

resources, otherwise the process is brought to an absolute standstill.

Only judges can exercise judicial power. There is no substitute. I urge my colleagues to fill and fund these vacancies and provide much needed help to judges, not only in Florida but across this Nation.

FLOOD RELIEF

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the Government shutdown artists are at it again. Americans watched with disgust as this House Republican leadership shut down the Government and frittered away one and a half billion dollars of taxpayers' hard-earned money. Well now, this same crowd is in control, and they propose to shut down flood relief moneys to families desperate for assistance throughout the American Midwest.

□ 1015

Even though the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense say that our troops in Bosnia cannot rotate out in order and cannot come home after placing their lives at risk for our security, they would shut down those funds.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the American people can see that this same shutdown fervor for partisan political advantage is wrong and they can recognize when they look at North Dakota that it is not the only disaster area in this country. One of those disasters is occurring right here, when the needs of the American people are forgotten in the race for partisan political advantage.

DOUBLE STANDARD EXISTS IN THE AIR FORCE

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, it was only 1 week ago that a junior officer in the Air Force was discharged without honor for engaging in an extramarital affair. This junior officer was a woman. Today, 1 week later, a general in the same Air Force is up for promotion to the pinnacle of military responsibility after engaging in an extramarital affair. The general was a man.

Whether this double standard is because of military rank or of gender, it is still a double standard and it is simply wrong. Secretary Cohen said today he wanted to stop the feeding frenzy surrounding allegations in the Armed Forces. I understand his goal and believe he is trying to do what he feels is the right thing; however, if he wants to promote General Gaston to the Chair of Joint Chiefs of Staff, he should invite Lt. Kelly Flinn to rejoin the Air Force as a B-52 pilot.

This morning women all over America are scratching their heads wonder-

ing what kind of double standard exists in the Air Force. The Secretary should rectify that immediately and reinstate Lieutenant Flinn.

FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1998 AND 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Pursuant to House Resolution 159 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. 1757.

□ 1017

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. 1757) to consolidate international affairs agencies, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and for other purposes, with Mr. NEY (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, June 4, 1997, pending was the amendment by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] adding a new title to the bill.

Pursuant to the order of the Committee of that day, debate on that amendment and all amendments thereto will be limited to 1 hour and 20 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the following Members or their designees:

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] for 20 minutes;

The gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] for 20 minutes;

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] for 20 minutes; and

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BARCIA] for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and let me just begin this debate by saying that today one of the most important pro-life amendments will be up before this Congress.

It is the amendment that separates abortion from family planning in our overseas population control programs. It is a policy that was in effect during the Reagan-Bush years and effectively erected a fire wall between family planning and the promotion of abortion on demand around the world, where approximately 100 countries protected their unborn. And regrettably they are under siege by organizations like Planned Parenthood and others in trying to bring down these laws.

So that is what the amendment is all about. I understand there will be a substitute that, frankly, is a fake, and we will talk about that during the debate.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] the designee for the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON]?

Mr. BERMAN. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

We have 25 speakers, many of whom thought this would be starting at 10:30, so many are probably on their way over at this time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. BERMAN. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman. Presently before us is the Smith amendment?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. BERMAN. And we are operating under a unanimous-consent request with respect to the Smith amendment, a substitute amendment to be offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL], and time limits for debate on both of those measures; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. On the Smith amendment and all amendments thereto.

Mr. BERMAN. But at this point, though, Mr. Chairman, the only amendment in front of us is the Smith amendment?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. BERMAN. I thank the Chair, and I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, first of all, a parliamentary inquiry. Is my understanding correct that there will be a unanimous-consent request to divide time?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The unanimous-consent agreement has already been ordered. The time has been divided.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Further inquiry, Mr. Chairman, before proceeding, and that is whether the Campbell-Greenwood-Lowey amendment is to be the only amendment included during this time period?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. On the clarification, the time restriction is on the Smith amendment and any amendments thereto.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Further inquiry, Mr. Chairman, if I may proceed, it is my understanding that that is the only amendment; otherwise we might want to divide the time differently.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, it is my understanding that presently before us is the Smith amendment, the Campbell-plus amendment will be offered as a substitute to that amendment, and the time limit is for the two amendments together, three 20-minute segments.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's clarification.

One last inquiry of a parliamentary nature, Mr. Chairman. Is it now appropriate or necessary for me to actually move the Campbell-Greenwood-Lowey amendment as a substitute for the Smith amendment?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It would be in order for the gentleman to offer an amendment at this time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CAMPBELL to the amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Page 1, strike all following the title designation and insert the following:

SEC. . POPULATION PLANNING ACTIVITIES OR OTHER POPULATION ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or any other provision of law, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for population planning activities or other population assistance may be made available 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) The limitation contained in paragraph (1) shall not apply to the treatment of injuries or illness caused by unsafe abortions.

