

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 24, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 748]
YEAS—402

Abercrombie	Dickey	Hyde
Ackerman	Dicks	Inglis
Allard	Dingell	Istook
Archer	Dixon	Jackson-Lee
Army	Doggett	Jefferson
Bachus	Dooley	Johnson (CT)
Baker (CA)	Doolittle	Johnson (SD)
Baker (LA)	Dornan	Johnson, E. B.
Baldacci	Doyle	Johnson, Sam
Ballenger	Dreier	Johnston
Barcia	Duncan	Jones
Barr	Dunn	Kanjorski
Barrett (NE)	Durbin	Kaptur
Bartlett	Edwards	Kasich
Barton	Ehlers	Kelly
Bass	Ehrlich	Kennedy (MA)
Bateman	Emerson	Kennedy (RI)
Becerra	Engel	Kennelly
Bentsen	English	Kildee
Berman	Ensign	Kim
Bevill	Eshoo	King
Bilbray	Evans	Kingston
Bilirakis	Everett	Klecza
Bishop	Ewing	Klink
Bliley	Farr	Klug
Blute	Fattah	Knollenberg
Boehrlert	Fawell	Kolbe
Boehner	Fazio	LaFalce
Bonilla	Fields (TX)	LaHood
Bonior	Flake	Lantos
Bono	Flanagan	Largent
Borski	Foglietta	Latham
Boucher	Foley	LaTourette
Brewster	Forbes	Laughlin
Browder	Fowler	Lazio
Brown (CA)	Fox	Leach
Brown (FL)	Frank (MA)	Levin
Brown (OH)	Franks (CT)	Lewis (CA)
Brownback	Franks (NJ)	Lewis (GA)
Bryant (TN)	Frelinghuysen	Lewis (KY)
Bryant (TX)	Frisa	Lightfoot
Bunn	Frost	Lincoln
Bunning	Funderburk	Linder
Burr	Furse	Lipinski
Burton	Gallegly	Livingston
Buyer	Ganske	LoBiondo
Callahan	Gejdenson	Loftgren
Calvert	Gekas	Longley
Camp	Gephardt	Lowey
Canady	Geren	Lucas
Cardin	Gibbons	Luther
Castle	Gilchrest	Maloney
Chabot	Gillmor	Manton
Chambless	Gilman	Manzullo
Chapman	Gonzalez	Markey
Chenoweth	Goodlatte	Martinez
Christensen	Goodling	Martini
Chrysler	Goss	Mascara
Clay	Graham	Matsui
Clayton	Green	McCarthy
Clinger	Greenwood	McCollum
Clyburn	Gunderson	McCrery
Coble	Gutierrez	McDade
Coburn	Gutknecht	McDermott
Coleman	Hall (OH)	McHale
Collins (GA)	Hall (TX)	McHugh
Collins (IL)	Hamilton	McInnis
Collins (MI)	Hancock	McIntosh
Combust	Hansen	McKeon
Condit	Harman	McKinney
Conyers	Hastert	McNulty
Cooley	Hastings (FL)	Meehan
Costello	Hastings (WA)	Meek
Cox	Hayes	Menendez
Coyne	Hayworth	Metcalf
Cramer	Hefner	Meyers
Crane	Heineman	Mfume
Crapo	Hergert	Miller (CA)
Creameans	Hilleary	Miller (FL)
Cubin	Hilliard	Minge
Cunningham	Hinchev	Mink
Danner	Hobson	Molinari
Davis	Hoekstra	Mollohan
de la Garza	Hoke	Montgomery
Deal	Holden	Moorhead
DeFazio	Horn	Moran
DeLauro	Hostettler	Morella
DeLay	Houghton	Murtha
Dellums	Hoyer	Myers
Deutsch	Hunter	Myrick
Diaz-Balart	Hutchinson	Neal

Nethercutt	Rose
Neumann	Roukema
Ney	Roybal-Allard
Norwood	Rush
Nussle	Sabo
Oberstar	Sanders
Obey	Sanford
Olver	Sawyer
Ortiz	Saxton
Orton	Schaefer
Owens	Schiff
Oxley	Schroeder
Packard	Schumer
Pallone	Scott
Parker	Seastrand
Pastor	Serrano
Paxon	Shadegg
Payne (NJ)	Shaw
Payne (VA)	Shays
Pelosi	Shuster
Peterson (FL)	Sisisky
Peterson (MN)	Skaggs
Petri	Skeen
Pickett	Skelton
Pombo	Slaughter
Pomeroy	Smith (MI)
Porter	Smith (NJ)
Portman	Smith (TX)
Poshard	Smith (WA)
Pryce	Solomon
Quillen	Souder
Quinn	Spence
Radanovich	Spratt
Rahall	Stark
Ramstad	Stenholm
Regula	Stockman
Richardson	Stokes
Riggs	Studds
Rivers	Stump
Roberts	Stupak
Rogers	Talent
Rohrabacher	Tate
Ros-Lehtinen	Tauzin

Taylor (MS)	Taylor (NC)
Tejeda	Thomas
Thompson	Thornberry
Thornton	Thurman
Tiahrt	Torkildsen
Torres	Torricelli
Towns	Traficant
Upton	Upton
Visclosky	Volkmer
Vucanovich	Waldholtz
Walker	Walsh
Walsh	Wamp
Waters	Watt (NC)
Watt (OK)	Waxman
Weldon (FL)	Weller
White	Whitfield
Wicker	Williams
Wilson	Wise
Wolf	Woolsey
Wyden	Wynn
Yates	Young (AK)
Young (FL)	Zeliff
Zimmer	

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CONFEREES ON H.R. 2491, SEVEN-YEAR BALANCED BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). Without objection, under the authority granted in clause 6 of rule X, the Speaker appoints Mr. BROWN of California as an additional conferee from the Committee on Agriculture for consideration of title I of the House bill, and subtitles A-C of title I of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the change in conferees.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

WAVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1868, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 249 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 249

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1868) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The motion printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution to dispose of the amendment of the Senate numbered 115 may be offered only by Representative Callahan of Alabama or his designee. That motion shall be considered as read and shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. All points of order against that motion are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on that motion to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

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

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to include extraneous material in the RECORD.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the floor this rule to provide for consideration of the conference report for H.R. 1868, the foreign operations appropriations bill for fiscal

NAYS—24

Andrews	Hefley	Salmon
Baessler	Jacobs	Scarborough
Barrett (WI)	Mica	Sensenbrenner
Beilenson	Nadler	Stearns
Clement	Rangel	Tanner
Filner	Reed	Velazquez
Ford	Roemer	Ward
Gordon	Royce	

NOT VOTING—6

Bereuter	Moakley	Tucker
Fields (LA)	Roth	Weldon (PA)

