

a normal day, 55,000 of those people would be here in Washington, ready to visit the Washington Monument, the White House, Ford's Theater and other locations here.

If today were a normal day, 23,000 Americans would be applying for their passports to get ready for trips abroad. And on a normal day, 700 young men and women would be ready to dedicate themselves to our country by enlisting in our Nation's Armed Forces.

But instead of these normal everyday things, today we have paralysis, confusion, delay, and waste. It's time to end this crisis, and get people back to work.

IT IS TIME FOR THE PRESIDENT TO GET SERIOUS ABOUT BALANCING THE FEDERAL BUDGET

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I am a little troubled by some of President Clinton's comments the last couple of days. I have been listening to the White House press conferences, which seem to occur about every 20 minutes, and I can keep hearing the President claim that he wants to balance the budget.

Now, that is interesting, because the budget that he sent to Congress called for \$200 billion annual deficits into the foreseeable future and added \$1 trillion to the national debt over the next 5 years. His so-called balanced budget was so unbalanced, the Democrats in the House refused to offer it. In the Senate, where it was introduced, it received not one single vote.

Now every time we turn on the television we see a somber President Clinton proclaiming that theoretically he supports some balanced budget at some time, just not this particular balanced budget.

Baloney. The President could care less about balancing the budget. He should join us and we should work together to finally balance the budget for this country.

WHO IS GOING TO BALANCE THE BUDGET IS NOT THE ISSUE

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, here is something the national Republicans do not want to talk about. The last time they were in charge, under former Presidents Reagan and Bush, they passed their budget. You remember it, it was called trickle down. The Federal deficit tripled last time they were in charge.

Under President Clinton, the deficit has finally begun to come down. In fact, for 3 years in a row the deficit has come down. The last President to pull that off was Harry Truman in the 1940's.

Here is a very remarkable thing: If the Gingrich budget passed, it would not reduce the deficit in its first 3 years as much as the Clinton budget reduced the deficit in its first 3 years. And Bill Clinton did it with equity and fairness, without savaging kids or farmers or veterans or old folks.

So the issue is not who is going to balance the budget. The Republicans have proven they do not know how to do it. President Clinton has proven Democrats do.

EVERYBODY WANTS A BALANCED BUDGET

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

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, the American people need to know that there was a vote on this floor to protect Social Security funds from being raided. They need to know there was a vote on this floor to protect pension funds from being raided to pay the national debt.

We voted for it, but we were not successful. We needed more support from over here. People talk about the fact that they want a balanced budget, until it is time to actually do it. The American people are not extremists. My district is overwhelmingly Democrat, and the calls are coming in overwhelmingly 9 to 1, by Democrats, Republicans, independents, working people across this country that they want a balanced budget.

The American people care about the money they put into their wallets, and their money for 26 to 30 years the Government has taken out of their wallets. No more smoke and mirrors, no more false promises of Gramm-Rudman. It is time to act and for Washington to act right now on behalf of the American people and the future of children in our country to balance the Nation's budget once and for all so people can keep their own hard-earned money.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. MCKINNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, since April of this year, Speaker GINGRICH has threatened that he would close down the Government in order to pass his extremist agenda. Well, yesterday, Speaker GINGRICH got his wish—the Government closed down.

All this because the GOP is in a mad rush to make their gargantuan cuts to Medicare, the environment, and education, so they can help pay for \$245 billion in tax breaks.

Mr. Speaker, the American people yearn for Medicare reforms worthy of the mainstream and not the GOP extreme. Clearly, extremist GOP policies have only one purpose in mind, and that is to reward those who finance the

Republican Party at the expense of those who don't make campaign contributions.

Don't try to blame the President, pass the appropriations bills.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky). Further 1-minutes will be recognized at the end of the legislative day.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up 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, with the remaining Senate amendment thereto, and move to disagree to the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment numbered 115.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment numbered 115, as follows:

Senate amendment to House amendment to Senate amendment:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment to the Senate amendment, insert: " *Provided*, That in determining eligibility for assistance from funds appropriated to carry out section 104 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, non-governmental and multilateral organizations shall not be subjected to requirements more restrictive than the requirements applicable to foreign governments for such assistance: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this Act may be used to lobby for or against abortion".

Mr. CALLAHAN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CALLAHAN

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CALLAHAN moves to disagree to the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment numbered 115.

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 within which to revise and extend their remarks and that I be allowed to include tabular and extraneous material on H.R. 1868.

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, under the present circumstances, we must do whatever is needed to move all of the remaining appropriations bills to the President's desk as soon as possible. Each appropriations bill the President signs will put more agencies back into business. In the case of this foreign aid appropriations bill, we must act to ensure that humanitarian aid continues without interruption.

The complicated motion I have just offered is actually a simple one. Both the House and Senate have passed the conference agreement on the foreign aid appropriations bill. This morning, the House is being asked to insist on its previous position on the only remaining amendment in disagreement.