(b) LIMITATIONS ON LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.—

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

(2) The limitation contained in paragraph (1) shall not apply to activities in opposition to coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization.

SEC. . UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND.

(a) LIMITATION.—Subject to subsections (b), (c), and (d)(2), of the amounts made available for each of the fiscal years 1998 and 1999 to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, not more than \$25,000,000 shall be available for each such fiscal year for the United Nations Population Fund.

(b) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS IN CHINA.—None of the funds made available under this section shall be made available for a country program in the People's Republic of China.

(c) CONDITIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—(1) Not more than one-half of the amount made available to the United Nations Population Fund under this section may be provided to the Fund before March 1 of the fiscal year for which funds are made available.

(2) Amounts made available for each of the fiscal years 1998 and 1999 under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for the United Nations Populations Fund may not be made available to the Fund unless—

(A) the Fund maintains amounts made available to the Fund under this section in an account separate from accounts of the Fund for other funds; and

(B) the Fund does not commingle amounts made available to the Fund under this section with other funds.

(d) REPORTS.—(1) Not later than February 15, 1998, and February 15, 1999, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees indicating the amount of funds that the United Nations Population Fund is budgeting for the year in which the report is submitted for a country program in the People's Republic of China.

(2) If a report under paragraph (1) indicates that the United Nations Population Fund plans to spend China country program funds in the People's Republic of China in the year covered by the report, then the amount of such funds that the Fund plans to spend in the People's Republic of China shall be deducted from the funds made available to the Fund after March 1 for obligation for the remainder of the fiscal year in which the report is submitted.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I offer to the Smith amendment restores the agreement that was reached last year on U.N. family planning assistance, and its purpose is that we would have exactly the same compromise which allowed us to go ahead with necessary family planning assistance through the U.N. population fund that we had last year and that was made law last year.

Let me be explicit in noting that it does not permit the United States contributions to go for any abortion purposes; and, also, it states that there is to be no contribution at all to China. So those two issues really should be taken off the table. In the Campbell-Greenwood-Lowey amendment funds may not be used in China, even if it is for family planning in China.

So the substance of the amendment is, I repeat, what we had last year. Money is to be cut into two parts, that which is available for disbursement before March 1 and that which comes after March 1. That which comes after March 1 goes to the U.N. population fund, as the first half does as well; but, dollar for dollar, if the United Nations family planning fund gives money to China, then dollar for dollar we restrict, we take that dollar out of what the United States is contributing to the UNFPA.

So, as a result, it is simply not true that any of our taxpayers' money will go to fund abortion. It is also untrue any of our taxpayers' money will go to assist even family planning in China. What the amendment permits, however, is the continuation of successful participation in family planning, which, I suggest, is a very great benefit to the U.S. interests and to those in need throughout the world.

I draw attention to the fact that family planning is a substitute for abortion. It is just essential to recognize that if a country is attempting to bring down its birthrate, and if there is a temptation to have abortion as a means of doing that, family planning is far preferable.

The Smith amendment, by contrast, runs a tremendous risk. What it does is to say unless the President can certify

that the entire United Nations fund does not go to assist in China, or unless the President can assert that there are no coerced abortions in China, then all United Nations family planning assistance contributions by the United States must end.

Let me be very clear about that. Even if the assistance is to Bangladesh, even if the assistance is to sub-Saharan Africa—because of China, the United Nations family population assistance, the part that comes from the United States, may not go ahead. Whatever one's views happen to be about China, it is simply wrong to punish the good essential functions of international family planning in destitute areas of the world because of China, which is what the Smith amendment does.

Last, Mr. Chairman, I want to draw attention to the fact that contraception diminishes abortion. The facts are indisputable. I cite the AID studies in this area involving Russia, Kazakhstan, Hungary, where there was an increase in the use of contraception, a dramatic drop in abortions followed.

Russia, 1990 to 1997, contraceptive use went up 30 percent, abortion dropped 22 percent; Kazakhstan, 1993 to 1994, contraception went up 59 percent, abortions dropped 41 percent; Hungary, from 1968 to 1988, contraceptive use more than tripled and abortion dropped more than half.

Examples of this nature are obvious because the need for family planning removes the occasion for abortion.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to clarify some of the information relative to the Smith-Barcia-Oberstar-Hyde amendment and mention a few of the points that the amendment attempts to address and focus the issue and the discussion back on the issue of the amendment itself as opposed to debate between of course the concept of contraception, which many of us support and certainly should support, and the actual language of the amendment.