□ 1423

Mr. WARD and Mr. ROYCE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 359

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 359.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, on October 25, I inadvertently missed roll-call vote No. 735, the conference report on H.R. 2002, the transportation appropriation for fiscal year 1996. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

year 1996. This is a simple, fair rule that will allow the House to vote on the conference report, and then on a separate motion dealing with the controversial issue of the restrictions on aid money for abortion. Specifically, as provided under House rules, we will have 1 hour of debate on the conference report itself—including the traditional right of the minority to offer a motion to recommit with or without instructions. Immediately following the consideration of the conference report, the rule provides for a motion to dispose of Senate amendment 115—to be offered by the chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], or his designee. This motion is debatable for a full hour, and the House will be able to cast an up or down vote following that debate. While the Callahan motion might sound complex, it can be summed up as follows: For years, under Presidents Reagan and Bush, there were sensible—in my view—restrictions on the use of foreign aid funds for abortion purposes; this policy is known as the Mexico City policy. However, during consideration of this bill, the House voted in favor of stricter standards, and the Senate voted for more lenient standards. To arrive at an acceptable solution to this dilemma, the conferees have decided to—no surprises here—go with the Mexico City policy. We are facilitating this agreement, by allowing Chairman CALLAHAN to offer his motion following debate on the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I am especially pleased that this conference report contains the original Goss amendment language on Haiti that the House adopted 252 to 164 on the 28th of June. This language provides a measure of accountability for the billions of taxpayers' dollars that have been spent in Haiti—and continue to be spent today. This measure was important in June, and it remains important today—we are still not sure exactly how much money has been used to restore President Aristide and maintain the peace in Haiti. But we do know that Haiti's fledgling democracy is facing some immediate challenges, including: Presidential elections, scheduled for the end of this year, but that date is rapidly slipping; reform of the justice system; and privatization of the economy which has suffered some setbacks recently.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the responsible use of the review mechanism provided under the Goss amendment with regard to Haiti, and I know other Members have other areas of concern in foreign ops as well, and there will be plenty of opportunity to debate them under the provisions of this fair and simple rule. I urge my colleagues to support the rule in the bill.

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

□ 1430

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague from Florida, Mr. GOSS, as well as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for bringing this rule to the floor.

House Resolution 249 makes it in order to consider the conference report on H.R. 1868, the foreign operations appropriation bill for fiscal year 1996, and waives all points of order against the conference report. The Rules Committee reported the rule without opposition by voice vote.

The joint statement of managers of the conference included \$108 million for basic education. This was a result of an amendment Mr. HOUGHTON and I offered on the House floor that received 263 votes.

During a hearing of the Rules Committee yesterday, Mr. BEILENSEN asked Mr. CALLAHAN, chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, about the support of the conferees for the funding level of basic education. In response to the question, Mr. CALLAHAN replied that the conferees would strongly insist on that funding level. I hope that AID follows this direction.

I am disappointed with the large cuts in development assistance contained in this bill. However, I am glad that the conference committee earmarked \$300 million for child survival and ensured that UNICEF would receive \$100 million, and it contained a recommendation that basic education will receive \$108 million.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule.

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

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I take the well to urge Members to vote against the previous question on the rule when we have the opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, under the rule, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], or his designee, will be permitted to offer an amendment related to amendment number 115, which has language concerning abortion and the United Nations Population Agency.

However, under the rule, Members are prohibited from offering amendments to that amendment. The White House has stated that if the language contained in the amendment by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] is included in the foreign operations bill, the President will veto the bill. Under those circumstances, I would like to be able to try to offer compromise language that I believe would make real our apparent passage of the conference report on foreign operations today.

My amendment, which I ask unanimous consent to be printed in the RECORD, would take out the so-called Mexico City language, which the administration opposes, leaving in a prohibition on lobbying for or against abortion, and prohibits funds to the United Nations Population Fund, unless UNFPA has terminated its program in China by May 1 of 1996.

Mr. Speaker, permanent law already requires that none of the funds in this bill can be used to perform abortions. The Mexico City language included in the Callahan amendment purports to be related to abortion, but, in fact, the funds that it cuts off are family planning funds, and I think that is ill-advised.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that it is wise to proceed in that way on this bill. I do want to make clear, however, that the language that I would like to include in my amendment would allow funds to go to the United Nations agency involved in family planning only if that agency terminates its program in China by next May.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, we need very much to separate the issues of family planning from the issues of abortion. In my view, those who describe themselves as conservatives are right to be concerned about the use of Federal funds for abortion, and I think they are right to be concerned about the abuse of government power associated with the Chinese program of so-called family planning, which is really coerced abortion.

Mr. Speaker, I think that Members in this House, who describe themselves as liberals, are right to try to keep a distinction between abortion and family planning, but I think they are wrong if they defend the continued operation of the United Nations population program in China so long as China continues a policy that I consider to be coerced abortion. I think it is very important that this distinction be made.

Mr. Speaker, I respect the views of people on both sides. I have almost given up the expectation that we can get a rational dialogue between people on either side of the abortion issue, either on this floor or almost anywhere else in society, because people seem to be more interested in shouting past each other than in working out these problems.

But I do not see any sense in passing a bill which we know the President will veto. I do not think that we do what we say we do when in the name of opposing abortion, we wind up cutting off family planning funds. I think we ought to focus instead on the abusive abortion.

I most certainly agree with that portion of the Callahan amendment which says that the United Nations should not be operating in China so long as China continues to follow its policy of coerced abortion. Any Member who has listened to or read accounts of what is

happening in China can have no reasonable doubt that that government viciously, and with an incredibly heavy hand, coerces families and coerces women into having abortions.

I think that the United Nations agency in the past has tried to soft-pedal criticism of the Chinese program. In recent months I think they have become more realistically aware of the defects in the China program. I think it is nonetheless important for us to indicate that we will not continue to cooperate in any way with an agency that does business within China so long as China continues to follow that abusive policy.

The only difference between my amendment on China is that we give them several more months in which to close down their existing contracts, which I think is a much more realistic approach administratively. I would like, if we can beat the previous question on the rule, to offer this amendment, which I think is a reasonable compromise between the two poles.

I recognize very much that we are not likely to be able to beat that motion today, but I nonetheless would urge Members' support so that we can try to bring this bill into a position that the President will be able to sign it and we will accomplish what we claim we are trying to accomplish.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the following for the RECORD:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 249

On line 12, page 2, strike "." and insert ", except one motion to amend if offered by Representative OBEY of Wisconsin. The text of the amendment is printed in section 2 of this resolution.

Sec. 2. The text of the amendment to be offered by Representative OBEY is as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves that in lieu of the matter proposed by Mr. CALLAHAN, insert:

Provided, That none of the funds made available under this Act may be used to lobby for or against abortion.