This is the so-called Smith-Callahan amendment on population funding and abortion. It last passed the House on October 31 by a vote of 232 to 187. In a slightly different version, the Smith amendment passed the House on two previous occasions during consideration of H.R. 1561, the foreign aid authorization bill. This will be the fourth time the House is being asked to vote on this.

By sending this amendment back to the Senate, we will be giving the other body another opportunity to consider the Smith amendment which is so important to many Members of this body. I expect the Senate leadership to work to pass this amendment. I hope they are successful, but I recognize that parts of the Smith amendment have failed to pass the Senate on two previous occasions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to agree to this motion. Our leadership has determined that this is the best way to move the foreign operations appropriations bill toward the President's desk. We must do what we can to make sure that humanitarian aid to displaced people and refugees around the world is not disrupted.

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

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, we finished the foreign operations conference more than 3 weeks ago, but we have been unable to send a bill to the President because of the issue of who will receive family planning funds.

Today we are wasting a vote by again voting on the same language that the Senate has refused to accept, and the President has said he will veto the bill if it is included.

We need to look at the priorities in this bill and take out the Mexico City

language so that this bill can get to the President for signature.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, my friend, the distinguished subcommittee chairman, just indicated that this bill is before us because we had to move these appropriations bills forward.

□ 1045

I agree that we do. The problem is this motion does not do that. It keeps the Congress stuck on dead center on another 1 of the 10 appropriation bills which still have not made their way into law.

We have been here before, Mr. Speaker. Three weeks ago we went through this exercise. The House voted to insist on its position on this matter. It was sent to the Senate and the Senate turned it down. I know of absolutely no development which has changed the Senate position to this point. What we have is, I think, another example of why the Government at this moment is shut down with over 90 percent of the appropriations still not in law for the coming fiscal year.

Frankly, there are a whole lot more issues in this bill that I care about more than how we come down on the Mexico City issue. I have been trying through the years to find any way to resolve that issue, and I offered a compromise motion the last time we were on the floor with this issue. We lost. The rules do not allow me to make that same motion again. If they did, I would make that motion again because I think both chambers need to show some movement.

I respect people's strong views on this subject, on both sides, but it seems to me we are caught in a higher problem this morning. It seems to me that this motion is again, in a small way, a vivid example of why the Congress has not been able to finish its work, why we are sitting here wrapped around the axle with the Government shut down, with the majority party blaming the President because he has not signed bills they have not sent him yet.

It just seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the way out of this box is to, not just on this bill but on all the other bills that have not yet become law, try to find ways to bridge the differences between the House and the Senate, not to keep those differences going. This motion keeps that difference going this morning. It does nothing constructive to either move this bill to the White House or to lessen the portion of the Federal budget which has still not been passed for the coming fiscal year.

I will vote against the motion, Mr. Speaker, not because of any particularly strong feelings about the motion per se, but simply because I do have strong feelings that we ought to be moving these bills forward, as the subcommittee chair indicates, but this motion is not doing that.

I really think that sooner or later people have to get over their insistence

on first preferences. We have to recognize that we have an obligation in a legislative body to get our work done, and continuing to polarize this issue between the House and the Senate is not making any significant contribution toward that end.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the motion before us. This motion aims to completely eliminate family planning aid overseas.

Mr. Speaker, this motion is one of the reasons why the Federal Government is shut down today. The Republican leadership has insisted on putting extreme provisions in appropriations bills like this one that have no place here. Every appropriations bill that comes up has an abortion rider attached to it. Collectively, these riders have brought the budget process to a grinding halt.

This language is a substantial change in law that should not tie up passage of an important spending bill like this one. I have the utmost respect and admiration for Chairman CALLAHAN. He has crafted a good bill here that makes sense for America and the world, and it is a shame that this critical legislation is being held up by extremist language.

Proponents of this language claim that it simply cuts abortion funding. What they have not told you is that abortion funding overseas has been prohibited since 1973. This language would cut abortion funding from its current level of zero to zero.

Therefore, this motion goes after family planning, not abortion.

One of the most important forms of aid that we provide to other countries is family planning assistance. No one can deny that the need for family planning services in developing countries is urgent and the aid we provide is both valuable and worthwhile.

The world's population is growing at an unprecedented rate. In 40 years our planet's population will more than double. As a responsible world leader, the United States must do more to deter the environmental, political, and health consequences of this explosive growth.

And let us not forget what family planning assistance means to women around the world. Complications of pregnancy, childbirth, and unsafe abortion are the leading killers of women of reproductive age throughout the third world. One million women die each year as a result of reproductive health problems.

Each year, 250,000 women die from unsafe abortions.

Only 20 to 35 percent of women in Africa and Asia receive prenatal care.

Five hundred million married women want contraceptives but cannot obtain them.

