

Mr. Speaker, if you have no fear of the truth, do the right thing.

UNITED STATES-JAPAN AUTO DISPUTE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, as the New York Times recently reported, it is a steep, nearly insurmountable uphill journey to Japan for United States autos and auto parts. It is also an expensive journey, as rigged prices in Japan serve as significant nontariff barriers to higher sales of our goods in that country.

In my hometown of Toledo, OH, the world-renowned Jeep Cherokee is manufactured having a factory price of \$19,100. By the time that Jeep Cherokee clears customs, passes through Japan's Byzantine distribution system, is checked for compliance with 238 regulations and is inspected in no less than 3 places, the sticker price of the same Jeep Cherokee in Nagoya is \$31,372, a 52-percent markup.

Japan claims to be one of the world's greatest competitors. This label seems to be true in every market except their own. The Clinton administration is right to keep its foot on the accelerator of the unfair trade practices of Japan.

Open up your market, Japan. It is long overdue.

MEDICARE REFORM

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, even though the third largest expenditure of the national budget is the interest on the national debt, there are still Members of Congress and the Senate and the administration who are debating the need to balance our budget. I think this is clearly irresponsible, particularly in view of what we want to do for the future of America, for the future of children, students, senior citizens and so forth.

These same people are debating the need to change Medicare, even though the administration has told us that Medicare is going to be out of money and broke within 6 years. The Republican Party is trying to transform Medicare. If you want to help senior citizens, you need to save Medicare.

We are working on insurance reform, trying to make insurance more affordable and more accessible. We are working on some Medicare options so that senior citizens can keep their choice of doctors, so senior citizens can join a health maintenance organization if they choose to, if they can get better care.

We are trying to cut down on the fraud and abuse in the Medicare system which has driven up the price of it. The

average cost payout has gone from \$4,700 to \$6,300. I hope that the Democrats will join the Republicans in trying to save Medicare rather than partisan grandstanding.

MEDICARE AND THE FEDERAL BUDGET

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

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reference to the budget that is before the House and the Senate, and to say as we look toward the Medicare cuts that many of the new Republican majority in the House have indicated that they want these Medicare cuts for the purposes of giving huge tax cuts to the well-to-do in America. I think when we look around and we really study what these Medicare cuts are all about, \$289 billion, we are basically saying that we are going to increase those premiums on the elderly population of this Nation, those recipients of Medicare.

Yes, we ought to reform Medicare. Sure, we ought to look at some type of national health care plan for this country. Sure, those things should happen. But to say like the new Republican majority that we want to cut the Medicare Program for the well-to-do in America, to give them a tax cut, that is wrong, it is mean to the elderly.

We should not let that happen. We ought to take the budget that we have before this House and the Senate and move over the next 7, 8 to 10 years to try to bring about a balanced budget, but let us not do it with the elderly population and the Medicare Program.

PERMISSION FOR CERTAIN COMMITTEES AND SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule:

Committee on Agriculture; Committee on Banking and Financial Services; Committee on Commerce; Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities; Committee on Government Reform and Oversight; Committee on the Judiciary; Committee on National Security; Committee on Resources; and Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

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

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, the majority has consulted with our ranking members on these requests and we have no objection.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

AMERICAN OVERSEAS INTERESTS ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 155 and rule XXIII, the chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1561.

□ 1043

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1561) to consolidate the foreign affairs agencies of the United States; to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal year 1996 and 1997; to responsibly reduce the authorizations of appropriations for United States foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1996 and 1997, and for other purposes, with Mr. GOODLATTE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, May 23, 1995, amendment No. 10, offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], had been disposed of and the bill was open for amendment at any point.

Eight hours and ten minutes remain for consideration of amendments under the 5-minute rule.

Are there further amendments to the bill:

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Smith of New Jersey: In title XXI (relating to authorization of appropriations for Department of State and certain international affairs functions and activities) insert at the end the following new chapter.

CHAPTER 2—GENERAL LIMITATIONS

SEC. 2121. PROHIBITION ON FUNDING FOR ABORTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law or of this Act, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for population assistance activities are authorized to be available for any private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organization that, directly or through a subcontractor or subgrantee, performs abortions in any foreign country, except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term or in cases of forcible rape or incest.

(2) Paragraph (1) may not be construed to apply to the treatment of injuries or illnesses caused by legal or illegal abortions or to assistance provided directly to the government of a country.

(b) LIMITATION ON LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.—

(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law or of this Act, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for population assistance activities are authorized to be available for any private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organization that

violates the laws of any foreign country concerning the circumstances under which abortion is permitted, regulated, or prohibited, or that engages in any activity or effort to alter the laws or governmental policies of any foreign country concerning the circumstances under which abortion is permitted, regulated, or prohibited.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to activities in opposition to coercive abortion or involuntary sterilizations.

SEC. 2122. PROHIBITION ON FUNDING FOR COERCIVE POPULATION CONTROL METHODS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law or of this Act, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act are authorized to be available for the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), unless the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(a) the United Nations Population Fund has terminated all activities in the People's Republic of China; or

(b) during the 12 months preceding such certification there have been no abortions as the result of coercion associated with the family planning policies of the national government or other government 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.

In section 2102(b)(2)(F), delete subsections (iii), (iv), and (v).

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, while the pro-life anti-abortion policies I seek to reinstate in our foreign aid population control programs are not new, recent experience suggests that these pro-life provisions are needed now more than ever before. In recent months, the Government-imposed nightmare of forced abortion and involuntary sterilization in the People's Republic of China has taken yet another turn for the worse.

□ 1045

In February of this year the Government announced a new intensified campaign against women who attempt to have a child without explicit government permission. According to Steven Mosher, the Director of the Asian Studies Center, Claremont Institute, "China's population control policy, which is without question the most coercive in the world, is about to become more so." Mr. Mosher explains on February 14 the Chinese Government announced a new campaign designed to ensure what Mr. Mosher termed as the most rigorous enforcement of its 16-year-old one child per couple policy.

By now I think, Mr. Chairman, most people are aware of the fact that brothers and sisters are illegal in China, and the one child per couple policy instituted in 1979 relies heavily on forced abortion and forced sterilizations to achieve its results. Forced abortion,

Mr. Chairman, is a crime against humanity. This House has gone on record on two occasions to condemn it as a crime against humanity, and we recognized in those resolutions that just as in the Nuremberg war crimes tribunals forced abortion against Polish women was construed to be a crime against humanity, forced abortions in China likewise is such a crime, and sadly it is on the rise in China and sadly as well the U.N. Population Fund is supporting the program to the hilt.

Arrogant leaders, Mr. Chairman, in Beijing have decreed that children should not be born, and the population control cadres march off in lockstep to ensure that millions of women every year are shamelessly violated and their children are poisoned and dismembered.

Last week the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights which I chair heard expert testimony from Dr. John Aird, the former research specialist on China at the United States Census Bureau. Dr. Aird, who is an advocate of abortion rights, who does not support my view on the right to life, nevertheless testified that the brutal, and I quote, "1991 crack-down is continuing." And he also pointed out that it took a turn for the worse in February, and I quote that, "contrary to the claims of some apologists for the Chinese program, it continues to rely on coercive measures to achieve its objective." He also pointed out in his testimony that the Clinton administration's resumption of funding for the U.N. Population Fund was seen by the Chinese Government as a "retreat on the coercion issue and indeed that is what it was."

Mr. Chairman, a retreat on coercion is a retreat on human rights. It is a retreat and abandonment of women who are exploited by their government with international organizations joining in and it is a retreat from the protection and the advocacy of children.

The language in the bill now, Mr. Chairman, and the substitute that will be offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], would codify that retreat by paying lip service to concerns about coercion, all the while facilitating U.S. taxpayer funds to the U.N. Population Fund, which unapologetically applauds the Chinese program. Make no mistake about it, the substitute will allow the money to get there and adds some language that looks good. It is form without substance.

Let me remind Members that the U.N. Population Fund cannot say enough good things about the Chinese program. In 1989, even when many abortion advocates in Congress had come to recognize the widespread coercion in China, Dr. Sadig, the executive director of UNFPA, continued to defend the programs as she does today, but she said at that time, "the UNFPA firmly believes, and so does the Government of the People's Republic of China, that their program is a totally

voluntary program." She also said that China has—and she gushed with this—"has every reason to feel proud of and pleased with its remarkable achievements made in its family planning policy, and control of its population."

"Now the country," she goes on to say, "could offer its experiences and special experts to help other countries." God forbid that that happen, that the Chinese policy, which has pervasive use of forced abortion and forced sterilizations, be exported to other countries to impose that kind of exploitation on women.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, these kinds of statements make a mockery of human rights and the idea that the UNFPA says over and over again that the Chinese program is voluntary does not comport with reality. It is a whitewash of very, very, serious crimes.