The Mexico City policy would ensure, of course, it would certainly address the point in the policy and it would ensure that U.S. tax dollars will not be allocated to foreign nongovernmental organizations unless they agree not to violate the laws or lobby to change the laws of other countries with respect to abortion and agree not to perform abortions in those countries, except in the cases of rape, incest, or where the life of the mother is in danger.

□ 1030

Second, it closes the loophole that allows U.S. tax dollars to subsidize organizations which perform abortions. Currently, law under the 1973 Helms amendment prohibits the direct use of U.S. foreign aid funds to pay for most abortion procedures. U.S. funds and tax dollars are being used indirectly by organizations claiming that they are

using their funds and not U.S. tax dollars to perform abortions.

Third, the amendment will prohibit any U.S. funds to the United Nations Population Fund, the UNFPA, until they cease their support for China's coercive abortion and involuntary sterilization policy. The actions of the Chinese toward their citizens are beyond description. The forced abortion of their unborn and mandatory sterilization of their people, regardless of the economic hardship in their country, is inexcusable. U.S. funds should not be used to support those actions.

This amendment does not decrease funding for population assistance. In fact, spending for population control programs increased over the time the Mexico City policy was in effect from \$318 million for fiscal year 1985 to \$448 million for fiscal year 1993. This amendment continues to fund international population assistance but limits the availability only to those organizations who do not perform abortions.

Finally, this amendment will not prevent funding for most family planning organizations. Virtually all family planning organizations agreed to the terms of the Mexico City policy.

Mr. Chairman, those are the points that I wanted to make. I know we will be hearing additional debate on these very important amendments, and I hope that those of us who are concerned about this issue will get to the floor on our side to be recognized for statements they might wish to make, recognizing of course that it is a very busy and hectic time this morning as we try to complete the session business this week. But I am delighted to join my cochair, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who has done a fine job in leading the discussion and offering these amendments which I was very pleased to offer bipartisan support to.

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

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague from California, the author of the substitute which we are now considering, made the essential point. It is counterproductive, it is wrong to seek language which would restrict the disbursement of contraceptive services in the name of opposition to abortion when the consequence of that very conduct will be to increase abortion. That point needs to be made over and over again.

I want to just take what little time I have yielded myself to point out the other language in the amendment of the gentleman from California. There is a clear prohibition on the use of U.S. funds to pay for abortions or for abortion counseling in any foreign country except in cases of rape, incest, or where the life of the mother is in danger. No U.S. funds will be used for these purposes.

The goal of the Campbell amendment is to free up family planning funds and

contraceptive services so that people can make their decisions about how to avoid the problem of having to have abortions. It also prohibits lobbying on the issue.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Smith language and in very strong opposition to the Campbell-Greenwood amendment. I would like to clarify the debate at hand here. This is a funding issue, what are we going to do with our U.S. taxpayer dollars. While there are prohibitions against U.S. taxpayer dollars being used for purposes like providing abortions, for lobbying to overturn pro-life laws in foreign capitals, or to go to an organization that promotes the forced abortion issue that is going on in China, United Nations funds right now are going to China and they are using it to force women who do not want to have abortions to have abortions.

Our colleagues will claim that that is OK and that they can play this numbers game, and they can use our U.S. taxpayer dollars to provide condoms or other contraceptive services and then use dollars from somewhere else for forced abortions, for providing abortions or lobbying to overturn abortion laws in foreign capitals.

The Smith amendment very clearly just says we are not going to give it to those organizations, we do not want to give U.S. taxpayer dollars that come out of the pockets of hard-working Americans, millions of whom are pro-life, millions of whom are pro-life Catholics and Protestants who have a strong religious prohibition against this.

We do not want to give our U.S. taxpayer dollars to those organizations. Why would we want to give U.S. taxpayer dollars to an organization that is going to do forced abortions in China, and then we are going to get up here on the floor of the House and smile and say, well, our dollars did not go for that purpose.

I mean, what a joke. They have got \$1 million in the account, and they get \$500,000 from the United States and \$500,000 from their private sources, and they say the \$500,000 going for abortions comes from the private sources. I say support the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and support his amendment, vote against the Campbell-Greenwood amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD], the co-author of the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, what is this all about? The base bill does the right thing. The base bill holds true to America's commitment to population control.

This is the history of population growth on planet Earth. We can say that in the second half of this century we headed off on an explosive growth of population worldwide, and most of that growth is in underdeveloped nations, in places like India and China and Africa.

The purpose of these funds is to simply enable families, particularly poor families, to have the number of children that they want to, as many children as they want to or as few as they want to.

My colleague and friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], has an amendment. His amendment would say that none of the funds to help control population development may go to an organization if that organization, with its own money, not with American taxpayers' dollars but with the money of the woman who seeks an abortion, provides that service as well.