Sec. 518A. Coercive Population Control Methods.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or other law, none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be made available for the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), unless the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that (1) the United Nations Population Fund will terminate all family planning activities in the People's Republic of China no later than May 1, 1996; or (2) during the 12 months preceding such certification, there have been no abortions as the result of coercion associated with the family planning activities of the national government or other governmental entities within the People's Republic of China. As used in this section the term "coercion" includes physical duress or abuse, destruction or confiscation of property, loss of means of livelihood, or severe psychological pressure."

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend not only the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], but his excellent amendment on Haiti, which we were able to bring back intact in this conference agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I also commend the Committee on Rules that has given us a good rule. I appreciate the consideration shown to me, and to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and others on the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, I know that there are some problems in this bill and that some Members have some problems. I am sorry that they in this bill, because most of the problems, if not all of the problems that we had in this bill, had to do with areas that we were not even involved in. They are involving things that should be in an authorization bill.

Unfortunately, we have not been able to pass an authorization bill, so the only vehicle leaving the station is the foreign operations appropriations bill. But, nevertheless, and in defense of all of that, the bill came back from the Senate with 193 amendments to the House bill.

Mr. Speaker, we negotiated long and hard and in a bipartisan manner, including the Democrats and the Republican members of our subcommittee, including the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, to bring to this floor the best possible bill we could bring under the circumstances of having to include all of those issues that had to do with areas outside our jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, we have done that. We have worked long and we have worked hard. I have worked in conjunction with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] as well, and I want to congratulate those gentleman, because they have worked splendidly with me throughout this entire process of educating me on the manner and educating me on the process of passing this very complicated bill. Mr. Speaker, I commend them for their help.

Mr. Speaker, I also commend the Committee on Rules for bringing a rule before the House that will resolve the one major difference that we could not resolve in the conference, and that is the issue of the Mexico City language.

Mr. Speaker, we brought to the floor the best bill that we could possibly get. I recognize that there are some in this House, and I recognize that President Clinton and I recognize that the State Department would like to have more money, but we just do not have any more money.

The American people told us loud and clearly to come to Washington and to cut back on Federal spending. They did not just say cut everything but foreign aid. They said cut everything.

It would be irresponsible of us to come to this floor to ask for an increase, as President Clinton has requested. So, we have cut President Clinton's request by \$2 billion. Yes, we did. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry if that impacts his foreign policy. That is not our intent. We tried to give the administration as much latitude as we possibly can in this respect.

So, Mr. Speaker, we will debate this issue, this main issue of the Mexico City language, as we come to the floor. But once again let me encourage my colleagues to vote against the Obey motion and to vote for the Committee on Rules' motion that is pending here today.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Obey motion and hope all my colleagues will join together on this.

Mr. Speaker, I remember the Mexico City policy. I think if we do not get rid of the Mexico City policy, we are really dooming all of our future aid programs and everything else, because this is family planning. Basically, the Mexico City policy overturned Richard Nixon's policy. It was Richard Nixon who walked out and said, "There must be international family planning and we should tie it to aid."

When we look at Bangladesh and when we look at Egypt and when we look at many other places, of course there should be international family planning. Mr. Speaker, what we are doing here is rolling it back to the policy developed in the 1980's, in which any kind of family planning that most people would call family planning is being redesignated as an abortifacient. So, the only kind of family planning that we could treat would be like the rhythm system. They call it natural family planning, and in Colorado we call people who use that system parents. I mean, it does not work.

So, Mr. Speaker, let us be really clear about that. We are totally wasting our money by saying we are training people in family planning and it does not work.

Now, if my colleagues look at the threats to this globe, overpopulation in places like Egypt or Bangladesh, or certain places, are certainly a humongous threat to destabilization.

□ 1445

But there is another whole issue on the environment. We can plant all the trees, clean all the water, clean all the air on the globe; and, if we doubled the global population in 20 years, it will not make any difference. So we are living in this fragile environment. We have many people seeking this information which this Government has, and it does not make any sense not to make it available.

I constantly, as the senior woman in this House, listen to elected women leaders from all over the globe saying American women have let them down because they truly want family planning information. By our having gone along with this Mexico City policy for years, we have really treated them in a very backward, ignorant, arrogant way. They want the information. They want the real information. They know we have it. Why in the world will we not make it available?

I think that is what we are talking about today. The gentleman from Wisconsin is going to make that very clear. We are not talking abortion. We are talking basic family planning that every American would define as basic family planning. I think the White House is right. I certainly hope they all stand up on this, and I hope we give the gentleman from Wisconsin a resounding "aye" vote.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in voting against this rule. Let me say why I am urging Members to vote against this rule.

At issue in this bill is the policy of the United States of America toward the country of Azerbaijan. This is not a well-known country in the United States. It is well known to Armenian-Americans. Armenian-Americans are aware of the fact that the country of Azerbaijan has established a blockade on Armenia for 4 years. As a direct result of this blockade, Armenia has lost 20 percent of its population because of the severe hardships which have been caused.

The House of Representatives debated this issue several months ago and decided the United States should continue its policy of admonishing Azerbaijan for this blockade. By a voice vote we made it clear that we do not want to change this policy. The Senate did not raise this issue at all. Yet in the darkness of conference, along comes the effort to provide governmental assistance to Azerbaijan despite this blockade. This is wrong.

It is wrong for the United States to provide assistance to Azerbaijan so long as they blockade Armenia. At issue here is more than just whether this bill will pass. At issue are the human rights of the people of Armenia which have been trampled on so many times in this century. We have a chance by defeating this rule to send it back to the Committee on Rules and tell them we want a separate vote on this disgraceful amendment.

We have spoken on this once in the House of Representatives. We must speak on it again today, and the only chance we have is by defeating this rule. Join me in defeating this rule and making it clear that we object to the Azerbaijani blockade of Armenia.

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

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to commend the gentleman for addressing his concerns by way of an amendment relative to Haiti. The gentleman has been concerned that

they carry out the commitments to hold the election, if those elections would be done in a timely way. The gentleman has made that known to everyone.

I was concerned at the time that the gentleman brought the amendment before the House that he did not do anything that would tie their hands so that, if they were working hard to be in compliance, somehow they would be penalized. He would cause them to be penalized if in fact they did not meet the letter of the law.

I think the gentleman has done exactly what he said he would do, and he has spoken to substantial compliance. As you know, from the Senate side, the other house, funds were held up that would have been funds to support moving forward with those elections. So we are concerned that, if those elections do not take place at the exact appointed time and perhaps they are off a few weeks or even a few months or so, that somehow this would not trigger the discontinuance of all foreign aid to Haiti.