Most of these disabilities and deaths could be prevented.

This motion would defund family planning organizations that perform legal abortions—even if the abortion services are funded with non-U.S. money.

The motion also cuts funds to the UNFPA, an organization that provides family planning and population assistance in over 140 countries. The pretext for this provision is that the UNFPA operates in China, and therefore the funding must be cut. However, the law currently states that no United States funds can be used in UNFPA's China program. Proponents of this language are clearly using the deplorable situation in China as an excuse to eliminate funding for this highly successful and important family planning organization. The UNFPA is in no way linked to reported family planning abuses in China, and should not be held hostage to extremist antiabortion rhetoric.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this motion. No matter how its proponents try to disguise it, this motion is ultimately intended to end U.S. family planning assistance overseas. A vote for this motion is a vote against sensible, cost-effective family planning programs.

It is also a vote to continue these destructive budget games at the expense of the American people. Let us face it. The reason October 1 has come is because we have not done our work, my colleagues.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to respond to the two previous speakers.

What we are trying to do, I think, is a responsible thing, and that is just what Mr. OBEY wants us to do, is to pass these bills, to get the Government operating.

I think that we are being very responsible in giving the President the opportunity to have a foreign policy operation capability. So that is the purpose of it.

I do not know why we should go through this continued debate on a bill that has already been debated four times and say the same things that we are saying; but, nevertheless, we have indications from the Senate that if we will send this message back to them, that possibly they can work something out. So it is a responsible thing to do in order to give the President the latitude he needs to handle foreign policy and to continue the humanitarian efforts worldwide.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. KNOLLENBERG] who is a member of our subcommittee.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time. I rise and join my colleagues in urging the House to reaffirm its strong commitment to the Callahan amendment language, the very language which passed the House on October 31 by a vote, and most of my colleagues know this, by a vote of 232 to 187.

This amendment prevents taxpayer money from going to fund the pro-

motion or performance of abortions. It does not reduce, and I would challenge the comments of the gentleman from New York, does not reduce funding for international family planning. It simply ensures that our money is spent saving lives and not taking them.

Mr. Speaker, the statement has been made, and I am just repeating it, that this is the very same language that we passed before. The will of the House is very clear on this issue. Our limited funds, and we do have limited funds, and the gentleman from Wisconsin, [Mr. OBEY] spoke in regard to some of this, as has the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], that we do have limited funds, but those funds for foreign assistance programs should not be spent on promoting or performing abortions.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Callahan motion and insist on the House-passed language.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, with the highest regard for the chairman of our subcommittee, Mr. CALLAHAN and for the maker of this original amendment, the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. SMITH, I rise in opposition to this motion today.

I heard our colleagues on the other side talk about this. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], our chairman, and it reminded me of the many weeks our chairman with his leadership took us through with this bill. We resolved every point except this one. Indeed, 3 weeks ago we were gathered here and we voted on this very issue and here we are back again.

Mr. Speaker, it is, yes indeed, one example of why our appropriations bills are not finished, and why we are in the difficult situation we are in today with the closing down the Government. If we could get our appropriations bills passed we would not have to be waiting for a continuing resolution.

Having said that, in terms of procedure, I oppose the technique that is being used, to go back and forth and back and forth to the Senate on this language. The Republican Senators agree with many people in this House of Representatives that the language in the Smith legislation is not appropriate to this legislation. I would urge my colleagues to support that position, which is to oppose this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, we have been down this road before as I have said. The conference report has gone back and forth. This legislation contains the same restrictive anti-choice language which the Senate has already rejected. Negotiations require each side to compromise. Sending back the exact same language already rejected by the other body is not a compromise.

When the bill was before us 3 weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from

Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] proposed language that would remove the legislative language referred to as the Mexico City policy that should be debated on an authorizing bill. Mr. OBEY proposed restrictions that are in current law on coercive abortion. The gentleman included a provision limiting funds for UNFPA unless they stop their program in China. It was tougher than I wanted, but, nonetheless, it was a compromise.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the House language in disagreement. According to the World Health Organization, 500,000 women die each year of pregnancy-related causes, 99 percent of them in the developing world. Restrictions on family planning organizations proposed in this provision represent a threat to the health and safety of the world's women.

We all share the goal of decreasing the number of abortions performed throughout the world, and, indeed, even in our own country. However, it is not at all likely that the Smith language would succeed in that regard. Indeed, during the time the Mexico City policy was in effect there was no decrease in the number of abortions performed worldwide, but there was a decrease in the safety of that procedure.

The provision in disagreement is not about cutting abortion funding, because there is no funding to cut. Existing law, as has been said over and over again, existing law already prevents the use of U.S. funds for abortion activities abroad, and has done so under the Foreign Assistance Act since 1973. This amendment would restrict effective women's health care in family planning organizations and interfere with the efforts to provide safe and legal reproductive health care for women in developing countries.

