

We have a precedent in this case.

In early 1975 there were 50 Cubans in Angola. In June 1976, the Clark amendment forbade any covert aid to anti-Marxist forces in Angola.

A steady climb of Cuban forces then began. By the end of 1977 they numbered 19,000. By 1981 it was 23,000. By the end of 1983 it was 30,000 Cuban troops in Angola.

In July 1979 there were 50 Cuban advisers in Nicaragua. Today we estimate some 9,000.

Do you want more of them? I can guarantee you that is what you will get if we repeat the folly of the Clark amendment.

It happened before in Angola. From 50 troops to 30,000. It can—and will happen again in Nicaragua if we make the same mistake twice.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the New York Times on Tuesday carried a story about the recent pastoral letter, issued by all nine bishops in Nicaragua.

The letter, says the Times, "did not contain any condemnation of the United States or the insurgent forces it is supporting in Nicaragua. Instead it urged peace talks with the rebels. Sandinista officials have repeatedly vowed they will never agree to such talks."

The bishops of Nicaragua and the people they serve know who the enemy is in Nicaragua.

Why is it so difficult for us to see the light, and learn from history?

I would urge my colleagues to vote against the Boland motion.

□ 1430

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time on our side to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, what we address in our vote within a very few minutes goes to the very heart of U.S. foreign policy. By this vote we will be determining, in connection with the vote which we earlier had, what kind of country we want to be, what kind of a role we feel that we have a right to play and ought to play in our hemisphere.

Every Member of this House knows where I have stood on aid for El Salvador. I believe that it is a matter of principle. I believe we are committed by international law and as signatories to the Rio Treaty to assist a friendly, constitutionally elected government, at its request, to defend its right to local nonviolent self-determination.

But if we believe in the right of self-determination for El Salvador, then must we not believe in the right or self-determination for other countries, including Nicaragua, with which we disagree?

Are we consistent in our principles?

We state the high principle as a signatory to the Rio Treaty that we will respect and protect the right of every country in the hemisphere to territorial integrity. For that reason I have suggested that we have a right and a duty to assist the Government of El Salvador to respect and protect its territorial integrity from invasion.

My friends, if we really believe that, do we have any right to invade and violate the territorial integrity of the Government of Nicaragua? Do we have a right to invade their borders?

I think this is a test of what our role is in this hemisphere. Throughout the hemisphere friends are looking. Do we regard ourselves as the good neighbor or do we regard ourselves as the hemispheric bully? Do we think it is our right to dictate to others under pain of our financing third parties to shed their blood, to bring down their Government if they do not agree with us?

How do we look upon others in the hemisphere? Do we look upon them as equals or do we look upon them as subordinates, to whom we may issue orders and ultimata?

In July President Reagan wrote a letter to the Presidents of the Contadora nations, Panama, Colombia, Mexico, and Venezuela. In that letter in July President Reagan said as follows:

There must be respect for the principle of nonintervention, including a ban on support for subversive elements that seek to destabilize other countries.

I have to say, Mr. President, our words ring hollow in the hemisphere when we do not practice what we preach.

If that is a principle to be abided by, by others, is it not a principle to which we also must commit ourselves, and by which we must live?

There is much in the Nicaraguan Government's policies with which I find disagreement. I have said so there as well as here. I have said it directly to the heads of the Nicaraguan Government.

But that does not give to us or to me the right to dictate their form of society. It does not give us a right to start a war. It does not give us the right to mine their harbors in contravention of international law. That is under international law, an act of war, you know.

Executive Registry

36,081

H 4806

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

May 24, 1984

It does not give the administration the right to violate the laws that this Congress has passed. In the Boland amendment in 1982 we provided that none of the funds might be used by anyone for the purpose of overthrowing the Government of Nicaragua. That was unequivocal. That was not subject to misunderstanding. It was the law.

Then the CIA disingenuously explained that while overthrowing the Government may have been the publicly avowed purpose of those whom we recruited and trained and supplied and put into the field, it was not really our purpose nor that of the CIA and therefore nobody was violating the law.

My friends, people in Latin America are not deceived. They understand the difference between a forthright position and a surreptitious attempt to evade the law.

So clearly it is a question of whether we practice what we preach, whether we are consistent in the principles we proclaim.

If you wonder why there are people in Nicaragua who are fearful of the United States and susceptible to anti-U.S. propaganda, you just have to look at the history of U.S. intervention there for a century and more. In 1855 a Tennessean named William Walker raised a private army and installed himself as Emperor of Nicaragua. From 1911 until 1933 a contingent of U.S. marines occupied Nicaragua almost continuously. Then for 43 years the three Somozas ruled the country and were widely regarded, rightly or wrongly, as our surrogates.

It is against this backdrop that our mining of their harbors and financing of some 8,000 or more troops to invade their land gives credibility among their citizenry to the most provocative propaganda against our country. It feeds the fires of nationalism and anti-Americanism, not only in Nicaragua but elsewhere in Latin America as well.