My colleague stands on a moral point. I respect him for that. But there is a time in public policy where morality becomes hypocrisy and morality becomes hypocrisy, when what we are trying to achieve does far more harm and in fact goes counterproductive to what we are trying to accomplish.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will say that I am not suggesting that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is hypocritical, if that is his point.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I appreciate that.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I am suggesting that public policy can make us all hypocrites. The point is that without these funds, the consequences are real. The consequences are 1,600 women dying every day because their pregnancies are too closely spaced together, because their bodies are too young, their bodies are too old to sustain that pregnancy, they die of postpartum hemorrhage.

Five hundred eighty thousand women die a year because they do not have access to good reproductive health services, and it is hypocritical for any of us to suggest that we want to, in the name of reducing the number of abortions, allow that to occur. It is wrong to allow 7 million infants a year around the world to die because they are born to women who cannot nourish them, they are born into families that cannot sustain them. That is an awful consequence to pay for a moral principle.

It is wrong and most ironic that the consequence of the Smith amendment is millions and millions of more abortions around the world, because we will not stop abortions by simply prohibiting agencies from participating in family planning funds. That defies common sense on its face. In fact, what we do have is an explosive growth of abortions in those places around the world where women do not have access to family planning.

My colleagues, please support the Campbell-Greenwood amendment. It accomplishes what we all want to accomplish. It reduces human suffering. It empowers poor families to develop their families, to grow their families as they are able, to prevent this awful toll of human suffering, and it ensures that not a penny, not a dime of taxpayer moneys goes to pay for abortion.

Let us talk about the realities of this process. We know that if the Smith amendment prevails unamended by Campbell-Greenwood, that this will not be accepted by the Senate and it will be vetoed by the President, so this will not stand. This is the time for compromise. We have found ourselves compromising on this issue year after year, session after session. Let us be realistic. Let us understand the political realities as well as the realities in human suffering and support the Campbell-Greenwood amendment.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I would just also like to comment on the Campbell-Greenwood amendment and say that it simply does nothing to end United States support for the UNFPA's continued activities in China that have already been referenced, and I think are certainly viewed in a very negative fashion by the taxpayers across this country. It also does nothing to end United States tax dollars being used to promote and perform abortion around the world.

Pro-life Americans believe that it is improper use that any tax dollars go to organizations that perform or promote abortions, even though these organizations may claim that U.S. dollars are not used for abortion-related activities. We should not support any organization that fails to adhere to our unyielding belief in the right to life.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ADERHOLT].

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], an amendment that would save literally countless children throughout the world, and in opposition to the alternative amendment which would only continue the status quo, dodging the real issue at hand.

I would like to commend my colleague from New Jersey for taking action to try and prevent the use of hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars for promoting abortion and funding the international abortion industry. How can we justify using our hard-earned money for the purpose of helping foreign nations take the lives of innocent children? This is not what I would call foreign aid.

I also commend my colleague for taking steps to save children from a death sentence. Just yesterday in Poland, Pope John Paul II stated that the right of life is not a question of ideology, not only a religious right, it is a human right. He also restated his belief that a nation which kills its own children is a nation without a future.

The question we will vote on today is quite simply whether you oppose taxpayer funds being used to promote abortion in foreign countries or whether you support it, pure and simple.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes on behalf of the Campbell-Greenwood-Lowey amendment to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, our world's population is growing at an alarming rate. Resources are being consumed faster than they can be renewed. This exploding population is leaving poverty, malnutrition, widespread transmission of disease, and environmental degradation in its wake. That is why, Mr. Chairman, support for reproductive health services is becoming more important every day.

□ 1045

Voluntary family planning services give mothers and families new choices and hope. They increase child survival and promote safe childhood and safe motherhood. Without our support for international family planning, women in developing nations will face more unwanted pregnancies, more poverty, more despair.

Mr. Chairman, it continues to be extremely ironic that the same people who would deny women in the developing world the choice of an abortion would also seek to eliminate support for family planning programs, programs that reduce the need for abortion in the first place. Without access to safe and affordable family planning services, there will be more abortions, not fewer, the abortions will be less safe and put more women's lives in danger.

To this end, Mr. Chairman, the very least we can do is pass the Campbell-Greenwood-Lowey amendment. We should not be playing political football with international family planning funds. Let us allow international family planning programs to do what they were designed to do, maintain sustainable levels of population, giving people in the developing world better health, greater prosperity and more hope for the future.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Smith amendment which would reinstate the so-called Mexico City policy.

Once again we have this unnecessary debate. Once again those of us who are strong supporters of international family planning have to remind Congress that we already prohibit U.S. funds for

abortion in international family planning through a 1973 Helms amendment that is part of the permanent foreign aid statute. Once again we have to remind Congress that family planning is not abortion, that family planning prevents abortion. Once again we stand here today debating an issue of women and infant mortality.