So would the gentleman please, again, reiterate what he means by substantial compliance. Does he understand the limited difficulty they may be placed with in trying to move forward given that the funds have been held up?

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I accept the question, and I reclaim my time. I will answer, Mr. Speaker.

The words, I think speak for themselves very well in the amendment about substantial compliance with the 1987 constitution. I do not think anybody would say that all of the X's and T's need to be crossed or I's need to be dotted. I am certainly not looking to some kind of an excuse to frustrate what is clearly forward momentum to building democracy there in any way, shape or form.

The gentlewoman has properly characterized my views in trying to be supportive of democracy in Haiti in making sure that they understand that there are benefits there to complying with the constitution that they worked so hard to get in 1987.

If there is some slippage in the election but they nevertheless have the election and peaceful turnover of power in what I will call the term of expectation, that those things can reasonably happen as foreseen by the constitution, then that, to me, is certainly substantial compliance.

Does that mean that the date of December for the election is absolutely required and fixed? No. If there is some slippage on that, I think that is understandable. If there is a lot of slippage, I think it raises questions among prudent people; is there compliance? But I think we will know that. I think that will be in the eye of the beholder.

I do not want to fix any forum. I do not want to suggest that there is any particular date. What I do want to suggest is that, if the elections are well on their way but they are not quite held in December, they are obviously in sub-

stantial compliance and trying to do the job. I look forward a peaceful turnover and a new President of Haiti and successful growth of democracy.

As to the gentlewoman from California, I have been invited by President Aristide for the succession. I have accepted his invitation. He said it would be February. If it is a little later than that, that is OK. I prefer to be in Haiti during the winter season than the summer season.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I thank the gentleman. I think that takes care of my concern.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI].

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, on June 29, this institution in a sense of moral outrage voted for an amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKEY] to deny assistance to Azerbaijan in reaction, in outrage to the fact that it continues an illegal and immoral blockade against the people of Armenia.

Our sense of outrage is understandable. Armenia is a landlocked country. Eighty-five percent of everything it needs to feed and to clothe and to warm its people comes through Azerbaijan. Five years since the United States originally took this position, the blockade being in place, they have done nothing, nothing to lift the blockade and stop the suffering of the Armenian people.

Indeed, today 95 percent of the people of Armenia are living on an income of less than \$1 a day in a harsh environment. So this House, knowing these facts, cast a vote insisting that the blockade be lifted. The other body, in debating foreign assistance as well, offered no contradictory provisions. There seemed to be no objections here or there. Yet, in the rule before us today, the Committee on Rules, having waived all points of order, we find that this provision is removed, and the Members of this House, if they approve the rule, are without recourse.

We are without recourse despite the fact that the rules of this House specifically state that there is an action of this House, there being nothing contradictory in the other body; therefore the conference would have no contradictory provisions, that an unrelated contradictory provision should not be in the bill. But it is.

We are without the ability to raise a point of order if the rule is enacted. Sadly, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and remind the Members that, if they feel this continuing outrage in the same vote they cast in June, that this embargo is wrong. It should stop, consistent with our ability to deliver humanitarian assistance to Azerbaijan, because it is not covered but that no American assistance otherwise will continue unless and until the

blockade is lifted. If Members continue to feel that view, there is one way to express themselves. That is to oppose the rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the conference took up and considered a matter that had already been dealt with on the floor of the House. A vote was taken, and no similar provision was included in the Senate bill regarding humanitarian aid through the Government of Azerbaijan upon a finding that humanitarian assistance through nongovernmental organizations would be insufficient. It needs to be stressed, Mr. Speaker, that this language only permits humanitarian aid and does not require the President to provide any such aid in any event. Nonetheless, this provision is a grave error and should not have been included in the conference.

Azerbaijan itself holds the key to providing itself with United States assistance, because under section 907 of the Freedom Support Act, they may receive assistance if they take demonstrable steps, Mr. Speaker, to cease their blockading of and warring with Armenia and Karabakh. This is the correct approach.

The House had already considered and rejected amending section 907 through this bill, but provisions to resume aid to Azerbaijan that were struck on the floor of the House during consideration of the bill in June were reinserted in the conference. I believe that as a matter of procedure and as a matter of respect for the will of this body, when no Senate bill contained a similar provision, there should be no provision providing for aid to Azerbaijan other than pursuant to section 907 before us today.

I am sorry the rule that we are considering does not allow this matter to be treated under the normal procedures for items in technical disagreement so that this decision could be reconsidered. While I understand the need to move the bill forward, I would hope that, when ultimately it undoubtedly will go back to the conference committee, that this matter can be corrected.

We should give assistance to Azerbaijan, particularly humanitarian assistance, but they should be forthcoming and lift their blockade on Armenia and Karabakh before we do so. That is exactly what the Freedom Support Act provides in section 907. It ought to be observed.

I might say also, Mr. Speaker, that the conference did, in regard to this area, two very fine things. They provided that the Humanitarian Corridor Act should be a part of this bill. That sends a message particularly to Turkey that, if they disrupt humanitarian as-

sistance, they will not be entitled to any assistance from the United States; and that is as it should be.

In addition, we sent a very specific message to Turkey regarding their treatment of their Kurdish minority, their oppression of their Kurdish minority, their genocide against their Kurdish minority that has to be heard. It has now taken the place of repressing of expressions of disagreement with Government policy, and people get sent to jail.

□ 1500

It is time that we sent that message. The bill does so. I commend the conferees in approving both of those sections and commend the bill.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. ESHOO].

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon in opposition to the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge the work that was done on a bipartisan basis many, many weeks ago. It was the very late evening of June 29. I believe it was an all-night session. I remember speaking on the floor, and I think it was about 2:30 in the morning when we debated this, and I think that it was one of the prouder moments for Members of this House as they recognized that Azerbaijan should not be rewarded for blockading Armenia. That blockade has imposed enormous, enormous human suffering on the Armenian people, and so together, from both sides of the aisle, we underscored that suffering, and we said that the House of Representatives was going to take the necessary, and important, and critical steps not to reward Azerbaijan for that, and so we went forward, and the language went forward, and it was unanimous. It was a voice vote of this House.

Now in another late night, when the conference met, it was misrepresented that what we had sent to the conference had somehow changed. It has not changed, and so that is why I rise in opposition to the rule and all of the Members of this House should vote against this rule, so that we can bring back the language that we so in unified fashion passed that late night, and we thought then that we were victorious for human rights, decency. The right thing to do is that that language would be appropriately restored.

I want to commend my colleagues that have worked so hard on this from both sides of the aisle, and this correction really does need to be made. We were misrepresented. The other body did not even speak on this; they saw that what we had done in the House that night, the night of June 29, should be retained, and for that reason I rise in opposition to the rule and ask Members to join me in voting against it.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am in a dilemma because I both support the words of the gentleman from

New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] and the words of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER]. I think that the issue of Azerbaijan and Armenia needs to be addressed. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] tells me that it will go back to conference and it will be looked at. I hope that is the case.