Mr. Speaker, this is about improving health for women throughout the world, and especially in the developing countries. It is a big environmental issue. A vote for this amendment is a vote against family planning. It is not a vote for cutting abortion funding. There is no abortion funding in this bill to be cut.

So on the basis of procedure, Mr. Speaker, and on the basis of substance, I urge our colleagues to vote against this proposal.

□ 1100

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, there are some things that are factual, and one is that China has a brutal, inhuman policy of mandating only one-child families, and if you have more than one child, you can be, and I have talked to seven women from China who were forcibly aborted, coercively aborted, or sterilized. I talked to one woman whom the authorities took and aborted her when she was 6 months pregnant, because she picked up a baby girl that

was thrown away on the side of a road, and that gave her two children, and so they aborted her. How can anybody support that kind of policy?

Well, Mr. Speaker, the United Nations does. Money is fungible. Do not say "no money for abortion," because what you do not spend with this money, you spend with that money. So that is just a dodge.

Now, I have heard about the number of women who die from unsafe abortions, and that is tragic, but the mortality rate for the babies is 100 percent. Millions of them die.

Mr. Speaker, family planning is not abortion and abortion is not family planning. Whatever dollars we have for family planning are still going to go for family planning, but not to organizations that perform or council abortion. American tax dollars should not be in the abortion racket. We should not pay to exterminate unborn children. That is a policy decision.

Mr. Speaker, everybody who takes the well in opposition to the position of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] is for the abortion license. I do not say they are for abortions, but they think abortion is an acceptable answer to an unwanted child, and we think it is highly unacceptable. So do not use American tax dollars to advance the cause of exterminating unborn children, whether they are in the Third World or whether they are in Chicago.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

One of the previous speakers said that this language would completely eliminate family planning. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The Mexico City language and the UNFPA anticoercion language was in effect for most of the 1980's, since about 1984, and into the 1990's, and during that time, the United States, was still the primary donor nation to family planning, both to countries and to organizations around the world.

What we said was that coercion is a terrible and heinous thing, and that we as a nation will not look askance or look the other way when it comes to forcing women to have abortions. All our legislation does today is say that we are again serious about the human rights abuse that occur when women are forcibly aborted and forcibly sterilized. And by our legislation today we say no to those organizations, like the U.N. population fund that whitewashes these crimes and coddles those who commit these crimes and provides substantial money and other kinds of technical supports to programs that sanction these crimes. We are telling the world that we are opposed to that and that we are not going to allow our money to go to those kinds of crimes and the organizations that sanction them.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the language that the gentleman from Ala-

bama [Mr. CALLAHAN] has crafted is a compromise. It is a middle ground that has given in a number of areas, and the Senate should take it.

Let me also point out, Mr. Speaker, again, that anyone who says on the other side that this completely eliminates, and I say this to the press as well, completely eliminate family planning, that that is absolutely unmitigated nonsense. It did not happen before, funding continued under humane rules.

Those specious charges were made back in the 1980's on this House floor and one provider of family planning services after another agreed to the Mexico City clauses, signed on the dotted line—Planned Parenthood and others all got their money. However, they did so by having a wall of separation between family planning and the performance of abortion, except in cases of rape, incest and life of the mother.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say something else. Recently my Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights had a hearing and we heard testimony from women who had been forcibly aborted, who are now in this country awaiting to be deported. Right now some of those women are on a hunger strike in California.

This administration, which says that it cares for women, is about to send 19 women back to China, women that the INS itself has said were credible, had sufficient documentation and information to lead a reasonable man or woman to believe that they, indeed, were forcibly aborted. Well, these women right now are on a hunger strike because the Clinton administration is trying to kick them out of the country and send them back to China.

We heard from those women. They came to our subcommittee. It took over 4 months to get them to come, because the administration threw up every kind of barrier to prevent us from hearing their story.

One of those witnesses, Li Bao Yu, told us that when she had an IUD that was forcibly inserted into her body by the cadres, when she had it removed, she got pregnant. So what did the Chinese Government do? It said that that baby that was conceived had to be aborted, and they dragged her in and they forced her to have an abortion.

Some of my friends on the other side of the aisle heard her testimony. We heard from another woman, Hu Shuye, who at 6 months had her baby ripped out of her body by the cadres, by the family planning cadres in the People's Republic of China, and she said, "I had no way out, they forced me, they dragged me to have this abortion done."

Mr. Speaker, are we serious about voluntarism? Are we going to look the other way and allow and subsidize these terrible crimes against women?

Mr. Speaker, this administration talks out of both sides of its mouth. It says they want to help women, but instead it is sending those women back;

it wants to give money to those organizations that do this kind of thing and assist those countries that do this kind of human rights abuse.