A police state, I would submit, could not ask for a better front. If the U.N. Population Fund was fronting for international terrorists or perhaps a drug cartel, we would not hesitate for a moment in redirecting U.S. taxpayer funds to more worthy recipients, which is exactly what Presidents Reagan and Bush had done when they were in office. They, like me and like many Members of Congress, believe that fronting for crimes against women and children is unconscionable.

Mr. Chairman, just let me remind Members, and Mr. Mosher and others have pointed this out—and again, he is the one who broke the story back in the early 1980's—in China today women who have an unauthorized birth, because again the government tells you when and if you can have that child. And you are only allowed one, they tell you when and if, and if you fight that, women are arrested, they are taken to abortion clinics in handcuffs, and they are tied up and they are forcibly aborted.

Pregnant women are routinely incarcerated, embarrassed until they acquiesce and make the voluntary decision because they have nowhere else to turn. It is not voluntary, it is coercion. They are forced to attend study sessions away from their families until they agree to have abortions. They are forced to carry out sterilizations without their consent. Infants' skulls are crushed, very often late in the term of the pregnancy as a routine. Often when children are being born to a woman who has an unauthorized child she is carrying. Can you imagine it, a country where children are illegal? And here we have—often have the injecting of iodine, alcohol, or formaldehyde into the cranium of the child as the child is emerging from the womb.

Also, Amnesty International just came to us with a chilling report on

how two villages are being focused upon because they refuse to comply, and their homes have been bulldozed, their women have been raped, and there has been torture to get compliance with forced abortions and with the one-child-per-couple policy.

There is also the issue of missing girls, a whole generation of girls, and you are only allowed one. Particularly in the Chinese culture, very often boys are the preference, and that is just the way they do it, but girls are screened out by way of an ultrasound or some other way, and they are killed because they are only allowed one, and the families say if they are only allowed one it is going to be a boy. There is a whole missing generation of girls. Infanticide is on the rise in China.

We are poised, if the Morella amendment were to pass—and unfortunately in the first 2 years of the Clinton administration we are giving money to the group that is out there providing tangible assistance, people on the ground to help and assist these Chinese population-control zealots.

Mr. Chairman, let me remind Members as well that UNFPA, in addition to providing cover and tangible assistance, has pumped over \$100 million into this heinous program, and it is the kind of program that only a Nazi could be proud of.

Mr. Chairman, let me also say that the language that I am offering today also would restore longstanding policy as it relates to the so-called Mexico City policy, which erected a wall of separation between family planning and abortion. I remember when President Reagan first announced that back in 1984, Members said no one will accept those clauses. Well, most of the family planning organizations said we want to provide family planning, not abortion, so they accepted it and they and their subcontractees decided to get out of the abortion business.

This is especially important in light of the fact that most of the countries of the world protect their unborn children. Between 95 and 100 nations, virtually all of Central and South America, have laws on their books that protect their unborn children. We are out of the mainstream of human rights when we put those children at such grave risk and allow them to be killed. But let us not export it.

Again, family planning money during the Reagan and Bush years flowed uninterrupted. Only groups like International Planned Parenthood Federation of London, a London-based organization, and PPF of America, their foreign-based organizations, would not accept it, and I say this noting that a number of IPPF affiliates did accept it. They countered what the national office was doing and they said we want to provide family planning and we want to get out of the abortion business.

Mr. Chairman, let me just conclude by saying that this amendment is pro-life. It is backed by all of the pro-life organizations. The amendment of the

gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] I like CONNIE MORELLA, she is a good friend and colleague—is opposed by all of the pro-life organizations. It is form without substance. It repeats some of the current law and tries to substitute that with the substantive language that we are offering today.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, first, this amendment was defeated in the Committee on International Relations and was proposed by the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS]. I am prochoice, but I am adamantly opposed to forced abortions and certainly against sterilization and the policies of the Chinese Government on these issues, but neither does the United Nations Population Control nor any other multilateral or nongovernmental organization working in China fund abortions or support coercive family planning practices.

But because there are forced abortions and sterilizations taking place in China, the Congress, this Congress, previously has mandated that no United States money provided to the United Nations Population Control may be used in China. That is the law today there, and I support this approach.

This amendment is totally unnecessary. It goes far beyond the existing law that we have. It has far-reaching implications for all United States-supported international health and family planning activities.

The real purpose of this amendment is to cut off all U.S. funding for population control worldwide without a doubt.

The United Nations Population Control is the leading multilateral organization providing voluntary family planning services in the developing world. In this bill we already repeat existing law, the Kemp-Kasten language which ensures that no U.S. money go directly or indirectly to support these Chinese programs. This language allows us to take a forceful stand against China without undermining overall multilateral efforts in population planning worldwide.

I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, the same as they did in committee.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. MORELLA TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. MORELLA to amendment No. 19 offered by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey: Page 1, strike line 4 and all that follows and insert the following:

(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law or of this Act, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for population assistance activities are authorized to pay for the performance of abortions in any foreign country, except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term or in cases of rape or incest.

(2) Paragraph (1) may not be construed to apply to the treatment of injuries or illnesses caused by unsafe abortions.

(b) LIMITATION ON LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.—

(1)(A) Notwithstanding any other provision of law or of this Act, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for population assistance activities are authorized to be available for any private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organization that violates the laws of any foreign country concerning the circumstances under which abortion is permitted, regulated, or prohibited.

(B) Notwithstanding any other provision of law or of this Act, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for population assistance activities are authorized to be available to lobby for or against abortion.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to activities in opposition to coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization.

SEC. 2122. UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND LIMITATIONS ON FUNDING.

(a) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law or of this Act, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act are authorized to be available for the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), unless the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) either—

(A) the United Nations Population Fund does not support coercive abortion and that no United States funds have been used for activities in the People's Republic of China; or

(B) during the 12 months preceding such certification there have been no abortions as a result of coercion associated with the family planning policies of the national government or other governmental entities within the People's Republic of China; and

(2) the United States representative to the governing board of the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) has made an official request that UNFPA censure Chinese coercive practices and transmit a report of the action taken on such request to the appropriate congressional committees of the Congress.

(b) DEFINITION.—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.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I offer this perfecting amendment on behalf of the prime sponsor, the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS], who could not be here today because of illness. Mrs. MEYERS is a member of the committee. The amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] was rejected by the full committee, which supported Mrs. MEYERS.

This perfecting amendment states that no American money may be used to perform an abortion overseas except in the case of rape, incest, or endangerment of the mother's life. No American money may be used to lobby either for or against abortion, and no American money may be spent by the UNFPA in China, and further, the

United States representative to the UNFPA must ask UNFPA to condemn Chinese coercion. The bill already reduces our aid to UNFPA by the percentage of its budget which the UNFPA spends in China.

I want to also indicate exactly what it is we are talking about here. This is not, Mr. Chairman, whether or not U.S. taxpayers' money should be going to pay for abortions. This is already prohibited by current law. The Smith amendment strikes directly at women's rights to access family planning information, to space and time their pregnancies to suit the needs of their families, and to prevent pregnancy if they do not want more children. Access to family planning information and contraception decreases abortions, and we have many examples of that.

The amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], by cutting out funding of organizations solely because they have an opinion on abortion, will deny money to those groups which have been most effective in preventing unwanted pregnancies.

□ 1100

This proposal is even more extreme than the Reagan administration's Mexico City policy that denied funding only to groups which actually performed abortions, and this amendment will not just affect groups like Planned Parenthood. The provisions threaten any number of humanitarian assistance organizations sponsored by prolife religious institutions. After all, the U.S. Catholic Conference lobbies on abortion. The proposal offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] will deny funds to Catholic Relief Services. The United States foreign assistance funds have, to the greatest extent possible, been channeled through nongovernmental organizations, because they use the money more effectively and with greater accountability than Government agencies. The Smith amendment will, by default, require population assistance to be channeled through foreign government agencies and less of the money will be available to assist those that it is meant to assist.

The amendment that I offer today will maintain current law. No U.S. taxpayers' money will be used to finance abortion. That is the current law. No U.S. taxpayers' money will be used to lobby for more liberal abortion laws. That is already the law. No United States taxpayers money will be spent by UNFPA in China. This is currently the law.

I would like to also point out, Mr. Chairman, the Smith amendment is extreme because it would defund organizations that perform legal abortions or engage in abortion-related advocacy with their own funds. It is an attempt to revive the so-called Mexico City policy and place a new twist on an old gag rule. It is, in fact, an international gag rule. And the gag rule has been repudiated by Congress.

This version would go far beyond cutting off family planning assistance, however. It would cut off any U.S. foreign aid for child survival programs, HIV-AIDS prevention programs, and other basic health services if a local hospital also provides legal abortion services.

Similarly, indigenous women's organizations that receive U.S. aid to improve, the status of women or to promote female literacy would also be defunded if they engage with their non-U.S. funds in efforts to influence their own country's abortion law either for or against.

And, quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, the Smith amendment would have no impact on access to abortion. Rather, it would only hinder access to family planning and other health and development programs centered on the needs of women.

Despite its ostensible goal of reducing abortion, during the time the Mexico City policy was in effect, which was 1985 to 1993, there was no decrease in the number of abortions worldwide, no decrease.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mrs. MORELLA was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, instead, it perpetuated the situation where women resorted to unsafe abortions in the absence of access to quality family planning and information about safe abortion. According to the World Health Organization, 500,000 women die each year of pregnancy-related causes, 99 percent in the developing world, and up to one-third of these maternal deaths are attributable to septic or incomplete abortion.

Indeed, the only impact of the old Mexico City policy as well as the new, more sweeping version offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is to interfere with the delivery of effective family planning and other development programs whose purpose is to reduce the incidence of unwanted pregnancy and the need for abortion. The prime target of the amendment that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who is my friend, has offered, the prime target concerning China is the United Nations Population Fund, UNFPA. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the anti-abortion movement are using the UNFPA's presence in China as a pretext for pressing for United States withdrawal from supporting UNFPA altogether, and, indeed, they succeeded in convincing some administrations to boycott UNFPA for almost a decade until funding was resumed by the Congress, with the support of the administration, in 1994.

Operating in over 140 countries, besides China, UNFPA is the principal multilateral organization providing worldwide family planning and population assistance. Nearly half of

UNFPA assistance is used for family planning services and maternal and child health care in the poorest and most remote regions of the world. And since its founding, UNFPA has saved the lives of countless women and children.

And I, frankly, think the amendment is unnecessary. Current law already denies foreign aid funding to any organization or program that supports or participates in the management of a program of coerced abortion or involuntary sterilization, and this is in any country under the so-called Kemp-Kasten amendment, which is restated in H.R. 1561.

And, further, current law also ensured that none of the United States contributions to UNFPA may be used in its China program, including numerous penalties for any violation of this requirement.

So, current restrictions and conditions are reiterated in H.R. 1561, as amended by the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MYERS], in committee. So, frankly, for that and a lot of other reasons, if we want to avoid abortions, if we want to allow these organizations to help women and children in countries throughout the world, then I ask this body to vote for the Morella-Meyers-Porter-Gilman amendment.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in sharp opposition to the amendment to the amendment.

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, if you think abortion is a good idea or if you think it is a neutral idea or if you think it is an acceptable solution to unwanted pregnancies, then this amendment is for you.

But if you are troubled by abortion, if you understand the difference between family planning, which prevents a conception from occurring, or facilitate one if you want to get pregnant, as distinguished from abortion, which kills the life of an unborn child once it has begun, and those are the words of Planned Parenthood, which used them in a brochure for some years until they got into the business of promoting abortions, then they backed away from it, abortions kill a human life. They do not kill an animal, a vegetable or a mineral. And so if you think that is a good idea and a helpful idea, there are just too many people in the world and once they get created in the womb, exterminate them, then this is a good amendment.

But if you do not think American money should go to pay for exterminating unborn children, this is a terrible amendment and ought to be opposed.

Now, family planning is one thing. This country supports family planning. But it should not and ought not, and by defeating this amendment will not, support abortion. And those are 2 different ideas. One prevents a conception; the other exterminates it once it has begun.

In this country, now, following, Roe versus Wade, we have had over 33 million abortions. Is that a figure to be proud of?

I hope and pray and believe that this Congress will back away funding organizations that support abortion.

Now, the UNFPA, with all of its gimmicks and its semantic gymnastics, at the end of the day they support the Chinese coerced abortion policy. Nothing is more evil or inhuman that coercing a woman to have an abortion because it conflicts with the population policy. And yet that is what China does, and that is what the UNFPA supports.

Oh, they have a bookkeeping gimmick, but money is fungible, and that would not deceive anybody, and it ought not deceive you.

Now, we support population control if it is done through family planning, and by withdrawing the money from the UNFPA, there are still some 350 family planning organizations that will receive the largesse, the taxpayers' money to pay for family planning around the world. But the two organizations that do not want to take the money under those terms are International Planned Parenthood and the Planned Parenthood Federation of America. Well, they get plenty of money from other sources, from the abortion culture. Let them get it. But the taxpayers ought to make sure their money does not go to support killing unborn children.

And, therefore, I urge you, with all the vigor I can muster, to reject the Morella amendment. I mean no reflection on the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] or her cosponsors, who are all wonderful people. They just are not as offended by abortion as I am, and I hope this amendment will be defeated.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Smith amendment and in support of the Morella perfecting amendment. The Smith amendment would do nothing to stop China's policy of coerced abortions to which I object just as strongly as does the gentleman from New Jersey. It is merely an attack on international family planning efforts which I strongly support.

The coercive abortion policy in China violates all principles of a modern society. Despite overwhelming evidence of forced abortions and involuntary sterilization, the Chinese Government denies it is conducting a campaign of intimidation and violence against the Chinese people. We must condemn this brutal policy, which deprives families of real choices and threatens hundreds of thousands of lives. We must ensure that no United States funds contribute to China's repression and violation of individual liberties.

That is why we have a compromise that strikes a sensible balance between the need to censure China for its deplorable policies, while restoring the

United States commitment to critical family planning programs in other nations that are trying hard to struggle with exponential population growth which makes their economic development goals even more difficult to meet. The family planning portion of the bill before us today accomplishes these goals. It imposes strong policies to confront the abuses, and imposes tough restrictions on the use of United States funds. We continue to ensure that no UNFPA would be used in China.

One of the most important forms of aid we promise 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 abortion.

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.

Today we have the opportunity to ensure funding for the United Nations populations fund, funding which has been held hostage to anti-abortion politics in the past. Today, we can make a real difference in the lives of millions of women, and the future of our planet.

Yet despite the opportunity to make real progress in world health, some would punish UNFPA, developing nations, and many other public health organizations around the world for China's policies. Approval of the Smith amendment would mean denying funds not only for UNFPA, but for critical projects all over the world.

Let us be frank. The language currently in the foreign aid bill makes clear that no United States funds shall be used in China. A vote for the Smith amendment is a vote against sensible, cost-effective international family planning programs.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Smith amendment. And support the Morella perfecting amendment.

□ 1115

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

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee I rise in strong support of

the Smith amendment and in opposition to the Morella amendment, and I would also like to make clear that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], who spoke so eloquently just a few minutes ago, when he was speaking out against the amendment, he was referring to the Morella amendment. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] strongly supports the Smith amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague from New Jersey, Mr. SMITH, is one of the great leaders of the pro-life movement, along with the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. HYDE and also the gentlewoman from Nevada, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, who will be speaking shortly, and I want to commend all three of them for their commitment over the years to the defense of the innocent unborn.

This amendment will simply restore the pro-life policies that served as the basis for U.S. international population policy during the Reagan and Bush administrations. Even though the American people strongly oppose the use of tax dollars for abortions, the Clinton administration has embarked on a worldwide crusade to promote abortion in the developing world. The Smith amendment attempts to curb that crusade by preventing U.S. tax dollars from going to any private, nongovernmental or multilateral organization that directly or indirectly performs abortions in foreign countries.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Smith amendment is a sensible amendment, it is a much-needed amendment, and it is the right thing to do. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Morella substitute and in support of the Smith amendment and to compliment my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], on his sustained, vigorous and forthright leadership on the issue of opposition to abortions performed with U.S. funds overseas. He has been vigilant on this issue and has led the way on the committee and in the House year after year.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot allow U.S. funds to be used for population control programs in other countries where abortion is the means of population control. It is just that simple.

If we do not support such policies at home, and we do not—consistently under the Hyde language year after year we have opposed the funding of abortions with U.S. taxpayer dollars here at home—we should not be promoting such practices or allowing such practices to take place overseas. An unborn human being is still a human being whether American, or Chinese, or African, or wherever in the world.

Clearly the language offered by our colleague from Maryland would open the way for funds to be moved from one account to another, would make, as the technicians say, those monies fungible

to be used for abortion support activities in other countries, and particularly in China. The language in the bill is insufficient to prevent the use of Federal funds for abortions overseas.

The Smith amendment will tighten that language up, will make it very clear that no U.S. funding to any private, nongovernmental or multilateral organization that directly or indirectly provides funding for or performs abortions in a foreign country can be supported with U.S. taxpayer dollars in our foreign aid program. That principle should be maintained, should be set forth very clearly in law, and the Smith amendment will do so.

Support the Smith amendment. Defeat the Morella amendment.

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

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, the committee did not include in its bill a prohibition on funding for the UNFPA, nor did it impose the Mexico City prohibitions on what international family planning organizations can do with their own funds overseas. The Smith amendment was specifically not adopted by the committee, and for good reason, because it is not in the best interests of the United States, and that is what any foreign policy bill is all about.