On the second point, this Member personally believes that this body in Congress has no reason to get involved in family planning of other countries. As a matter of fact, I feel, no matter what side of the issue one is on, it should stay out of the bedrooms of American citizens, and I do not think it should be funded abroad or here in Congress, either way, and basically stay out of it. As my colleagues know, it is established under Roe versus Wade, and I think this body ought to stay the hell out of it.

Insofar as this bill, I would ask support of the rule, and I will work with the gentlemen on the other side to make sure that the Azerbaijan-Armenia issue is included.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise also in opposition to the rule because it waives all points of order. Yesterday I went before the Committee on Rules and urged that the point of order not be waived with respect to my opposition to language that essentially repeals section 907 of the Free Support Act relating to aid to Azerbaijan. Let me explain why I believe that this is a very serious procedural breach, if I can.

As was mentioned by some of the previous speakers, we had an extensive debate, 2½ hours, on the night of June 29 on the issue of section 907. Under current law section 907 prohibits direct United States aid to the Government of Azerbaijan because of their blockade of Armenia and Karabakh. What happened in the subcommittee was that language was added that essentially repealed section 907 and said that direct government aid could be sent to Azerbaijan for humanitarian purposes assuming that the President decided that that was appropriate. We had extensive debate on the House floor on the issue, and we voted by voice vote overwhelmingly, to take that language out that repeals section 907, and during the debate on the House floor it was abundantly clear that we were talking about humanitarian assistance, that we were talking about the discretion of the President of the United States to grant that humanitarian assistance, and that we were talking about assistance that was going to go to refugees.

Now when the conference met, new language, which is essentially the same as the old language, was put into the conference bill contrary to the vote on the floor of this House that says the same thing, that says that it is OK to give humanitarian assistance to refugees in Azerbaijan if the President decides that that is what he wants to do.

There is no difference between this new language and the old language that was deleted by the House of Representatives. Substantively it is the same, and the way I understand it, that means that we should be able to raise the point of order today and take that language out of the conference bill because it is substantially the same.

All we are asking for today, and the reason we are opposed to the rule, is because we are not given the opportunity to reiterate our opposition to this language and to reiterate what the House has already said. I certainly hope there will be an opportunity, if this bill is vetoed or if it is not passed in the Senate, to reopen the conference and that we will have that opportunity in some future weeks to deal with this again, but the bottom line is that this rule is inappropriate because we have the same substantive language here, and do not let anybody say that it is not the same. There is no question that the debate was complete for 2½ hours and this was understood by everyone.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Speaker, I join in this protest against the disregard of the will of this House by the conference committee. I was a participant in the debate in the wee small hours of the morning of June 29, and I do believe that, if for no other reason than out of a regard for the will of the Members of this House, this conference report is out of line.

I protest on another ground as well, and that is that the nation of Azerbaijan has used the revolving-door style of lobbying to accomplish its legislative objectives. There have been press reports about Azerbaijan hiring for millions of dollars a firm headed by a former Member of this body, a convicted felon, who led the lobbying campaign to remove the provision barring aid to Azerbaijan unless it lifted the blockade of Armenia.

Finally, of course, there is the substance of this matter. Azerbaijan has been acting in a heartless, cruel, ruthless way to try to strangle and destroy its neighbor. It is appropriate that the United States, in a demonstration of our humanitarian values, use the power and the leverage that we have to change the policy of Azerbaijan.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we got it right the first time on June 29, and I believe it was wrong for the conference committee to disregard the will of this House and the will of the other body.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKEY].

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] for yielding this time to me, and I rise in strong opposition to this rule. This rule does not allow a point of order to be raised against the language

that would now allow direct payments to be made to the Government of Azerbaijan that continues to create a blockade against the country of Armenia. Section 907 that has been mentioned before is a provision that was signed into law by President George Bush, indicates that, as soon as that blockade is lifted, direct payments can be made to the government. So, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] mentioned earlier in his remarks, the key to this issue lies with the actions of the Government of Azerbaijan.

Originally the House bill contained language that overrode 907 and would allow those direct payments to this government that continues the blockade of the Armenian people. That was stripped by this House by voice vote on the evening of June 29. The House has spoken on this issue, the Senate did not take this issue up, and there was no contention in conference, although language clearly has now been added back in that would allow these payments to be made directly to the Government of Azerbaijan without them having to lift the blockade.

There is a lot of talk and discussion about the plight of the refugees. We all share that concern. But in their heart of hearts, if that Government of Azerbaijan was so concerned, they can lift the blockade, and that is the point of 907 that today, by passing this bill and being prohibited from raising a point of order, we are now in a moment going to overturn.

I again emphasize my strong opposition to this rule because we are not provided an opportunity to strike the provision.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule, and I encourage our colleagues to vote against it for two reasons at least.

One reason has been discussed by our colleagues on both sides of the aisle—the rule does not allow the language that is contained in the legislation about Azerbaijan to be considered. As our colleague from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] has said, this rule waives all points of order.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], made a good-faith effort, I believe, in our conference to moderate the language that he was suggesting for the bill. Nonetheless, all of his good intentions notwithstanding, the legislation still allows for assistance to go to the Government of Azerbaijan. That is in opposition to the legislation that was passed in this body in the late-night debate where many Members weighed in in support of not having the funds going to the Government. A compromise passed which allows the funds to go nongovernmental organizations to support the refugees in that area.

So I hope that the House would have the chance, once again, to work its will on this issue so that all sides could be

heard on it. The more moderate amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] could be considered, but then the House could come closer to its original position.

I also rise in opposition to the rule and urge our colleagues to vote against it because the House bill insists on retaining the antifamily family planning provisions in the foreign operations appropriations bill. I have great respect for the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN]. He masterfully crafted our legislation this year, but I disagree with him and with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], whom I also respect. I know the depth of their commitment on this issue. I just happen to disagree. I think their language stands in the way of our support of international family planning.

In his early days in office, President Clinton signed an executive order lifting the Mexico City policy restrictions. There is no evidence that the number of abortions, either legal or illegal, declined under the Reagan era policy even though that was the goal of the policy. If we reject this rule, we will have an opportunity instead to vote on a proposal by our colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]. Mr. OBEY's proposal represents a good compromise and is in furtherance of the goals we all have in reducing the number of abortions in the world.

□ 1515

Mr. OBEY's amendment states that notwithstanding other provisions in the act, the funds appropriated in this act may not be made available for the U.N. population fund unless the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that the U.N. population fund will terminate all family planning activities in the People's Republic of China no later than May 1, 1996. For these and other reasons, I urge our colleagues to vote against this resolution.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to engage the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] in a colloquy.