This amendment uses scare tactics to prevent nongovernmental organizations from discussing issues pertaining to reproductive rights. The Smith amendment gags foreign nongovernmental organizations from talking to their own governments with their own funds about abortion law or policy, even when it might involve discussions about making abortions safer.

The effects of the Mexico City policy are far-reaching and negative. According to UNICEF, each year 600,000 women die of pregnancy-related causes; 75,000 of these deaths are associated with self-induced unsafe abortion. Is this the result we want? Do we want the blood of 75,000 women on our hands year after year after year?

In addition, this amendment would terminate the entire U.S. contribution to the U.N. Population Fund unless the President certifies that the U.N. Population Fund has terminated all activities in China. This is simply not fair.

The U.N. Population Fund's country program in China ended in 1995. Currently they maintain a liaison office only in Beijing for programs in Mongolia and North Korea. This amendment seeks to use the U.N. Population Fund's past program in China and its small presence in China as a basis for withdrawing all support of the U.N. Population Fund altogether.

Lastly, I would like to emphasize that to call family planning abortion is to trivialize a critical and complex issue. Family planning is prenatal care. Family planning is child nutrition. Family planning is followup and preventive care. It is the education provided by international family planning that is often what enables children to survive the first year and what enables women to survive their pregnancies.

Do not impose this gag order. Provide the world with family planning education that works to eliminate the need for abortion. Defeat the Smith amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTLER].

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

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, today, I rise in strong support of the Smith amendment and in opposition to the Campbell amendment. The Smith amendment is about abortion and it is about prohibiting the use of Federal dollars for the promotion of abortion. Do not be misled. Promoting abortion is never about family planning.

This administration would have us believe that once we give away millions of dollars to contractors or grantees in faraway countries, how these dollars are used is irrelevant as long as their money is not being used to directly perform abortions. Since when is it irrelevant that U.S. tax dollars are being used to harm innocent human life? Since when are Americans obligated to finance efforts to dismantle the laws of foreign countries who have so appropriately chosen to protect human life? And since when has this Government simply turned over tax dollars to any individual, organization or entity and simply said, "What you do with this is irrelevant," especially when lives are at stake?

Mr. Chairman, human life is relevant. Nothing is more relevant. It matters to that innocent baby that may be killed because laws that protect it are being dismantled with U.S. tax dollars. It matters to the families of these children. Quite frankly, it should matter to us. It is our obligation as elected officials to actively protect innocent human life. Abortion is a disgrace to society and to civilization. Let us not degrade ourselves and our reputation abroad any longer. Please support the Smith amendment and defeat the Campbell amendment.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise respectfully in disagreement with the Smith amendment and support of the Greenwood-Campbell-Lowey amendment and thank them for their leadership in bringing this amendment to the floor.

It seems repetitive to say what some of my colleagues have already said on the floor on this issue, but obviously the issue needs repetition because it does not seem to be clear that this provision, the Smith amendment, is unnecessary. No United States funds can be used by UNFPA in China. Current appropriations law, and I speak as ranking member of the subcommittee on appropriations for foreign operations, so I know intimately the details of our legislation. Current appropriations law already denies foreign aid funding to any organization or program that, quotes, supports or participates in the management of a program of coerced abortion or involuntary sterilization in any country, and this is under the so-called Kemp-Kasten amendment. Further, current appropriations law also ensures that none of the United States contribution to UNFPA may be used in China, and United States funds are maintained in a segregated account and may not be commingled with other UNFPA funds.

I understand and appreciate the concern that my colleague has spoken out on in terms of China and their forced abortion program. But the United States Government should not as a matter of principle hold family plan-

ning and UNFPA hostage to a legitimate concern that my colleagues and I share about the conduct of the Chinese Government. There is a well-founded concern about China's family planning program but not UNFPA's. UNFPA is already subject to more restrictions that are more punitive than those imposed on other multilateral organizations working in countries considered to be rogue nations or guilty of human rights abuses.

We must not hold our policy hostage to the politics of the House of Representatives. We must not hold the poor families and the poor women of the world hostage to the politics of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 seconds to respond.

This is not about politics. This is about life and death. We are talking about not reducing family planning by a dime. That is a priority issue and that is a money issue. We are talking about erecting a wall of separation between promotion and performance of abortion overseas by groups like Planned Parenthood Federation of America and their international branch and the IPPF and all these other groups who have it as their mission to promote abortion on demand globally. That is what we are talking about. This is not about politics.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH].

Mrs. CHENOWETH. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I come forward today to express my strong support for the Smith amendment that would essentially restore two policies that were in effect during the Bush and Reagan Administrations. I totally support and identify with the comments of the gentleman from New Jersey. One concerns future U.S. funding of the United Nations Population Fund. The second is intended to prevent U.S. funding of nongovernmental organizations which perform or promote abortion as a method of family planning.