Mr. Chairman, the United States is the largest international donor of funds for voluntary family planning. We recognize that a host of international issues, including economic development, immigration, political stability, health, and the environment are all linked to population. Providing targeted family planning assistance to nations that request it is in our Nation's interest.

The U.S. voluntary family planning program is a proven success. In Kenya there was a 20-percent reduction in family size in just 4 year, done through voluntary family planning. In Bangladesh the contraceptive prevalence rate went from 5 percent in 1975 to 40 percent in 1993, and there was a decline in fertility from 6.7 births per woman to 4.9, voluntarily. In Egypt the average number of children per family has declined from 5.8 to 3.9 between 1960 and 1994 through voluntary family planning.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] aims at an egregious practice of coercive abortion in China that all of us deplore, but the Smith amendment guts United States bilateral and multilateral population programs, and it would first effectively cut off all United States funds to UNFPA, which operates not in China alone, but in 140 developing countries, including the poorest countries in the world, only one of which is engaged in coercive practices. He claims correctly that China is engaged in a regime of coercive family planning practices, but he would condi-

tion all United States contributions to UNFPA on its pulling out of China, and there is not anybody who does not understand that a U.N. agency cannot pull out of a member country. It cannot unilaterally pull out of China.

Mr. Chairman, the Smith amendment is a killer amendment for all U.S. family planning programs.

The UNFPA activity in China is minuscule, and very little, or none, of it goes to support the Government. The UNFPA is not supporting coercive practices. It has a total annual budget of \$275 million. Only \$4 to \$5 million goes to China. China's own family planning expenditures are \$1 billion a year. UNFPA is not part of the problem in China, it is part of the solution.

Mr. Chairman, the Morella amendment would prohibit any United States funding going to UNFPA unless the President would certify that the UNFPA does not support coercive abortions in China. That is a reasonable way to approach the problem.

The bill also contains language walling off all United States funds into a separate account that cannot be used in China, and United States law has long prohibited funds in this bill from being used to perform abortions overseas.

These are reasonable protections. They ensure that U.S. funds are not used for coercion or for abortions, but allow truly voluntary family planning programs, the ones that we supported in 139 other countries, to continue, all of which would be cut off if the Smith amendment were to be adopted.

Second, the Smith amendment prohibits U.S. funds from going to the most active and effective voluntary family planning organizations overseas, including Planned Parenthood, and it reinstates the so-called Mexico City language keeping AID from funding the most experienced, successful NGO's in family planning.

The Smith amendment keeps U.S. funds from going to entities that use their own funds for performing abortions or for engaging in any activity or effort to alter the laws of any foreign country concerning the circumstance under which abortion is performed, regulated, or prohibited.

This is, in effect, an international gag rule.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not say or support abortion as a legitimate family planning method; it is certainly not, and we do not fund it. But this amendment keeps organizations from promoting their own agenda with their own funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PORTER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. PORTER. It is the equivalent of in the United States prohibiting hospitals using title X funds on the first floor from performing privately funded abortions on the third floor. Existing

law already prohibits U.S. funds from going for abortions.

Mr. Chairman, I would say that the Smith amendment is extreme, it prevents organizations from using their own funds for their own legal purposes, and it would, together with the part dealing with UNFPA, effectively destroy U.S. voluntary family planning programs in 139 countries that depend upon our support and are making real progress in this area voluntarily, not with coercion.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong opposition to the Morella amendment and in very, very strong support of the Smith amendment.

As a background, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and I spent a week in China, the week we went into Beijing Prison No. 1, but we interviewed all of the population people in China, and what they are doing is abysmal, it is just a disgrace. I say to my colleagues, "If you look at the statement by Director of UNFPA, Nafis Sadik, she said China has every reason to feel proud and pleased with its remarkable achievements made in family planning policy and control of its population growth over the past 10 years. Now the country could offer its experience and especially experts to help other countries."

That is crazy. Let me tell my colleagues what we have now found out. We have found out in China, and I am not going to show this picture, but I will show it to any Member that wants to see it, but we have found out in China that in government hospitals, because of their forced abortion policies, they are selling, and I would urge all Members to read this article from Eastern Express that says embryonic food of life; they are selling aborted fetuses, or frankly they are selling aborted babies for money, for about \$1.25 in Hong Kong money. This money will be used by the Chinese indirectly to literally track down women. We have heard, CHRIS and I, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and I have heard, of cases whereby they literally track down women in the villages, and bring them in and force them to have an abortion.

This is a fundamental, important vote; it is much more important than population control. Let me just say, too, that I support birth control, I support money for birth control to India and places like that unable to gain control of the population, but under no circumstances would I ever support, nor should this Congress support, nor should any Member support, giving any American taxpayer money indirectly that goes to China.

Here is a picture of what is not bad to show, of a young lady leaving, leaving with a container of aborted babies, leaving to go to Hong Kong. I say to my colleagues, "When you read this story and look at these pictures, which

I will not show, they will make you sick."

This is a vote on a fundamental, ethical, moral issue. Under no circumstances should any American money go to UNPF and then go to China.

So, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is right, and I commend him for offering this, and I urge all my colleagues, those who have been following this issue and those who may be new, this is a vote that will be watched. The Chinese Government will watch what we will do, and by voting for the Smith amendment we will send the strongest possible message we can to the Chinese Government that their policy of tracking women down, of forced abortions, of selling aborted babies, is fundamentally wrong, and we will support it in no way. A vote for the Smith amendment is a vote, I think, to help a lot of people.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA]. I have a great deal of respect for the gentlewoman from Maryland, but I truly believe she is wrong on this amendment. The Morella amendment would facilitate taxpayer funding to organizations which provide and promote abortion on demand.

I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. Now, some may claim that this amendment is a gag rule on family planning assistance. Nothing could be further from the truth. This amendment would not prevent groups from merely advising women as to what the laws are in each country regarding abortion. Furthermore, 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.

This is just one reason why this amendment is important. This amendment will simply 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.

Most recipients of U.S. population assistance readily agreed to these terms from 1984 to 1993 and this amendment does not reduce the funding level for real international population assistance.

In a time when 69 percent of the American public opposes Federal fund-

ing for abortion this amendment is desperately needed 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 Smith amendment to H.R. 1561.

□ 1130

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Morella amendment and, regretfully, in opposition to the Smith amendment. It is with the highest regard for the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and others who support his amendment that I beg to differ.

I share the gentleman's concern about the number of abortions that occur in our country, and I believe that if some strong language has been used in this debate already, and I will use a couple strong words too, one being hate, which I do not like to use, but if you hate abortion, as we all do, I think you should love family planning, because this is the way that we can reach the goals that I believe we all share, which is to decrease the number of abortions that occur in our country and in the world.

The Morella amendment reasserts the restriction against any U.S. funds being used to fund abortion except where the life of the mother would be endangered. No taxpayer dollars should be used to fund abortion, nor would they be. The amendment also reasserts the restriction against U.S. funds being used for lobbying on the abortion issue. The Morella amendment further reasserts our strong opposition to the coercive population practices in China.

On the Smith amendment, Mr. Chairman, I believe it is inappropriate to pass this amendment because there are some general setbacks that we would suffer should it become the law. Stabilizing population growth is vital to U.S. national interests. Rapid population expansion is a major source of political instability in developing countries as well as a drain on the global environment. That does not mean that we perform abortions in order to control population growth. It means that we should instead be educating people in methods of family planning so that we, again, can control population growth and reduce the number of abortions.

Rapid population growth makes successful development and democratization much less likely. It reduces the quality and availability of health services, limits employment opportunities, and undermines economic and social progress. There has been tremendous progress already achieved in stabilizing world population, but we can do better and indeed we must.

The new international consensus in support of population planning provides an opportunity to achieve global population stabilization within the next generation. Existing law already

prohibits the use of U.S. funds for abortion-related activities. For 20 years there has been a protection in law and policy against using U.S. funds to pay for or advocate abortion.

U.S. population programs focus on providing quality voluntary family planning services. They are directed toward improving maternal and child care of health, slowing the spread of AIDS and HIV and enhancing access to basic education. Population programs work. Since the 1960's, births for women in developing countries have dropped by 37 percent, child mortality by 50 percent, and primary school enrollment is up by 38 percent. U.S. assistance has played an important role in these achievements.

As I said before, there are already strict prohibitions in U.S. funding for abortion as a method of family planning or to motivate or coerce any person to practice abortion. Also, there are strict prohibitions against funding for organizations that support and participate in the management of coercive abortion or in voluntary sterilization. There are existing provisions in the law that prohibit the use of Federal funds for lobbying on abortion.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that, similar to that, indigenous women's organizations that receive U.S. aid to improve the status of women or to promote female literacy would also be defunded if they engage with their non-U.S. funds, with their non-U.S. funds, in efforts to influence their own country's abortion laws, either for or against.