The House passed, with 263 votes, the amendment that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] and myself had passed, calling for \$108 million to be spent on basic education. I notice that you have included in the statement of managers a reference to the funding level but have not included it in the actual bill language.

My question is, do you in fact intend that the \$108 million be spent on basic education?

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. I would say to the gentleman, yes, I do. Mr. Speaker, let me explain that I realize what the House did, and I also realize what the House did on the recommittal, and that was to separate the two funds, child survival from your \$108 million basic

education. The Senate, as you well know, took out both, the child survival program, and it also took out the \$108 million.

However, we put in the report language, and I think it is very emphatic, it said, the conferees strongly believe that strong support of these programs should be maintained and that \$108 million should be maintained for children's basic education programs. We intend to follow that, along with the gentleman, to make certain.

My concern is not that the administration would not be spending \$108 million on basic education; my only concern during this entire process is that if we did not earmark that portion for child survival that they would spend more of my \$450 million on basic education. So we put the money back in the bill, and I think it fully protects, and it fully displays the intent of Congress to the administration to tell them to spend this money in accordance with wishes and the wishes of the majority of the Members of the House.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. So it is the intent of the committee in a very strong way that the AID spend \$108 million on basic education?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, absolutely.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, to respond further, just as it is the strong intent and direction of this House that they spend the \$450 million on child survival programs.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chairman.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in favor of the rule. I would like to point out that in spite of everything that has been said here that the conference committee language is substantially different from the language that was rejected on the House floor. The House floor language included democracy building, which is not included in the conference committee language. The conference committee language is dedicated solely to the relief of suffering refugees. That was not the case in the language that was rejected in the House.

Finally and most importantly, the conference committee language provides for a Presidential waiver that determines and finds that refugee assistance is not getting to the refugees under the PVO. This means, of course, that basically the health institutions in Azerbaijan are owned by the Government and it has to be government-to-government assistance to get there, and it is dedicated entirely to suffering refugees.

Finally, I would like to point out in all of this blockade talk that has kind of taken a life of its own, I would like to point out that Armenia now occupies 20 percent of Azerbaijan. It is not a normal situation for a country that

occupies 20 percent of another country for the country that is being occupied to sell oil to the occupier, which is by my information the only thing that could be called a blockade, and that is the right to sell your oil to who you want to.

Therefore, I want to compliment the Committee on Rules. I think it is a good rule. I want to compliment the chairman of our subcommittee, and I would urge a vote for the rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for the foreign operations appropriations bill, H.R. 1868.

Mr. Speaker, a number of my colleagues have expressed concern that the rule does not permit an amendment which would excise language in the conference report regarding assistance to refugees and displaced persons within Azerbaijan. When the House debated this issue on June 28, I made a very strong statement in support of the provision allowing assistance through the Azerbaijani Government and entitling it to the suffering refugees, and there are about 1 million of those refugees. I remain committed to the principle of refugee assistance. My subcommittee oversees that on the authorizing side, and I think this language is a very carefully crafted piece of workmanship.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to read the actual language that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] put in the bill. It is replete with caveats and its intention is beyond doubt. I quote: "Assistance may be provided for the government of Azerbaijan for humanitarian purposes if the President determines that humanitarian assistance provided in Azerbaijan through NGO's is not adequately addressing the suffering of refugees and internally displaced persons."

The conference report states further that the assistance would be for, and I quote again, "for the exclusive use of refugees and displaced persons."

My Armenian friends know well that I have fully supported provisions which address humanitarian concerns of their community. I was a prime sponsor of the Humanitarian Aid Corridors Act, offered it on the authorizing bill, and it passed, which is also included in this conference report offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS]. The sole factors, in my view, are the women and the children and the refugees.

Again, I think the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] has worked out a very carefully crafted compromise, and I do hope that Members will vote in favor of this conference report, in favor of the rule.

Just very briefly on the issue raised by Mr. OBEY, the language dealing with the United Nations Population Fund

and the Mexico City Policy, which Mr. CALLAHAN will offer shortly, are the two issues that we have voted on and debated several times in this House, both on the authorizing bill and on the appropriations bill. The issue has been divided in the past, and the votes are very similar, and I would hope that Members would see fit to continue to keep these joined together.

The conferees felt it was necessary to have one vote, up or down, on these two important policies. We have divided it in the past, we had separate votes, and those votes were decidedly in favor of the pro-life provisions.

So rather than wasting the time of this body, I would hope that we can have our argument on those two policies without the motion that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] would like to offer. So vote "yes" on the motion as well as "yes" on the rule itself.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I will briefly just close by saying that we have had clearly some evidence here that there are many matters here that have been very difficult. We have gone through the process to achieve the best balance possible. We have tried to craft a rule that we think is fair and reasonable. Obviously there are some loose ends still out there that people care about, as they always will and should. I notice that just about everybody who has an opinion on this who is involved in the conference report did sign the report, so I think we have made great progress on this, enough that I can say that I would urge support for the rule at this time which is the issue before us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. OBEY. 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 SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 268, nays 155, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 749]

YEAS—268

Allard	Baldacci	Barton
Archer	Ballenger	Bass
Armey	Barcia	Bateman
Bachus	Barr	Bereuter
Baker (CA)	Barrett (NE)	Billbray
Baker (LA)	Bartlett	Bilirakis