Mr. Chairman, current law, known as the 1973 Helms amendment, already bans direct funding of abortions. But I have learned that Planned Parenthood Federation of America—now, this is a fact—Planned Parenthood Federation of America provides direct assistance to family planning projects through its Family Planning International Assistance Program. That is not fiction. That is fact.

In Kenya, for instance, the Family Planning International Assistance Program began supporting a project designed to remedy the serious problem of unsafe abortions. The project offers feminine cyclical regulation and post-cyclical family planning services. The other projects, in Bangladesh and Nicaragua, also provide abortion and cyclical regulation services. Altogether these projects perform nearly 10,000 abortions a year.

Mr. Chairman, this news makes me very angry, because we have to deal with the facts. We cannot be fooled by the false claims of many international population groups who state that this is not an abortion issue. It is an abortion issue.

We must be firm and stipulate that no population funds will go to foreign nongovernmental organizations that, No. 1, perform abortions, except in the case of criminal rape, incest, or when the mother's life is in imminent danger; or, two, violate the laws of any foreign country. We must respect their laws with respect to abortion. Or, three, engage in any activity or effort to alter the laws or governmental policies of any foreign country with respect to abortion.

My position on abortion is very clear and consistent. I oppose it except in the case of the imminent life of the mother being threatened, or criminal rape or criminal incest, where that has occurred.

Our system of laws, our American heritage, is based on the idea that people have certain God-given rights, and those rights are life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Those rights existed before laws were established. In fact, it is because of those rights that existed that laws were established in order to protect those rights.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I have the highest respect for the gentleman from New Jersey. He has been and is one of the great leaders in this Congress in supporting human rights and the rule of law across the world. Yesterday, he stood up and ensured that Voice of America and Radio Free Asia got additional funds so that we can broadcast the message of freedom to the people of China hourly.

We have had this debate so many times. Sometime I hope that I can convince the gentleman from New Jersey that voluntary family planning, the right to plan the number and spacing of one's children by the spouses of a family, is a basic human right for all people across this planet and that the United States of America ought to be the strongest supporter of that basic human right.

□ 1100

Mr. Chairman, yes, I agree there is absolutely no question that abortion is not a legitimate family planning method. The United States has never provided \$1 for abortion as a family planning method, and we do not do so today. Unfortunately, some have seen an opportunity to address a tangential issue in the context of voluntary family planning, and in the meantime, 75,000 women a year all across this world are dying from botched abortions.

In the year 2025, the world's population is projected to be 8.2 billion people; 85 percent of this population will

live in less developed countries. Thirty-five percent of the developing world is under the age of 15, compared to 20 percent in an industrialized country. In nearly all sub-Saharan African countries close to half the population is under the age of 15. What opportunity do those people have to a life of any hope?

In 1994, the average gross national product per capita in the United States was \$25,860; in Africa, \$660. With the population rate increasing faster than an economic growth rate, people are simply assigned to the dustbin of a life of no hope, no future, and no chance.

We are talking about international family planning. The abortion issue has been brought into this debate sideways, as a tangential issue. Some day we have to realize that access to family planning is a basic human right. I would say to the gentleman from New Jersey, that, since we are both strong supporters of human rights worldwide, I hope we can find common ground to support family planning and to ensure that abortion is never considered as a legitimate option.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Smith amendment and in strong support of the Campbell-Greenwood-Lowe substitute. My good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and other proponents of the Smith amendment, claim that the amendment simply cuts abortion funding. What they do not tell us is that abortion funding overseas has been prohibited since 1973.

This amendment would cut abortion funding from its current level of zero to zero. Therefore, the Smith amendment must be after something more. That something is family planning.

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

Let us not forget what family planning assistance means to women around the world. Complications of pregnancy, child birth, unsafe abortion are the leading killers of women of reproductive age throughout the third world. One million women die each year as a result of reproductive health problems; each year 250,000 women die from unsafe abortions. Only 20 to 35 percent of women in Africa and Asia receive prenatal care. Five hundred million married women want contraceptives but cannot obtain them. Most of these deaths can be prevented.

The Smith amendment would impose a gag rule on U.S.-based organizations, nongovernmental organizations, multilateral organizations that provide U.S. supported family planning aid overseas. The gag rule is written, in fact, so broadly that it would prohibit the publishing of factual information about maternal morbidity and mortality related to unsafe abortion.