Those are some of the reasons I urge my colleagues to support the Morella amendment and oppose the Smith amendment.

On the subject of China, I am adamantly, as all of our colleagues have declared, adamantly opposed to forced abortion and sterilization and to policies of the Chinese Government on these issues. Neither the UNFPA nor other multilateral or multigovernment organizations working in China fund abortion or support coercive family planning practices. But because forced abortion and sterilization may be taking place in China, and indeed I believe they are, the Congress has mandated that no United States money provided to UNFPA may be used in China. I support this approach. This amendment, the Smith amendment, has far reaching implications for all U.S.-supported health and family planning activities.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Morella amendment and reluctantly to oppose the Smith amendment.

The real purpose of this amendment is to cut off U.S. funding for UNFPA. UNFPA is the leading multilateral organization providing voluntary family planning services in the developing world.

In this bill, we already repeat existing law (the Kemp-Kasten language) which ensures

that no United States money directly or indirectly supports the Chinese program. This language allows us to take a forceful stand concerning China, without undermining overall multilateral efforts in population planning.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, we have now gone 50 minutes with regard to this issue. We have about three speakers on our side. I think the other side has about three speakers. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be limited to 12 noon today, and that the time be equally divided between both sides of the issue. This is with regard to the Smith amendment and all amendments there-to.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time will be equally divided between the minority and the majority to manage.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to control the time on this side.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Who will control time for the majority?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will control the time until the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] returns.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST].

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment of the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA]. The amendment continues the policy of preventing funds provided to UNFPA from being spent in China. Further, the United States representative to the UNFPA must seek condemnation of China's coercive population policy, and the amendment prevents funds to groups that lobby for changes in abortion laws in other countries. It does just about everything that anybody wants it to do.

This amendment is the reasonable approach that our foreign policy should take with respect to family planning programs. The aid provided by the United States for the purpose of improving knowledge and access to family planning methods is an important investment in helping people improve the quality of their lives.

Just listen to some of these statistics. In 1830, the world's population reached 1 billion people. Today the world's population is close to 6 billion people. In the year 2020, 8 billion people are expected to live on earth. In 40 years the population is expected to double, to about 12 billion people. During the years 2000 to 2025, the poorest countries will grow the fastest, accounting for 5.1 billion people of the world's population.

Twenty-five percent of the Earth is land, and that is where we live. We do

not have that much room on the planet.

Mr. Chairman, population conferences such as the Bucharest Conference, the Mexico City Conference, and the Cairo Conference in 1994, all became mired in this controversy about the abortion issue. I really think it is time, people are pleading with us around the world and people are pleading with us in this country, it is time for us to stop the argument and for those who are pro-choice, if I can label that, and pro-life, if I can label that, to get together and think of creative, thoughtful solutions to this most difficult problem.

I do not think there is anybody in this Chamber that favors abortion. But the people who are discussing this issue today recognize the serious, severe potential calamity if we do not reduce the number of people, the huge burgeoning population growth, especially in underdeveloped countries, where they will never have an economy that can support the people, they do not have resources right now that can support their population.

So it is necessary for us to sit down together, pro-choice people, pro-life people, and think of thoughtful, creative solutions that can solve the problem, so that abortions will become unnecessary as a result of the funds that we provide through education.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the gentlewoman from Maryland's amendment.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. INGLIS].

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Smith amendment and in strong opposition to the Morella amendment, and to make three very brief points.

First, I think we need to approach this, every time the word "abortion" is mentioned on this floor, with tremendous compassion for the victims of abortion that are walking around today. Unfortunately, most of us have had experience with abortion. Somewhere in the family there is somebody hurting from this tragedy of abortion. So every time it comes up on the floor, I think it is important to indicate compassion for those for whom this is a very painful memory. The question then becomes why would we export this pain to other countries?

The second point I would like to make is, is it not wonderful to have a bipartisan discussion here? It is sort of a break here on the floor where you have Republicans and Democrats of good faith working together to restore the right policy created in 1984 under Ronald Reagan.

The third point I would like to make is money is fungible. Any time you have funding for a program, the money is fungible. That means if the money comes to that program, yes, it may be

restricted so that it cannot go directly to abortion services, but since money is fungible, it means it frees up other money of that program to go into the provision of those services.

It is very important that we understand what is at stake here. We simply want to return to the Mexico City policy enunciated by President Reagan in 1984 that we will not use taxpayer funded dollars to fund any program in any foreign country that provides abortion services. So it is a very simple point here. What the Morella amendment would like to do is change that policy or actually preserve the now existing policy that we will fund those programs. I believe very strongly we should return to that Mexico City policy and not fund programs that provide abortion services.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], and ask unanimous consent that she be allowed to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD].

□ 1145

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of the Morella amendment to the Smith language.

I believe that every Member of this body who calls him or herself pro-choice should be a yes vote on the Morella amendment but so should every Member of this body who calls him or herself pro-life but also supports family planning, who also supports child survival programs around the world.

The language in the bill gives every Member of this body who is pro-life anything they could possibly want. It prohibits use of U.S. funds for abortion. But it also, unfortunately, produces a result that no Member of this body could possibly want, and that is to deny life saving services to innocent people around the world, many of them children.

Mr. Chairman, whether we are talking about a hospital in Russia, a community center in India or Bangladesh, a hospital in Kenya, where on one side of the hospital, with private funds, abortions are being performed and they will continue to be performed with or without this language, precisely because those nations lack family planning services. And on the other side of the hospital services are being provided that all of the Members in support of my friend's amendment say they support, family planning services, also providing services of child nutrition, child inoculation, services to save young lives.

This amendment would cut off funds to those institutions, simply because in another wing of the hospital, unrelated

to those services, not using American money at all, abortions are performed.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, those of us who do not want to see abortion used as a method of birth control or family planning but do want to see that family planning continues internationally along with American funds for child survival programs should support the Morella amendment. The Morella amendment amending the Smith amendment is a good compromise that we should all support.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, let me point out to my friends that on the Child Survival Program, I take a back seat to nobody. In the mid-1980's, I authored the continuation of that program and made sure that money for immunization and oral rehydration and the like was available.

This language comports, I am not talking about the Morella language, the Smith language, with that whole idea that children born and unborn are precious and valuable. When the Mexico City policy was in effect during the Reagan and Bush years, child survival was not hurt. Family planning organizations had agreed to put a wall of separation between abortion, and family planning got their money. Only the crusaders for abortion disqualified themselves by not agreeing to the walls.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains on both sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] has 8½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. SEASTRAND].

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Smith amendment and strongly oppose the Morella amendment.

The Smith amendment is a straightforward attempt to make sure that the American people are not forced to use their tax dollars to subsidize abortions around the world. I think all Americans, virtually all Americans, no matter where they stand on the issue of abortion, agree that millions of abortions around the world is a human tragedy and what makes this tragedy even worse is the fact that some nations impose abortion.

The Chinese population control policy forces women to have abortions. I can think of few established policies that are more antiwoman or policies that are making women victims.

This is not about family planning. Most Americans support responsible family planning. But support for family planning does not mean support for subsidizing abortions around the world. There is no reason why this Congress should continue to provide financial support for these types of international organizations.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

(Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Morella amendment to the Smith amendment. Family planning money that the United States contributes annually to the United Nations Population Fund has had an extremely positive impact in developing countries throughout the world. In the 28 countries with the largest U.S. AID-sponsored family planning programs, the average number of children born per family has dropped from six in the 1960's to about four today, a decline of nearly one-third.

Providing women with the means to control fertility enables them to better provide for the children they choose to have. Thailand has made controlling the rate of population growth a priority issue in their development, and it has paid off. The average number of children born to Thai women has declined from 6 in the 1960's to the replacement level of 2.1 now. That means better health; that means less poverty; that means less tragedy in the lives of women and children in Thailand and a far better future for everyone.

Let me point out to my colleagues that current law already prohibits the use of U.S. funds to either pay for or lobby for abortion. We do not need the Smith amendment. The Smith amendment, however, would cut off all foreign aid not just for family planning but to any organization that performs abortions so that local hospitals throughout the world that legally perform abortions would be denied any foreign aid for child nutrition programs, disease prevention or other basic health services for women and families, simply because those institutions, according to their national law, perform abortions.

This is tragic. This is a stunning example of U.S. hubris that we are willing to micromanage the domestic and health policies of developing nations.

I urge my colleagues to support the Morella amendment, maintain the ban against any U.S. dollars for abortion, maintain the ban against any U.S. dollars used to lobby for abortion, but preserve health services for women and children and population growth programs, population control programs throughout the world.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, when President Clinton took office in 1993, he changed U.S. family planning policy overseas in fundamental ways.