We will see, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] and the rest of the committee will confirm, that there is money in this bill for family planning. We just say that human rights criteria ought to have sway. Coercion? Or voluntarism? When it comes between the two, let us come down on the side of voluntarism and not on the side of coercion.

Finally, let me just say that we have made some concessions. The Mexico City policy worked, and it will work again.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] said a couple of minutes ago that anyone who opposes this amendment is for the abortion of an unwanted child. That is absolute baloney. The gentleman is perfectly entitled to describe his own motives. He certainly by no means has any right to describe mine.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to abortions period. I just do not happen to think that I ought to be making the decision for every woman in this country. That is a distinction which I think the gentleman from Illinois is bright enough to understand.

I also want to say that with respect to the China issue, I want to read the language of the amendment that the gentleman who just spoke voted against the last time it was before us on the floor.

My amendment said in section 518 (a):

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 unless the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that, one: 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 two: During the 12 months preceding such certification, there have been no abortions as a result of coercion associated with the family planning activities of the national government or other governmental entities within the People's Republic of China.

Now, that language is very clear, and my statement was very clear at the time. I wanted us to end funding for the U.N. Population Program if it does not pull the plug in China, because I believe, and most of us believe on this side of the aisle, that China does have a coercive program and we have no business being associated with a program that does not recognize that. I feel that very strongly and have felt that way for 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] says that he thinks the language in this amendment is a compromise. Well, that is very nice. The fact is, the Senate does not think it is a compromise, because they

have already voted against it. All I am suggesting is that if the gentleman wants to move this bill forward, the gentleman will find some other formulation than the one in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, we have already tried this route. The Senate has already voted it down, and the hardheadedness that is demonstrated by insisting on everyone's first principles is a clear demonstration of why 10 out of the 13 appropriations bills still have not become law and we are sitting here today with the Government in a situation where it is shut down.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that if the gentleman wants to compromise, it has to be a compromise somewhere other than in your own mind. It has to be a compromise which is generally recognized.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the comments of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. He referenced the hearings that he had, and indeed, the gentleman is to be commended for his leadership on this issue of the inhumane treatment of women in China. We all agree, we all agree. We stipulate to the fact that the program that is being conducted in China is not one that we want to be associated with.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], under his leadership, held hearings. We shuddered to hear the testimony of these women who were brought into the hearing room in handcuffs. The gentleman is absolutely right on this subject about the coercion of abortion in China. The gentleman is absolutely right about how these women are treated.

However, what is happening here today is not about that. What is happening here today is that this amendment will curtail the activities of organizations that are engaged in family planning throughout the world. A poor family in Africa should not be held hostage to the coercive programs in China, and that is what this proposal will do. I urge our colleagues to respect the attitude of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] but vote against his proposal.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Callahan motion. The Callahan motion would reiterate the House's support for restoring two important pro-life policies in effect during the Bush and Reagan administrations.

These policies will ensure that none of the moneys will be available to the

United Nations Population Fund unless the President certifies that the UNPF has terminated all activities in China or, during the 12 months preceding, there have been no abortions as the result of coercion by government agencies.

We will also ensure that none of the moneys sent to the UNPF may be used to fund any private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organization that directly or through a subcontractor performs abortions in any foreign country—except to save the life of the mother or in cases of rape and incest.

Now some may claim that this is a gag rule on family planning assistance. However, this is not the case, abortion is not considered a family planning method and should not be promoted as one, especially by the United States. Recently, the State Department decided that the promotion of abortion should be a priority in advancing U.S. population-control efforts. This is unacceptable to the millions of Americans who do not view abortion as a legitimate method of family planning and do not support Federal funding of abortion except to save the life of the mother or in cases of rape and incest.

The Mexico City policy prohibits funds to organizations unless they certify that they do not perform abortions in any foreign country except in the cases cited above. Over 350 foreign family planning organizations readily agreed to these terms from 1984 to 1993. Also, it is important to note that we are not reducing the funding level for real international population assistance.

In a time when 69 percent of the American public opposes Federal funding for abortion we desperately need to clarify congressional intent so that it cannot be disregarded by those who seek to fund abortion on demand throughout the world. I urge my colleagues to support the Callahan motion. Vote "yes."

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS].

(Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, what is the problem here? We all accept that abortion should not be performed with American money, and family planning groups have abided by this law.

□ 1115

But the Smith-Callahan language goes one step further and says that these women's health groups cannot perform abortions even in cases of serious health problems of the mother or in cases of serious malformation of the fetus, even if it is performed with private money, money that they raise privately.

The result? Americans cannot provide money to the most efficient, effec-

tive family planning groups, because these groups are made up of health care professionals. These health care providers find it difficult to turn women away from their clinics that have these terribly serious health problems.

Mr. Speaker, there are two problems here. One is China which receives money from the U.N. Fund for Population Assistance, UNFPA. We all agree that we should give money to UNFPA but restrict it in China. We all agree to that. They keep talking about China like it is a problem. It is not a problem. We agree with them.