Surely that is not the image we seek to reflect, nor the policy we seek to pursue. So I suggest that, true to our own finest principles, we should support the Boland motion today.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

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

Mr. ROBINSON. 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 241, nays 177, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 181]

YEAS—241

Ackerman	Gejdenson	Obey
Addabbo	Gephardt	Olin
Akaka	Gibbons	Ortiz
Albosta	Glickman	Ottinger
Alexander	Gonzales	Owens
Anderson	Goodling	Panetta
Andrews (NC)	Gore	Patterson
Andrews (TX)	Gradison	Paul
Annunzio	Green	Pease
Anthony	Guarini	Penny
Applegate	Gunderson	Pepper
Aspin	Hall (IN)	Perkins
AuCoin	Hall (OH)	Pickle
Barnes	Hamilton	Price
Bates	Harkin	Pritchard
Bedell	Harrison	Pursell
Bellenson	Hawkins	Rahall
Bennett	Hayes	Rangel
Berman	Hefer	Ratchford
Biaggi	Hefner	Regula
Boehlert	Heftel	Reid
Boggs	Hertel	Richardson
Boland	Horton	Ridge
Boner	Howard	Rodino
Bonior	Hoyer	Roe
Bonker	Hughes	Rose
Borsari	Jacobs	Rostenkowski
Bosco	Jeffords	Roybal
Boucher	Jones (NC)	Russo
Boxer	Jones (OK)	Sabo
Britt	Jones (TN)	Sabo
Brooks	Kaptur	Savage
Brown (CA)	Kastenmeier	Scheuer
Bryant	Kennelly	Schneider
Burton (CA)	Kildee	Schroeder
Carper	Kiecicka	Schumer
Carr	Kogovsek	Seiberling
Chandler	Kolter	Shannon
Clarke	Kostmayer	Sharp
Clay	Lantos	Sikorski
Coelho	Leach	Simon
Coleman (TX)	Lehman (CA)	Slattery
Collins	Lehman (FL)	Smith (FL)
Conte	Leland	Smith (IA)
Conyers	Levin	Snowe
Cooper	Lipinski	Solars
Coyne	Long (LA)	Spratt
Crockett	Long (MD)	St Germain
D'Amours	Lowry (WA)	Stagers
Daschle	Luken	Stark
de la Garza	Lundine	Stokes
Dellums	MacKay	Studds
Derrick	Markey	Swift
Dicks	Martin (IL)	Synar
Dingell	Martinez	Tauke
Dixon	Matsui	Torres
Donnelly	Mavroules	Torricelli
Dorgan	Mazzoli	Towns
Downey	McCloskey	Udall
Durbin	McCurdy	Valentine
Dwyer	McHugh	Vento
Dymally	McKernan	Volkmer
Early	McKinney	Walgren
Eckart	McNulty	Waxman
Edgar	Mikulski	Weaver
Edwards (CA)	Miller (CA)	Weiss
Evans (IA)	Mimeta	Wheat
Evans (IL)	Minish	Whitley
Fazio	Mitchell	Whitten
Feighan	Moakley	Williams (MT)
Ferraro	Mollohan	Wilson
Fish	Moody	Wirth
Florio	Morrison (CT)	Wise
Foglietta	Mrazek	Wolpe
Foley	Murphy	Wright
Ford (MI)	Natcher	Wyden
Ford (TN)	Neal	Yates
Fowler	Nowak	Yatron
Frank	Oakar	Young (MO)
Frost	Oberstar	Zschau
Garcia		

NAYS—177

Archer	Billye	Chappell
Badham	Breaux	Chapple
Barnard	Broomfield	Cheney
Bartlett	Brown (CO)	Clinger
Bateman	Broyhill	Coats
Bereuter	Burton (IN)	Coleman (MO)
Bethune	Byron	Conable
Bevill	Campbell	Corcoran
Bilirakis	Carney	Coughlin

Courter	Johnson	Quillen
Craig	Kasich	Ray
Crane, Daniel	Kazen	Rinaldo
Crane, Philip	Kemp	Ritter
Daniel	Kindness	Roberts
Dannemeyer	Kramer	Robinson
Darden	Lagomarsino	Roemer
Daub	Latta	Roth
Davis	Leath	Rowland
DeWine	Lent	Rudd
Dickinson	Levitas	Schaefer
Dowdy	Lewis (FL)	Schulze
Dreier	Livingston	Shaw
Duncan	Lloyd	Shelby
Dyson	Loeffler	Shumway
Edwards (AL)	Lott	Shuster
Edwards (OK)	Lowery (CA)	Siljander
Emerson	Lujan	Sisisky
English	Lungren	Skeen
Erdreich	Mack	Skelton
Erlenborn	Madigan	Smith (NE)
Fascell	Marlenee	Smith (NJ)
Fiedler	Martin (NY)	Smith, Denny
Fields	McCain	Smith, Robert
Flippo	McCandless	Snyder
Franklin	McCollum	Solomon
Frenzel	McDade	Solomon
Fuqua	McEwen	Spence
Gaydos	McGrath	Stangeland
Gekas	Mica	Stenholm
Gilman	Michel	Stratton
Gingrich	Miller (OH)	Stump
Gregg	Molinari	Sundquist
Hall, Ralph	Montgomery	Tallon
Hall, Sam	Moore	Tauzin
Hammerschmidt	Moorhead	Taylor
Hansen (UT)	Morrison (WA)	Thomas (CA)
Hartnett	Murtha	Thomas (GA)
Hightower	Myers	Vander Jagt
Hiler	Nelson	Vandergriff
Hillis	Nichols	Vucanovich
Holt	Nielson	Walker
Hopkins	O'Brien	Weber
Hubbard	Oxley	Whitehurst
Huckaby	Packard	Whittaker
Hunter	Parris	Winn
Hutto	Pashayan	Wolf
Hyde	Patman	Wortley
Ireland	Petri	Wyle
Jenkins	Porter	Young (AK)
		Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—15

Gramm	Lewis (CA)	Sawyer
Hance	Marriott	Sensenbrenner
Hansen (ID)	Martin (NC)	Traxler
Hatcher	Rogers	Watkins
LaFalce	Roukema	Williams (OH)

□ 1450

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. LaFalce for, with Mr. Hance against.

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

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and the several motions was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1985

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 494 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5167.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5167) to authorize ap-