He reinterpreted law with regard to funding for the U.N. Population Fund so that United States dollars could be used in China, where it is well-known that a brutal and coercive birth quota policy is in place.

Clinton also outright repealed the Mexico City policy, which prohibited United States funding from going to nongovernmental organizations which perform abortions and which lobby internationally for the repeal of laws protecting unborn children and their mothers from abortion.

Now, regardless of one's personal view of whether abortion is right or wrong, one generally agreed-upon principle is that taxpayers' dollars should not be used for its promotion. These drastic policy changes made by the Clinton administration completely fly in the face of this principle.

The Smith amendment contains nothing radical—it simply puts into law what was practiced prior to Clinton's coming to office. It is Clinton's policy that is radical, forcing U.S. taxpayers to fund organizations that promote or lobby for abortion as a method of family planning overseas.

To my colleagues, I say let us stick to the principle that has served U.S. family planning funding overseas well for so many years—that taxpayers should not be forced to support coercive population control or the promotion of abortion as a method of family planning.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on the Morella amendment and a "yes" vote on the Smith amendment.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER].

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

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

This debate has nothing to do with family planning. It has everything to do with coerced family planning. The Smith amendment has everything to do with funding of forced abortions and everything to do the use of American taxpayer dollars to support organizations which perform abortions overseas and which lobby for pro-abortion policies.

As my colleague from Texas just pointed out, the Smith amendment reenacts, simply reenacts, a policy which was in effect during the Reagan and Bush years. I hope my colleagues can agree that the United States should not be spending American taxpayer dollars promoting abortion anywhere or promoting China's forced abortion policy.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Morella amendment and to vote "yes" on the Smith amendment.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] for her leadership on this issue.

I simply ask the question, Mr. Chairman, are we in fact our brothers' and sisters' keepers? And yes, we are. This Nation has been in the forefront of

seeking peace but as well of helping those who cannot help themselves. Unless we implement the Morella amendment, 139 countries across this world will lose opportunities for informed, educated family planning. And yes, millions of families across this international family will lose the opportunity to be informed and educated about the ability to do wise family planning.

Where are we in this instance? Are we willing then to cause the annihilation of young children, through hunger and disease simply because we have not further informed these families of the opportunities of sure family planning?

Mr. Chairman, this is a wise amendment. I encourage us to support the Morella amendment that aids us in providing support for our brothers and sisters across the world for family planning.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON], who has been an outstanding advocate for the pro-life position.

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

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Morella amendment and in support of the Smith amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to give my strong support to the Smith amendment to the bill which codifies the Mexico City policy and prohibits funding to the U.N. Fund for Population Activities unless that organization discontinues all activities in China.

During the 1970's and early 1980's, foreign nongovernment organizations were the major source of funding for a number of groups which promoted abortion and the legalization of abortion in developing countries. Adopted in 1984, the Mexico City policy substantially changed the United States position on funding such organizations by stipulating that the Agency for International Development will NOT fund any private organization which participates in performing or promoting abortion as a method of family planning.

A year later, in 1985, the House approved the Kemp-Kasten amendment which denies funds to organizations that support coercive population programs. Funding is denied the UNFPA due to its active participation in China's population control program—its one-child-per-family program.

Today, the Clinton administration is conducting an ideological crusade to expand access to abortion throughout the developing world. The Clinton administration's policy was announced by Under Secretary Tim Wirth in a speech to a U.N. population meeting in 1993. Mr. Wirth stated that the Clinton administration's position was to, "support reproductive choice, including access to safe abortion" and to make such "reproductive choice" available to every woman by the year 2000.

It is inconceivable to me that as we debate the American Overseas Interest Act—a bill which attempts to support basic human rights across the globe—that the Congress would even consider denying the most basic human right, LIFE.

Mr. SMITH's amendment will codify the Mexico City policy and ensure that United States tax dollars do not support China's coercive population control policies. The Smith amendment is not a gag rule and will have no effect on private organizations that merely advise, counsel, or refer women for whatever types of abortions are legal within a given country. Rather, the Smith amendment will simply ensure that the United States will not pay for abortions or impose a proabortion doctrine in foreign countries.

I urge my colleagues to support the Smith amendment. The right to life is the most fundamental human right—both here and abroad.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Morella amendment and in favor of the Smith amendment.

I would like to cut through all the rhetoric that has been heard here today for a little over the last hour and put it very simply. If you are in favor of using taxpayers money to kill babies, then I say vote for Morella. If you are in favor of saving those babies and not using taxpayers money to kill babies, then I say vote for Smith.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN].

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from New Jersey and the proponents of the Smith approach have some obligation to explain to the body the effectiveness of their strategy.

Coercive abortion and coercive policies are going on in China. We pulled out for many years. Nothing changed. Things got worse. Meanwhile, you cut out a whole bunch of positive, important profamily planning programs all over the world.

The Morella amendment in this bill reduces the amendment by the amendment they put in to China, requires them not to support any process and allows the other programs to go on. You cannot keep pushing things on rhetorical and ideological basis without some look at the consequences of what you are doing. Your policy did not work. You tried it. China went on, continued to do it, and all you have done is hurt important and good programs all around the world.

I urge a vote for the Morella amendment and defeat the Smith amendment.

□ 1200

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH], who is a strong advocate of life.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk about a woman who, except for being in another country, would look a lot like me. Her name is Chee An. She is a Chinese citizen. I want to give the Members her words as she came back from an abortionist.

She said:

The population control official gave me an ultimatum. "I have made an appointment for you tomorrow at 8 a.m.," she told me. "If you miss it, the party secretary swears the consequences will be serious." I knew I had no choice, and the next morning, escorted by the population control officials, I went to the hospital. The following days passed in a haze of emotional pain.

I want to tell the Members, under the Smith amendment we would be assured that our tax dollars would not go to that. I ask American women to listen carefully. After Clinton changed the policy, money can be shifted and shuffled to where money that is given for birth control, as we know it, IUDs, condoms, and such, forces women like Chian into stirrups.

I will tell the Members, I started in the proabortion, and none of us ever believed our tax dollars would go to forcing a woman into stirrups. I have to tell the Members, if there is one woman that is kept from this inhumane position, we have done great things today by passing the Smith amendment.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN].

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, 95 nations, including all, I repeat all, of Latin America, most of Africa, and much of the rest of the developing world have laws that are protective of unborn children. We have allowed our own proabortion laws to undermine American values at the expense of 4,000 children killed every day. The Clinton administration arrogantly believes we should require this poison to be spread to other nations. We need to defeat the Morella amendment and pass the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], our outstanding leader.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask my colleagues how they would think they would feel if they, their loves ones, including families and friends, were forced to live in a land where brothers and sisters were officially declared illegal; where only one child per couple is permitted; where children, if not explicitly authorized by a birth quota system, engineered by the Government, are literally stolen from their moms and killed with poison by population

control fanatics; where, as we talk, a new policy of eugenics reminiscent of the Nazis has just gone into effect across the country, and then to know that the United Nations Population Fund is there whitewashing these crimes against humanity in all kinds of international fora where apologists will stand up and say, "But our money is not going to do that."

We all know money is fungible. The Morella amendment allows the FPA to take the United States donation, put it in their right pocket, and it frees up other money that they would send to China where this terrible crime and exploitation of women is daily practiced.

Remember, too, that the U.N. FPA Executive Director has said that this is a totally voluntary program. That is a big lie, Mr. Chairman. It is not true. It is a terrible crime against women.

She has always said we need to export the experience of the Chinese Government. God forbid. We would never allow it to happen here. If we were told that women had to be forcibly aborted, there would be rioting in the streets. Defeat the Morella amendment. I urge Members to support the underlying amendment, the Smith amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am really very surprised about the rhetoric, not only the hyperbole, but the accuracy of what the amendment would do.

Under the bill already, Mr. Chairman, none of the funds authorized would be used to help manage a program of any coercive abortion. No funds can be used for abortion. No funds can be used for lobbying. In fact, there is a reduction of the percentage that the United States would give to U.N. FPA for any funds that go to China. We have spoken against China's policies. The amendment would also direct the United States representative at the U.N. FPA to censure Chinese policies.

Mr. Chairman, I want to reflect on the previous reference to the woman looking for an abortion. She may well be a Russian woman. Russian women have an average of 9 abortions during their lifetime. Why? Because they do not have access to family planning. We are not talking about any proabortion policies, we are talking about policies that are going to enable people to have the ability to manage their lives and their families, and to avoid the need for any abortion.

The amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is not about cutting off China; it is about cutting off family planning aid to 139 other countries. We know the world population tops 5 billion. Many of us will live to see it double by 2025. I urge adoption of the amendment. The Morella amendment is endorsed by the committee of jurisdiction and I hope by this House.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Morella amendment and in

support of the Smith amendment. The Smith amendment will reinstate the long-standing prohibition on providing taxpayer dollars to any private organization that performs or promotes abortion in foreign countries.