We just keep talking past each other. We say, give money to the U.N. Fund for Population Assistance, restrict it from China, but grant it to the rest of the world. Smith-Callahan says take this valuable family planning money from all women in the world because there are abuses in China. We say, provide money to private family planning groups that are widespread and have a presence in the most needy countries in the world. Bangladesh, where the average number of children for childbearing women is 6, or Rwanda where the average number of children for women of childbearing age is 7.

Smith-Callahan would deny this family planning money to those groups that are in the most needy countries in the world. We need to start communicating with each other. We need to accept the Senate language and accept that family planning money is essential in this world.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Callahan amendment. One point must be reiterated in this debate—this amendment has nothing to do with abortion. Current law already prohibits the use of U.S. funds for abortion. For 20 years, foreign aid policy and law has clearly stated that U.S. funds cannot be used to pay for abortion services or to lobby on the issue.

What this amendment does do is gut family planning programs—resulting in more abortions.

The Callahan amendment would deny funds to women's health organizations which use their own funds to perform abortions or lobby their governments on abortion policy. This amendment is antifamily planning. I urge my colleagues to recognize that the effect of this provision would be to kill family planning programs.

Let me provide some examples to illustrate the impact of this amendment: A university providing contraceptive training to hospitals in the former Soviet Union would be ineligible for funding because the hospital provides legal abortions funded from other sources. An Indian women's health clinic lobbying that nation's health ministry with its own funds to provide safer conditions for legal abortion would not be eligible for funding.

Ukrainian women average two abortions for every live birth. The average woman will have four or five abortions during her lifetime. Some will have as many as 10 or more. By making safe and reliable family planning information and contraceptives available, a Kiev clinic reports that only 25 percent of pregnant women coming to the clinic had abortions—a high number, of course, but the average for the rest of the country was 60 percent. Sixty percent—and there are many more examples.

There are a number of similar clinics around the world which we are helping to fund. By giving women the opportunity to regulate their own fertility, we have reduced the number of abortions, while empowering women to manage and space their pregnancies to best suit their needs and the needs of their families.

The gentleman from Alabama has argued that family planning funding will still be available if his amendment is adopted—and that is true—but the effect of his amendment will be that the funding will be channeled through foreign government health ministries, with all of the problems of corruption, mismanagement, and bureaucracy which they entail. This approach would also run counter to the philosophy of this Congress, which has been seeking to reduce the intrusions into the lives of families.

The Callahan amendment, and international gag rule, endangers women's health and will deny women and couples access to family planning information. It will increase, not reduce, abortions. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the Callahan amendment and accept the Senate language.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask my good friend, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], if she is aware that during the course of the Reagan and Bush years when the Mexico City policy was in effect that, yes, money went to foreign governments but it also went in record amounts to foreign nongovernmental organizations, including Planned Parenthood, Western Hemisphere, and other organizations that agreed to the Mexico City clause.

So it is untrue that the money will only be funneled through governments. It will also continue to go to nongovernmental organizations as it has in the past.

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

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

One would think there was nothing else in this bill. This is a body of compromise. While we should never compromise our principles, I think that we have worked in a responsible manner in

responding to the constitutional requirements and needs of this administration to provide them with the vehicles they need to implement foreign policy. There are other things in this measure other than this antiabortion debate that is taking place today. The Middle East peace accord is at stake if we do not get this thing fulfilled today and send it to the Senate and let them act more responsibly than they did in the past. We are very optimistic that this can take place and this is the reason we are sending it back to the Senate. We have indications that they think that in this two bodies of compromise that maybe they ought to reconsider their vote of two times before.

I think that we have a good bill. This House has voted favorably for it twice before in the past. It is the same identical thing.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this motion which would insist on the House language which prohibits U.S. funding to any private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organization that directly or indirectly to engage in family planning in a foreign country. This language would effectively eliminate all funding for international family planning organizations.

Organizations like International Planned Parenthood offer basic health care screening and information on family planning. Denying funds to organizations like International Planned Parenthood is nonsensical. This language would implement an international gag rule.

With the world's population growing at an unprecedented rate, one of the most important forms of aid that we provide to other countries is family planning assistance. As a world leader, the United States must work to reduce the complications of pregnancy, childbirth, and unsafe abortions, which are the leading killers of women of reproductive age throughout the third world. One million women die each year as a result of reproductive health problems.

But this debate has nothing to do with abortion itself. Current law prohibits—and has for 20 years—the use of U.S. funds for abortion. Foreign aid policy and law clearly states that U.S. funds may not be used to pay for abortion procedures or to lobby on the issue.