Finally, the Smith amendment cuts funds to UNFPA, an organization that provides family planning and population assistance in over 140 countries.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose the Smith amendment and to support the Campbell-Greenwood-Lowe amendment.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I would just like to respond to the gentlewoman from New York's comments, a Member who I have a great deal of respect for, but again we emphasize this amendment does not decrease funding for population control assistance. In fact, spending for population control programs, as I mentioned in my earlier remarks, increased over the time the Mexico City policy was in effect from some \$318 million for fiscal year 1985 to over \$448 million for fiscal year 1993. The intent of the Smith amendment is to restrict those dollars from being used through subterfuge for the performing of abortions.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARCIA. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind my good friend and colleague that I recently came back from a trip to Egypt. This amendment would have a chilling effect on programs such as exist in Egypt which are lifesaving to women and children, helping them space their children, giving them the information. If an organization such as we find in Egypt that provides these valuable services to these women uses their own money or even provides some factual information in response to a question, they could be defunded.

So we are saying here, and I believe with all due respect to my friend and colleague, that this is not about family planning; it is because, in speaking to the health professionals, they make it very clear that this would have a tremendous impact on family planning.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT], my good friend and colleague.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support a strong wall between abortion and other health-related services. This Congress should do nothing to spend U.S. tax dollars overseas to promote abortion. We as Members of Congress should not help abortionists push abortion.

If my colleagues want to hear the type of philosophy this administration wants to fund, listen to a quote from the director of the U.N. Population Fund. China has every reason to feel proud of and pleased with its remarkable achievements made in its family planning policy and control of its population growth. Now the country could offer its experiences and its special experts to help other countries.

This is a shameful statement. The forced abortion policy in China is

wrong and immoral. This Nation should not use our hard earned tax dollars to push China's policy or this administration's abortion philosophy on other nations in the world.

Mr. Chairman, we should build a strong wall between the abortion industry and other health-related services. We should promote health-related services, but let us stand up to the most pro-abortion administration in our history. Please support the Smith amendment.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. NEY). Is the gentleman the designee for the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON]?

Mr. GEJDENSON. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I think there is one fact that cannot be argued here. If the Smith amendment wins, as well-intentioned as it is, there will be more abortions because every time we shut down a family planning project we end up with unwanted pregnancies, and the only alternative we are going to leave for these women are abortions. In many instances not only will the fetus die, the mother will die because they do not have the kind of conditions that a safe abortion can be performed in. So my colleagues can be on lots of sides on the issue of abortion, but they cannot argue with one central fact here:

If the Smith amendment wins, women will die, and more abortions will occur because when we take away the choice of family planning, when we reduce the leverage of the dollars we have that provide for education and family planning, contraceptives and other methods of reducing the need for abortion and reducing unwanted pregnancies, we end up with one unarguable fact, that the number of abortions worldwide will increase.

Now my colleague's intent may be another category. People's intent may be completely honest here. I am sure the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who I know to be a genuine individual and cares deeply about this issue, has the best intent possible. But the results of his amendment, if it succeeds, will be to increase abortions around the world in communities that cannot afford it. They cannot afford the economic consequences, they cannot afford the loss of life of mothers who are mothering children already born, and so the policy that we will send from this Chamber will have the exact opposite result than the one the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is seeking.

We need to defeat the Smith amendment to make sure that people have an alternative to abortion around the world, that family planning, that contraception is the way that we can do that, and so I say to my colleagues,

"Don't just walk into this Chamber and think about where you normally line up on this issue, because if you really want to cut the number of abortions worldwide, vote against the Smith amendment. If you're really against abortion, if you want to see fewer abortions than we had yesterday, then oppose the Smith amendment because it is the only way to reduce the number of abortions. You can't hope it is going to do it, you can't do anything else to reduce it except to increase family planning and education."

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds just briefly to respond.

First of all, we are saying in my amendment, "Divest yourself of abortion and you get family planning funds." The gentleman from Connecticut in 1984-85, when I first offered this amendment, said none of the non-governmental organizations would accept those conditions. Well, over the course of the years in the 1980's, early 1990's, virtually every family planning provider except for the International Planned Parenthood Federation in London and Planned Parenthood Federation of America accepted those conditions. They separated themselves from the killing of babies through abortion and took the money and did family planning. We want to erect that wall again in my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Smith-Oberstar-Hyde-Barcia amendment.

I find it ironic that today the U.S. Congress is honoring Mother Teresa for her devotion to protecting the lives of the world's children, born and unborn, and yet the American government is contradicting itself by sending money to pay for abortions in other countries. This is an outrage. Each year Congress authorizes hundreds of millions of dollars for family planning organizations which in turn use the money for population control activities. These groups perform and promote abortion worldwide so in essence this American money ends up paying for abortions.

The majority of the American public is opposed to spending their tax dollars on federally funded abortions. Let us not forget that we are elected to serve the people of America. Surveys have shown time after time that the people, no matter how they feel on the abortion issue, are adamantly opposed to their tax dollars paying for abortions. It is not fair and it is wrong that the U.S. Government continues to go against the will of the taxpayer.