The Smith amendment is correct in recognizing that promoting abortion is never in the true interests of our Nation. Over 95 countries in Central and South America and Africa have laws on the books against abortion on demand. The Hyde amendment, prohibiting taxpayer funded abortions here in the United States, has been in effect for years.

The United States has no business using American taxpayer dollars to overturn abortion laws in other countries. Why would we, as a nation, encourage a practice that is so divisive and controversial in our own country?

The Smith amendment provides clear rules that will ensure that no taxpayer dollars will be diverted for any form of abortion promotion. The outrageous practice of forced abortion in China demands such clear and strong rules as proposed by the Smith amendment.

It should be noted that the Smith amendment will not prevent private individuals from promoting family planning or abortion around the globe. Rather, the Smith amendment reinstates a sound policy that was in effect under the Reagan and Bush administrations. It is a policy that reflects the views of most Americans. Family planning is important but killing the unborn is just as wrong in Africa, Asia, or Latin America as it is in the United States.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, the consequences of rapid population growth include poverty, unemployment, hunger and malnutrition, economic degradation, and urban decay.

These conditions may very well worsen before they improve—especially in countries experiencing high rates of population growth. Forty-five percent or more of the populace in several developing countries—including Libya, Syria, Iraq, Nigeria, Ethiopia, Kenya, Cambodia, Guatemala, and Honduras—have not yet reached their reproductive years.

We must mobilize resources to achieve stabilization of our human numbers through modern, safe, effective family planning. Abortion is not a means of family planning. It is a procedure resorted to when people lack access to modern family planning methods or appropriate information and knowledge about such methods.

Those voting on the Smith amendment should know that it is really not about abortion. It would not prevent a single abortion. It is an amendment to limit funds for the U.N. Population Fund—the largest multilateral provider of family planning services for poor women. Thus, its approval would limit access to family planning, which is what it would indeed do. I intend to vote against it and call on my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], and in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The effect of the Smith amendment would be to cripple the ability of such organizations as the UNFPA and International Planned Parenthood to make available family planning services to millions of women and men around the world, at a time when we need these services more than ever, not less than before.

The rapid growth of the world's human population is the most serious problem the

world—and the U.S.—faces. We must not adopt a policy that would cut off funding to the organizations that are the most effective in reducing unwanted pregnancies, as the Smith amendment would do. To do so would be utterly senseless.

At this moment, nearly 5.7 billion people share our planet. By this time tomorrow, another quarter of a million will be added to that number.

Ninety-five percent of the newcomers will be born in the developing world. Many of them will die in childhood of malnutrition or disease, and most of the rest will live out their lives in countries that cannot begin to adequately take care of their existing populations, where there are already too few jobs, inadequate schools, inadequate health care, inadequate amounts of food and, usually, very little, if any, individual freedom.

By the year 2020, the world's already strained and overexploited resources will have to sustain life for more than 8 billion people—an increase of 2½ billion, most of them desperately poor, in just 25 years.

In much of the developing world, high birth rates, caused largely by the lack of access of women to basic reproductive health services and information, are contributing to intractable poverty, malnutrition, widespread unemployment, urban overcrowding, and the rapid spread of disease. Population growth is stripping the capacity of many nations to make even modest gains in economic development, leading to political instability and negating other U.S. development efforts.

The impact of exponential population growth, combined with unsustainable patterns of consumption, is also evident in mounting signs of stress on the world's environment. Under conditions of rapid population growth, renewable resources are being used faster than they can be replaced. Other direct, and catastrophic, environmental consequences of the world's burgeoning population are tropical deforestation, erosion of arable land and watersheds, extinction of plant and animal species, and pollution of air, water, and land.

Overpopulation, however, is not a problem for developing countries only. Rapid population growth in already overcrowded and underdeveloped areas of the world has given rise to an unprecedented pressure to migrate, as people seek decent, and more hopeful lives for themselves and their families. According to a report by the United Nations Population Fund [UNFPA], over 100 million people, or nearly 2 percent of the world's population, are already international migrants, and countless others are refugees within their own countries. Many of the world's industrialized nations are now straining to absorb huge numbers of people, and in the future, as shortages of jobs and living space in urban areas, and resources such as water, agricultural land, and new places to dispose of waste grow even more acute, there will be even greater pressure to emigrate.

Population growth is an enormous problem, but one we can solve—if we make a determined effort to do so. Over the last three decades, population programs have been remarkably successful. Since the early 1960's, contraceptive use worldwide has gone up from roughly 10 percent of couples to over 50 percent today. And over the same period, the number of births per woman dropped from 6

to 3.3, almost half the fertility of just one generation ago. Much of this progress is a direct result of U.S. involvement. In the 28 countries with the largest USAID-sponsored family planning programs, the average number of children per family has dropped from 6.1 in the mid-1960's to 4.2 today.

These international trends, however, while highly encouraging, conceal great demographic diversity among countries and regions. In most of sub-Saharan Africa and some Pacific Island countries, where family planning services are not yet widely available, contraceptive use is below 15 percent, and women bear an average of six or more children. At the global level, an estimated 350 million couples do not have access to a full range of modern family planning information and services. One indication of the large unmet demand for more and better family planning services is the estimated 50 million abortions that occur every year, many of them unsafe.

But time is of the essence. How quickly we provide worldwide access to family planning and reproductive health services is crucial. Like compound interest applied to financial savings, high fertility rates produce ever-growing future populations. For example, if a woman bears three children instead of six, and her children and grandchildren do likewise, she will have 27 great-grandchildren rather than 216.

That is why it is absolutely essential that we adopt the Morella amendment and continue the progress we have been making toward reducing population growth. At the International Conference on Population and Development [ICPD], held in Cairo last year, the United States was instrumental in helping to build a broad consensus behind a comprehensive program of action, which was signed by almost all of the 180 countries that participated in the conference, and which will help guide the population and development programs of the United Nations and national governments into the next century. Central to this plan is the recognition that with adequate funding this decade for family planning and reproductive health services, as well as educational, economic, and social opportunities necessary to enhance the status of women, we can stabilize world population in the first half of the next century.

The ICPD program of action represents a historic opportunity to address adequately the causes and effects of the world's rapidly growing population, while placing an emphasis on individual choice and freedom. To meet this challenge, the international community—developing and industrial countries alike—has agreed to increase spending dramatically to achieve universal access to family planning and basic reproductive health services. In order to fulfill our responsibility under the Cairo agreement, the United States would need to allocate \$850 million in fiscal year 1996 for international population programs, an increase of more than \$260 million over this year's level.

The U.S. contribution under this bill will no doubt fall short. The fiscal reality of our Nation's fiscal situation has eroded our ability to fully fund even the most effective and cost-efficient programs. But we should still do as much as we can. The Morella amendment will prevent the crippling of our efforts in this area.

Mr. Chairman, combating rapid population growth by ensuring that our limited dollars for

family planning assistance are used as effectively as possible is one of the most humane and farsighted efforts we can undertake. Providing adequate funding now will save many times this expense in future U.S. foreign assistance, will greatly reduce human suffering, and will promote global peace and security.

I urge our colleagues to support the Morella amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 2(c) of rule XXIII, the Chair announces that he may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the period of time within which a rollcall vote by electronic device may be taken without intervening business on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 198, noes 227, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 349]

AYES—198

Abercrombie	Fawell	Lewis (GA)
Ackerman	Fields (LA)	Lincoln
Andrews	Filner	Lofgren
Baessler	Flake	Lowey
Baldacci	Foglietta	Luther
Barrett (WI)	Foley	Maloney
Bass	Ford	Markey
Becerra	Fowler	Martinez
Beilenson	Frank (MA)	Martini
Bentsen	Franks (CT)	Matsui
Berman	Franks (NJ)	McCarthy
Bilbray	Frelinghuysen	McDermott
Bishop	Frost	McHale
Boehlert	Furse	McKinney
Boucher	Gejdenson	Meehan
Brown (CA)	Gephardt	Meek
Brown (FL)	Gibbons	Menendez
Brown (OH)	Gilchrest	Mfume
Bryant (TX)	Gilman	Miller (CA)
Cardin	Gonzalez	Mineta
Castle	Gordon	Minge
Chapman	Green	Mink
Clay	Greenwood	Moakley
Clayton	Gunderson	Moran
Clement	Gutierrez	Morella
Clyburn	Hamilton	Nadler
Coleman	Harman	Neal
Collins (IL)	Hastings (FL)	Obey
Collins (MI)	Hefner	Olver
Condit	Hilliard	Owens
Conyers	Hinchey	Pallone
Coyne	Hobson	Pastor
Cramer	Horn	Payne (NJ)
Danner	Houghton	Payne (VA)
Davis	Hoyer	Pelosi
DeFazio	Jackson-Lee	Pickett
DeLauro	Jacobs	Pomeroy
Dellums	Jefferson	Porter
Deutsch	Johnson (CT)	Pryce
Dicks	Johnson (SD)	Ramstad
Dingell	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Dixon	Johnston	Reed
Doggett	Kaptur	Reynolds
Dooley	Kelly	Richardson
Dunn	Kennedy (MA)	Rivers
Durbin	Kennedy (RI)	Rose
Edwards	Kennelly	Roukema
Ehrlich	Klug	Roybal-Allard
Engel	Kolbe	Rush
Eshoo	Lantos	Sabo
Evans	Lazio	Sanders
Farr	Leach	Sawyer
Fattah	Levin	Schiff