Thus, the proposed language would simply eliminate funding for legal, and essential, health and family planning services—not abortion. Legitimate and effective international health organizations would be punished under the proposed language simply for providing family planning information. I urge my colleagues to defeat this motion.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise again in strong opposition to the Callahan motion to next year's foreign operations appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, just 2 months ago, women from different nations, cultures, and religions came together at the U.N. World Conference on Women in Beijing.

At Beijing, women from around the world spoke about the need to increase access to family planning, particularly in the developing world, where an unwanted pregnancy is often a matter of life or death.

If you believe that women, rich and poor, should have the right to choose safe motherhood, you must vote down the Callahan mo-

tion. If you believe that women should have the right to choose how many children they have and under what conditions, you must vote down the Callahan motion. If you believe that the United States has the obligation to support the United Nations in its efforts to slow the Earth's exploding population, and the misery that comes with it, you must vote down the Callahan motion.

I think that it is an outrage that the House is being forced to debate this issues once again. Come on, this is getting ridiculous.

The House of Representatives needs to get on with its work and send the foreign operations appropriations bill onto the President. We have a conference report, it is a good conference report, and we should not waste the taxpayers' dollars by going back and forth over the issue of international family planning.

I urge my colleagues to support international family planning, support the conference report language for the foreign operations appropriations bill, and vote down the Callahan motion.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support to Mr. CALLAHAN's motion.

For the fourth time this year, we revisit the issue of future U.S. funding of the U.N. Population Fund [UNPFA] and the reinstatement of the Reagan-Bush administration's Mexico City policy. This time—just as 2 weeks ago—the main motivation for the vote is to send a message to our counterparts in the Senate that we are willing to meet them halfway on these funding issues. We are not willing, however, to back down from our stance of allowing the United States to send unrestricted funds to the international abortion industry or to those that have no qualms with a coercive abortion policy.

Even though the three previous House votes on this issue were overwhelmingly positive, I guess we need to once again reiterate to our colleagues in the Senate that we will not weaken language when it comes to defending the life of the most defenseless member of the human race—the unborn child. So with that, I urge my colleagues to stand behind the Callahan motion by voting “yes.”

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky). Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

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

Mr. WILSON. 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 237, nays 183, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 794]

YEAS—237

Allard
Archer

Armey
Bachus

Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)

Ballenger	Goodlatte	Neumann
Barcia	Goss	Ney
Barr	Graham	Norwood
Barrett (NE)	Gunderson	Nussle
Bartlett	Gutknecht	Oberstar
Barton	Hall (OH)	Ortiz
Bateman	Hall (TX)	Orton
Bereuter	Hancock	Oxley
Bevill	Hansen	Packard
Bilirakis	Hastert	Parkar
Bliley	Hastings (WA)	Paxon
Blute	Hayes	Peterson (MN)
Boehner	Hayworth	Petri
Bonilla	Hefley	Pombo
Bonior	Heineman	Portman
Bono	Herger	Poshard
Borski	Hilleary	Quillen
Brewster	Hoekstra	Quinn
Browder	Hoke	Radanovich
Brownback	Holden	Rahall
Bryant (TN)	Hostettler	Regula
Bunn	Hunter	Riggs
Bunning	Hutchinson	Roberts
Burr	Hyde	Roemer
Burton	Inglis	Rogers
Buyer	Istook	Rohrabacher
Callahan	Jacobs	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Roth
Camp	Jones	Royce
Canady	Kanjorski	Salmon
Chabot	Kasich	Sanford
Chambliss	Kildee	Saxton
Chenoweth	Kim	Scarborough
Christensen	King	Schaefer
Clinger	Kingston	Seastrand
Coble	Klecza	Sensenbrenner
Coburn	Klink	Shadegg
Collins (GA)	Knollenberg	Shaw
Combest	LaFalce	Shuster
Cooley	LaHood	Skeen
Costello	Largent	Skelton
Cox	Latham	Smith (MI)
Crane	LaTourette	Smith (NJ)
Crapo	Laughlin	Smith (TX)
Cremeans	Lewis (CA)	Smith (WA)
Cubin	Lewis (KY)	Solomon
Cunningham	Lightfoot	Souder
Danner	Linder	Spence
de la Garza	Lipinski	Stearns
Deal	Livingston	Stenholm
DeLay	LoBiondo	Stockman
Diaz-Balart	Longley	Stump
Dickey	Lucas	Stupak
Doolittle	Manton	Talent
Doyle	Manzullo	Tanner
Dreier	Mascara	Tate
Duncan	McCollum	Tauzin
Dunn	McCrery	Taylor (MS)
Ehlers	McDade	Taylor (NC)
Emerson	McHugh	Tejeda
English	McInnis	Thornberry
Ensign	McIntosh	Tiahrt
Everett	McKeon	Trafficant
Ewing	McNulty	Vucanovich
Fields (TX)	Metcalfe	Waldholtz
Flanagan	Mica	Walker
Foley	Miller (FL)	Walsh
Forbes	Moakley	Wamp
Fowler	Molinari	Watts (OK)
Fox	Mollohan	Weldon (FL)
Frisa	Montgomery	Weldon (PA)
Funderburk	Moorhead	Weller
Galleghy	Murtha	Whitfield
Ganske	Myers	Wicker
Gekas	Myrick	Wolf
Geren	Neal	Young (FL)
Gillmor	Nethercutt	Zeliff