Bliley	Gordon	Norwood	Eshoo	Luther	Rose	Cunningham	Hyde	Poshard
Blute	Goss	Nussle	Evans	Maloney	Roybal-Allard	Davis	Inglis	Pryce
Boehlert	Graham	Oberstar	Farr	Manton	Rush	de la Garza	Istook	Quillen
Boehner	Greenwood	Ortiz	Fattah	Markey	Sabo	Deal	Johnson (CT)	Quinn
Bonilla	Gunderson	Orton	Fazio	Martinez	Sanders	DeLay	Johnson, Sam	Rahall
Bonior	Gutknecht	Oxley	Filner	Matsui	Sawyer	Diaz-Balart	Jones	Ramstad
Bono	Hall (OH)	Packard	Flake	McCarthy	Schroeder	Dickey	Kanjorski	Regula
Borski	Hall (TX)	Parker	Foglietta	McDermott	Schumer	Doolittle	Kasich	Riggs
Boucher	Hamilton	Paxon	Ford	McHale	Scott	Dornan	Kelly	Roberts
Brewster	Hancock	Payne (VA)	Frank (MA)	McKinney	Serrano	Doyle	Kildee	Rogers
Browder	Hansen	Peterson (MN)	Furse	McNulty	Sisisky	Dreier	Kim	Rohrabacher
Brown (OH)	Hastert	Petri	Gejdenson	Meehan	Skaggs	Duncan	King	Roth
Brownback	Hastings (WA)	Pombo	Gibbons	Meek	Slaughter	Dunn	Kingston	Roukema
Bryant (TN)	Hayes	Porter	Gonzalez	Menendez	Spratt	Ehlers	Klink	Royce
Bunn	Hayworth	Portman	Green	Meyers	Stark	Ehrlich	Klug	Salmon
Bunning	Hefley	Poshard	Gutierrez	Mfume	Stokes	Emerson	Knollenberg	Sanford
Burr	Heineman	Pryce	Harman	Miller (CA)	Studds	English	Kolbe	Saxton
Burton	Herger	Quillen	Hastings (FL)	Minge	Tanner	Ensign	LaFalce	Scarborough
Buyer	Hilleary	Quinn	Hefner	Mink	Thompson	Everett	LaHood	Schaefer
Callahan	Hinchey	Radanovich	Hilliard	Mollohan	Thornton	Ewing	Largent	Schiff
Calvert	Hobson	Rahall	Hoyer	Moran	Thurman	Fawell	Latham	Schiff
Camp	Hoekstra	Ramstad	Jackson-Lee	Morella	Torkildsen	Fields (TX)	LaTourette	Sensenbrenner
Canady	Hoke	Rahall	Jacobs	Nadler	Torres	Flanagan	Laughlin	Shadegg
Castle	Holden	Regula	Jefferson	Neal	Torricelli	Foley	Lazio	Shaw
Chabot	Horn	Riggs	Johnson (CT)	Obey	Towns	Fowler	Lewis (CA)	Shays
Chambliss	Hostettler	Roberts	Johnson (SD)	Olver	Traficant	Fox	Lewis (KY)	Shuster
Chenoweth	Houghton	Rogers	Johnson, E. B.	Owens	Velazquez	Franks (CT)	Lightfoot	Skeen
Christensen	Hunter	Rohrabacher	Johnston	Pallone	Vento	Franks (NJ)	Linder	Skelton
Chrysler	Hutchinson	Roth	Kaptur	Pastor	Visclosky	Frisa	Lipinski	Skelton
Clinger	Hyde	Roukema	Kennedy (MA)	Payne (NJ)	Ward	Frost	Livingston	Smith (MI)
Coble	Inglis	Royce	Kennedy (RI)	Pelosi	Waters	Funderburk	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Coburn	Istook	Salmon	Kennelly	Peterson (FL)	Watt (NC)	Gallely	Lofgren	Smith (TX)
Collins (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Sanford	Klecza	Pickett	Williams	Ganske	Longley	Smith (WA)
Combust	Jones	Saxton	Lantos	Pomeroy	Wise	Gekas	Lucas	Solomon
Condit	Kanjorski	Scarborough	Leach	Rangel	Woolsey	Geren	Manzullo	Souder
Cooley	Kasich	Schaefer	Levin	Reed	Wyden	Gilchrest	Mascara	Spence
Cox	Kelly	Schiff	Lewis (GA)	Richardson	Wynn	Gillmor	McCollum	Stearns
Cramer	Kildee	Seastrand	Lincoln	Rivers	Yates	Gilman	McCrery	Stenholm
Crane	Kim	Sensenbrenner	Lowey	Roemer		Goodlatte	McDade	Stockman
Crapo	King	Shadegg				Goodling	McHugh	Stump
Cremeans	Kingston	Shaw				Goss	McInnis	Stupak
Cubin	Klink	Shays	Fields (LA)	NOT VOTING—9		Graham	McIntosh	Talent
Cunningham	Klug	Shuster	Gephardt	Ros-Lehtinen	Volkmer	Green	Metcalf	Tate
Davis	Knollenberg	Skeen	Moakley	Tejeda	Waxman	Greenwood	Mica	Tauzin
Deal	Kolbe	Skelton		Tucker	Weldon (PA)	Gunderson	Miller (FL)	Taylor (MS)
DeLay	LaFalce	Smith (MI)				Gutknecht	Molinar	Taylor (NC)
Diaz-Balart	LaHood	Smith (NJ)				Hall (OH)	Mollohan	Thomas
Dickey	Largent	Smith (TX)				Hall (TX)	Montgomery	Thornberry
Dooley	Latham	Smith (WA)				Hamilton	Murtha	Tiaht
Doolittle	LaTourette	Solomon				Hancock	Myers	Upton
Dornan	Laughlin	Souder				Hansen	Myrick	Vucanovich
Doyle	Lazio	Spence				Hastert	Nethercutt	Waldholtz
Dreier	Lewis (CA)	Stearns				Hastings (WA)	Neumann	Walker
Duncan	Lewis (KY)	Stenholm				Hayes	Ney	Walsh
Dunn	Lightfoot	Stockman				Hayworth	Nussle	Wamp
Ehlers	Linder	Stump				Hefley	Oberstar	Watts (OK)
Ehrlich	Lipinski	Stupak				Heineman	Ortiz	Weldon (FL)
Emerson	Livingston	Talent				Herger	Orton	Weller
English	LoBiondo	Tate				Hilleary	Oxley	White
Ensign	Lofgren	Tauzin				Hobson	Packard	Whitfield
Everett	Longley	Taylor (MS)				Hoekstra	Parker	Wicker
Ewing	Lucas	Taylor (NC)				Holden	Paxon	Wilson
Fawell	Manzullo	Thomas				Horn	Payne (VA)	Wolf
Fields (TX)	Martini	Thornberry				Hostettler	Peterson (MN)	Yates
Flanagan	Mascara	Tiaht				Houghton	Petri	Young (AK)
Foley	McCollum	Upton				Hunter	Pombo	Young (FL)
Forbes	McCrery	Vucanovich				Hutchinson	Porter	Zeliff
Fowler	McDade	Waldholtz						
Fox	McHugh	Walker						
Franks (CT)	McInnis	Walsh						
Franks (NJ)	McIntosh	Wamp						
Frelinghuysen	McKeon	Watts (OK)						
Frisa	Metcalf	Weldon (FL)						
Frost	Mica	Weller						
Funderburk	Miller (FL)	White						
Gallely	Molinar	Whitfield						
Ganske	Montgomery	Wicker						
Gekas	Moorhead	Wilson						
Geren	Murtha	Wolf						
Gilchrest	Myers	Young (AK)						
Gillmor	Myrick	Young (FL)						
Gilman	Nethercutt	Zeliff						
Goodlatte	Neumann	Zimmer						
Goodling	Ney							

NOT VOTING—9

□ 1547

Messrs. DEUTSCH, TORKILDSEN, BISHOP, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Messrs. SERRANO, JEFFERSON, and BENTSEN, and Ms. RIVERS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. KLUG, BORSKI, RAHALL, HOLDEN, PETERSON of Minnesota, and OBERSTAR changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and noes were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 257, noes 165, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 750]