Schroeder	Thomas	Ward
Schumer	Thompson	Waters
Scott	Thornton	Watt (NC)
Serrano	Thurman	Waxman
Shaw	Torkildsen	White
Shays	Torres	Williams
Sisisky	Torricelli	Wilson
Skaggs	Towns	Wise
Slaughter	Trafigant	Woolsey
Spratt	Upton	Wyden
Stark	Velazquez	Wynn
Stokes	Vento	Yates
Studds	Visclosky	Zimmer

NOES—227

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

NOT VOTING—9

Calvert	Hansen	Meyers
Cubin	Klecicka	Peterson (FL)
Fazio	McDade	Rogers

□ 1223

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair advises Members that there has been a problem with one of the voting machines, so the Members are asked to please confirm their vote with the screen and in the voting machine.

□ 1225

Messrs. MOORHEAD, DORNAN, and BUYER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. SABO, CLAYBURN, and DAVIS changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, on roll-call No. 349, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 240, noes 181, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 350]

AYES—240

Allard	Clinger	Ganske
Archer	Coble	Gekas
Army	Coburn	Geren
Bachus	Collins (GA)	Gillmor
Baker (CA)	Combest	Goodlatte
Baker (LA)	Condit	Goodling
Ballenger	Cooley	Goss
Barcia	Costello	Graham
Barr	Cox	Gutknecht
Barrett (NE)	Cramer	Hall (OH)
Bartlett	Crane	Hall (TX)
Barton	Crapo	Hancock
Bateman	Creameans	Hastert
Bereuter	Cunningham	Hastings (WA)
Bevill	Danner	Hayes
Bilirakis	de la Garza	Hayworth
Bliley	Deal	Hefley
Blute	DeLay	Heineman
Boehner	Diaz-Balart	Hergert
Bonilla	Dickey	Hilleary
Bonior	Doolittle	Hoekstra
Bono	Dornan	Hoke
Borski	Doyle	Holden
Brewster	Dreier	Hostettler
Browder	Duncan	Hunter
Brownback	Dunn	Hutchinson
Bryant (TN)	Ehlers	Hytche
Bunn	Emerson	Inglis
Bunning	English	Istook
Burr	Ensign	Jacobs
Burton	Everett	Johnson, Sam
Buyer	Ewing	Jones
Callahan	Fields (TX)	Kanjorski
Camp	Flanagan	Kaptur
Canady	Foley	Kasich
Chabot	Forbes	Killdee
Chambliss	Fowler	Kim
Chenoweth	Fox	King
Christensen	Frisa	Kingston
Chrysler	Funderburk	Knollenberg
Clement	Galleghy	LaFalce

LaHood	Norwood	Smith (MI)
Largent	Nussle	Smith (NJ)
Latham	Oberstar	Smith (TX)
LaTourette	Obey	Smith (WA)
Laughlin	Ortiz	Solomon
Lewis (CA)	Orton	Souder
Lewis (KY)	Oxley	Spence
Lightfoot	Packard	Stearns
Linder	Parker	Stenholm
Lipinski	Paxon	Stockman
Livingston	Peterson (MN)	Stump
LoBiondo	Petri	Stupak
Longley	Pombo	Talent
Lucas	Portman	Tanner
Manton	Poshard	Tate
Manzullo	Quillen	Tauzin
Mascara	Quinn	Taylor (MS)
McColum	Radanovich	Taylor (NC)
McCrery	Rahall	Tejeda
McHugh	Regula	Thornberry
McInnis	Riggs	Thornton
McIntosh	Roberts	Tiahrt
McKeon	Roemer	Tucker
McNulty	Rohrabacher	Volkmer
Metcalfe	Ros-Lehtinen	Vucanovich
Mica	Roth	Waldholtz
Miller (FL)	Royce	Walker
Moakley	Salmon	Walsh
Molinari	Sanford	Wamp
Mollohan	Saxton	Watts (OK)
Montgomery	Scarborough	Weldon (FL)
Moorhead	Schaefer	Weldon (PA)
Murtha	Seastrand	Weller
Myers	Sensenbrenner	Whitfield
Myrick	Shadegg	Wicker
Neal	Shaw	Wolf
Nethercutt	Shuster	Young (AK)
Neumann	Skeen	Young (FL)
Ney	Skelton	Zeliff

Wilson	Wyden	Zimmer
Wise	Wynn	
Woolsey	Yates	

NOT VOTING—13

Calvert	Johnston	Meyers
Cubin	Klecza	Peterson (FL)
Fazio	Klink	Rogers
Franks (NJ)	McDade	
Hansen	McDermott	

□ 1235

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Calvert for, with Mr. Johnston of Florida against.

Mrs. Cubin for, with Mr. McDermott against.

Mr. DAVIS and Mr. THOMAS changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, on roll-call No. 350, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally in order that the House may receive a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) assumed the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will receive a message.

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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

AMERICAN OVERSEAS INTERESTS ACT OF 1995

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MCKINNEY

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment numbered 16 offered by Ms. MCKINNEY: After chapter 5 of title XXXI of the bill, insert the following new chapter (and redesignate the subsequent chapter accordingly and make other appropriate conforming amendments):

CHAPTER 6—ARMS TRANSFERS CODE OF CONDUCT

SEC. 3174. SHORT TITLE.

This chapter may be cited as the "Code of Conduct on Arms Transfer Act of 1995".

SEC. 3175. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

- (1) Approximately 40,000,000 people, over 75 percent civilians, died as a result of civil and international wars fought with conventional weapons during the 45 years of the cold war, demonstrating that conventional weapons can in fact be weapons of mass destruction.
- (2) Conflict has actually increased in the post cold war era, with 34 major wars in progress during 1993.

NOES—181

Abercrombie	Furse	Moran
Ackerman	Gejdenson	Morella
Andrews	Gephardt	Nadler
Baesler	Gibbons	Olver
Baldacci	Gilchrest	Owens
Barrett (WI)	Gilman	Pallone
Bass	Gonzalez	Pastor
Becerra	Gordon	Payne (NJ)
Beilenson	Green	Payne (VA)
Bentsen	Greenwood	Pelosi
Berman	Gunderson	Pickett
Bilbray	Gutierrez	Pomeroy
Bishop	Hamilton	Porter
Boehlert	Harman	Pryce
Boucher	Hastings (FL)	Ramstad
Brown (CA)	Hefner	Rangel
Brown (FL)	Hilliard	Reed
Brown (OH)	Hinche	Reynolds
Bryant (TX)	Hobson	Richardson
Cardin	Horn	Rivers
Castle	Houghton	Rose
Chapman	Hoyer	Roukema
Clay	Jackson-Lee	Roybal-Allard
Clayton	Jefferson	Rush
Clyburn	Johnson (CT)	Sabo
Coleman	Johnson (SD)	Sanders
Collins (IL)	Johnson, E.B.	Sawyer
Collins (MI)	Kelly	Schiff
Conyers	Kennedy (MA)	Schroeder
Coyne	Kennedy (RI)	Schumer
Davis	Kennelly	Scott
DeFazio	Klug	Serrano
DeLauro	Kolbe	Shays
Dellums	Lantos	Sisisky
Deutsch	Lazio	Skaggs
Dicks	Leach	Slaughter
Dingell	Levin	Spratt
Dixon	Lewis (GA)	Stark
Doggett	Lincoln	Stokes
Dooley	Lofgren	Studds
Durbin	Lowey	Thomas
Edwards	Luther	Thompson
Ehrlich	Maloney	Thurman
Engel	Markey	Torkildsen
Eshoo	Martinez	Torres
Evans	Martini	Torricelli
Farr	Matsui	Towns
Fattah	McCarthy	Trafficant
Fawell	McHale	Upton
Fields (LA)	McKinney	Velazquez
Filner	Meehan	Vento
Flake	Meek	Visclosky
Foglietta	Menendez	Ward
Ford	Mfume	Waters
Frank (MA)	Miller (CA)	Watt (NC)
Franks (CT)	Mineta	Waxman
Frelinghuysen	Minge	White
Frost	Mink	Williams