NAYS—183

Abercrombie	Chapman	Doggett
Ackerman	Clay	Dooley
Andrews	Clayton	Durbin
Baesler	Clement	Edwards
Baldacci	Clyburn	Ehrlich
Barrett (WI)	Coleman	Engel
Bass	Collins (IL)	Eshoo
Becerra	Collins (MI)	Evans
Beilenson	Condit	Farr
Bentsen	Conyers	Fattah
Berman	Coyne	Fawell
Bilbray	Cramer	Fazio
Bishop	Davis	Filner
Boehlert	DeFazio	Flake
Boucher	DeLauro	Foglietta
Brown (FL)	Dellums	Ford
Brown (OH)	Deutsch	Frank (MA)
Bryant (TX)	Dicks	Franks (CT)
Cardin	Dingell	Franks (NJ)
Castle	Dixon	Frelinghuysen

Frost	Maloney	Sabo
Furse	Markey	Sanders
Gejdenson	Martinez	Sawyer
Gephardt	Martini	Schiff
Gibbons	Matsui	Schroeder
Gilchrest	McCarthy	Schumer
Gitman	McDermott	Scott
Gonzalez	McHale	Serrano
Gordon	McKinney	Shays
Green	Meehan	Sisisky
Greenwood	Meek	Skaggs
Gutierrez	Menendez	Slaughter
Hamilton	Meyers	Spratt
Harman	Miller (CA)	Stark
Hastings (FL)	Minge	Stokes
Hefner	Mink	Studds
Hilliard	Moran	Thomas
Hinchey	Morella	Thompson
Hobson	Nadler	Thornton
Horn	Obey	Thurman
Hoyer	Olver	Torkildsen
Jackson-Lee	Owens	Torres
Jefferson	Pallone	Torricelli
Johnson (CT)	Pastor	Towns
Johnson (SD)	Payne (NJ)	Upton
Johnson, E.B.	Payne (VA)	Velazquez
Johnston	Pelosi	Vento
Kelly	Peterson (FL)	Visclosky
Kennedy (MA)	Pickett	Ward
Kennedy (RI)	Pomeroy	Waters
Kennelly	Porter	Watt (NC)
Klug	Pryce	Waxman
Kolbe	Ramstad	White
Lazio	Rangel	Williams
Leach	Reed	Wilson
Levin	Richardson	Wise
Lewis (GA)	Rivers	Woolsey
Lincoln	Rose	Wyden
Lofgren	Roukema	Wynn
Lowey	Roybal-Allard	Yates
Luther	Rush	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—12

Brown (CA)	Goodling	Mfume
Chrysler	Houghton	Tucker
Dornan	Kaptur	Volkmer
Fields (LA)	Lantos	Young (AK)

□ 1144

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Dornan for, with Ms. Kaptur against.

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

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 794, the Callahan motion to disagree to the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 115 on the foreign assistance appropriations conference report, I am not recorded. I was in conference with the majority leader of the Senate at that time and unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

□ 1145

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2020, TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 267 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 267

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2020) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, 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. If the conference report is adopted, then a motion that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 132 shall be considered as adopted.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN], 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. Speaker, House Resolution 267 is a rule waiving points of order for the conference report to accompany H.R. 2020, the Treasury, Postal Service, and general Government appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996. H.R. 2020 provides funds for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies.

The rule waives points of order against the conference agreement and its consideration. In addition, the rule disposes of the amendment in disagreement by including a provision which considers the House's insistence on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, numbered 132, as adopted with the conference report's adoption. In other words, to demonstrate the resolve of the House, the rule self-executes out the amendment in disagreement so that the conference report can be passed expeditiously by both Chambers and sent to the President without further delay.

The amendment in disagreement concerned language prohibiting the use of funds for political advocacy by certain Federal grant recipients, and the conferees were unable to decide on advocacy language between Senator SIMPSON's version and Congressman ISTOOK's proposed compromise. The President has indicated that a veto would be likely if this political advocacy language were to be included with the Treasury, Postal bill, and, in a spirit of compromise and in order to get this bill signed as soon as possible, without risking another trip back from the Senate in the interim, this lone amendment in disagreement is disposed of in the rule.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement on H.R. 2020 provides \$11.6 billion in discretionary spending for fiscal year 1996, which is \$646 million less than the fiscal year 1995 level. Thus, this bill saves money and keeps us on a glidepath to a balanced budget in 7 years. There has been some bipartisan cooperation in getting this bill to the