AYES—257

Allard	Blute	Chabot	Abercrombie	DeFazio	Harman
Archer	Boehlert	Chambliss	Ackerman	DeLauro	Hastings (FL)
Armey	Boehner	Chenoweth	Andrews	Dellums	Hefner
Bachus	Bonilla	Christensen	Baessler	Deutsch	Hilliard
Baker (CA)	Bono	Chrysler	Barrett (WI)	Dicks	Hinchey
Baker (LA)	Boucher	Clinger	Becerra	Dingell	Hoke
Baldacci	Brewster	Coble	Becerra	Dixon	Hoyer
Ballenger	Browder	Coburn	Beilenson	Doggett	Jackson-Lee
Barcia	Brownback	Collins (GA)	Bentsen	Dooley	Jacobs
Barr	Bryant (TN)	Collins (IL)	Berman	Durbin	Jefferson
Barrett (NE)	Bunn	Combust	Bevill	Edwards	Johnson (SD)
Bartlett	Bunning	Condit	Bishop	Engel	Johnson, E. B.
Barton	Burr	Cooley	Bonior	Engel	Johnston
Bass	Burton	Costello	Borski	Eshoo	Kaptur
Bateman	Buyer	Cox	Bono	Evans	Kennedy (MA)
Bereuter	Callahan	Crane	Brown (CA)	Farr	Kennedy (RI)
Bilbray	Calvert	Crapo	Brown (FL)	Fattah	Kennelly
Bilirakis	Camp	Cremeans	Brown (OH)	Fazio	Klecza
Bliley	Canady	Cubin	Bryant (TX)	Filner	Klecza
			Cardin	Flake	Lantos
			Castle	Foglietta	Leach
			Chapman	Forbes	Levin
			Clay	Ford	Lewis (GA)
			Clayton	Frank (MA)	Lincoln
			Clement	Frelinghuysen	Lowey
			Clyburn	Furse	Luther
			Coleman	Gejdenson	Maloney
			Collins (MI)	Gibbons	Manton
			Conyers	Gonzalez	Markey
			Coyne	Gordon	Martinez
			Cramer	Gutierrez	Martini
			Danner		

NAYS—155

NOES—165

Matsui	Payne (NJ)	Stark
McCarthy	Pelosi	Stokes
McDermott	Peterson (FL)	Studds
McHale	Pickett	Tanner
McKeon	Pomero	Thompson
McKinney	Radanovich	Thornton
McNulty	Rangel	Thurman
Meehan	Reed	Torkildsen
Meek	Richardson	Torres
Menendez	Rivers	Torricelli
Meyers	Roemer	Towns
Mfume	Rose	Traficant
Miller (CA)	Roybal-Allard	Velazquez
Minge	Rush	Vento
Mink	Sabo	Visclosky
Moorhead	Sanders	Ward
Moran	Sawyer	Waters
Morella	Schroeder	Watt (NC)
Nadler	Schumer	Waxman
Neal	Scott	Williams
Obey	Serrano	Wise
Olver	Sisisky	Woolsey
Owens	Skaggs	Wyden
Pallone	Slaughter	Wynn
Pastor	Spratt	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—10

Fields (LA)	Portman	Volkmer
Gephardt	Ros-Lehtinen	Weldon (PA)
Moakley	Tejeda	
Norwood	Tucker	

□ 1556

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. DE LA GARZA and Mr. OBERSTAR changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 750 on H.R. 2492, I mistakenly recorded my vote as "yes" when I should have voted "no."

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104—130)

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the Iran emergency is to continue in effect beyond November 14, 1995, to the *Federal Register* for publication. Similar notices have been sent annually to the Congress and the *Federal Register* since November 12, 1980. The most recent notice appeared in the *Federal Register* on November 1, 1994.

The crisis between the United States and Iran that began in 1979 has not been fully resolved. The international tribunal established to adjudicate claims of the United States and U.S. nationals against Iran and of the Iranian government and Iranian nationals against the United States continues to function, and normalization of commercial and diplomatic relations between the United States and Iran has not been achieved. Indeed, on March 15 of this year, I declared a separate national emergency with respect to Iran pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act and imposed separate sanctions. By Executive Order 12959, these sanctions were significantly augmented. In these circumstances, I have determined that it is necessary to maintain in force the broad authorities that are in place by virtue of the November 14, 1979, declaration of emergency, including the authority to block certain property of the Government of Iran, and which are needed in the process of implementing the January 1981 agreements with Iran.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, October 31, 1995.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1868, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rule, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1868), making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 26, 1995, at page H10974.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 1868, now under consideration, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to bring back to the House the conference report on H.R. 1868, the fiscal year 1996 appropriations for Foreign Operations,

Export Financing, and Related Programs.

The conference agreement represents a reduction of approximately \$1.5 billion, or 11 percent, below the 1995 enacted level. It is also a cut of almost \$2.7 billion, or 18 percent, below the President's request.

In addition, we are below the budget allocation for this bill by \$156 million in discretionary budget authority.

The agreement protects important child survival and disease programs, as we had proposed in the House bill. The Senate bill contained no protections whatsoever for these programs. The conferees also direct that \$100 million be provided for UNICEF, instead of a cut as assumed in the Senate bill.

In general, the House bill did not include authorization provisions that were not cleared by the relevant authorization committees. I can honestly say that I did not want authorization language on our appropriation bill. I have great respect for Chairman GILMAN and his colleagues on the International Relations Committee and I did my utmost to eliminate objectionable authorization language when the House considered H.R. 1868. However, the Senate included dozens of legislative provisions in the 193 amendments it made to the House bill. We were successful in deleting many of these in conference.

We also worked with the authorization committee to modify or retain those provisions of most interest to them. In particular, we worked closely with them on the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act and the NATO Participation Act amendments.

As I stated earlier, we had 193 Senate amendments to contend with in conference, and we were able to reach an agreement on all but one. The Senate conferees refused to accept the will of the House of Representatives on population funding and abortion.

Once the House has acted on the conference report, under the rule, I will ask the House to send back to the Senate the substance of a compromise amendment I offered in conference on the Mexico City abortion policy. This compromise has the support of the author of the amendment that was approved by the House, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

There are several matters in the conference agreement that merit further comment and clarification today.

With regard to concerns about conference report language on Azerbaijan, I want to repeat the statement I made before the Rules Committee: As chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, I expect to be consulted in advance and notified in writing on a case by case basis each time the President uses the limited waiver provided by the Wilson amendment.

Until the parties involved meet and agree to reduce the tension in the Caucasus region and terminate all blockades, which I believe is possible in