The fact that American tax money is spent overseas on abortion not only goes against the wishes of the taxpayer, it is anti-family. We are talking about the lives of innocent children. The allocation of this foreign aid money contradicts the ideals that this

Congress claims to support. It is wrong for the U.S. Government to set the social agenda for other countries.

I urge my colleagues to protect life. Support the Smith amendment.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. EMERSON].

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Smith amendment to prevent taxpayer dollars from promoting abortion overseas, and I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], for offering this important amendment and for his unwavering support for the unborn.

As many of us know, the House has already endorsed several of the provisions of the Smith amendment in a vote earlier this year, and in passing H.R. 581 we affirm the wisdom of the Reagan-Bush Mexico City policy, which does prevent taxpayer dollars from going to international organizations which promote or perform abortions as a method of family planning. Today the House has an opportunity to again make it clear that the U.S. Government must not be in a position of encouraging abortion.

The second part of the Smith amendment, which would prohibit funding of the United Nations population fund until that body ceases activities in China or until China abandons its policy of forced abortion, is equally as important as the first. It is a terrible injustice that the UNFPA would allow China's abuses to go unchecked, but worse still that the United States taxpayer may be a partner to this crime.

□ 1115

The safeguards contained in the Smith amendment are the only way to be sure that we are not fostering the policies of the Chinese Government, or making it possible for the UNFPA to do so.

I urge the House to say no to a policy of exporting abortion and yes to support the Smith amendment.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Smith amendment. I strongly support international family planning because we know it will improve women's health, it reduces poverty, and it protects our global environment.

Some people claim that our family planning efforts increase the number of abortions. This is not true. This amendment is not only harmful, it is unnecessary as well. By law and by practice, U.S. funds cannot be used today to provide abortion services, either in the United States or abroad. AID has implemented procedures that carefully monitor the spending of these funds, and independent audits confirm that not one dollar of U.S. funds is used today to perform abortions.

While I personally support a woman's right to choose strongly and I disagree with this policy, it is, nonetheless, the current policy and the current law with or without this amendment.

The real problem with this amendment is that it forces family planning clinics that receive U.S. funding abroad not to use their own resources to provide abortion counseling or to perform abortions. Clinics that accept these restrictions will be limited in the services they are able to provide, and many health clinics will not accept such restrictions on the use of their own resources and may be forced to close for lack of funding.

These closed clinics will no longer help women receive prenatal care, will no longer prevent more women from dying during childbirth, will no longer prevent unintended pregnancies, and therefore will no longer help reduce the number of abortions. The number of abortions will increase, not decrease, if this amendment were to pass.

This amendment is unnecessary, pernicious and harmful. It will simply result in more unwanted pregnancies, more fatalities among women in childbirth, and more abortions. It makes no sense on any grounds, and I strongly urge a yes vote for the Lowey-Greenwood substitute and a no vote on the Smith amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I heard the comments on that side of the aisle, and I would say to my good friend from Connecticut and the gentlewoman from New York, if we knocked on the door of the people who live in Danbury, CT, in Torrington, CT and in Hartford and we said to them, we want to tax you and take the dollars that you are paying for your automobiles and dollars you are paying for your food and we want to send them over, as the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] would like to do, to Egypt, we are sending them over to Egypt to a group that is involved with family planning. What do you think the people of Westchester and Armonk, New York and Torrington and Danbury and Hartford would say. Get a life. They would not say, here are my dollars, run over to Egypt and give them to a family planning organization. How ridiculous. They would say no, I want to keep my dollars here.

Then we would say, well, we are going to put in a very strict accounting mechanism that is going to say, wait a second, these dollars will not be used for abortion, they will only be used for the health and welfare of the child and the mother. They would say, well, maybe, just maybe, but by and large every one of the people in Torrington and Hartford and Armonk and Westchester County would say, you know what? I would like to keep my tax dollars here.

We are talking about taxpayers money. We are talking about people

who pay taxes. My colleagues on the other side want to send this money way over to these countries and let these people use it for anything they want. And the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] here, all he is saying is, I want to put a mechanism in place to protect the taxpayer. Good Lord. Let us support the taxpayers and support the Smith amendment.

Mr. Chairman, since his first days in office, President Clinton has pushed for abortion on demand, both domestically and abroad. His policies undermine the laws of several foreign countries where abortion is illegal, particularly in Africa and parts of Latin America.

With his repeal of the Mexico City policy in 1993, President Clinton has granted United States funds to organizations heavily involved in promoting both the legalization and provisions of abortion in foreign nations.

Supporters of worldwide family planning legislation say that this vote has nothing to do with abortion, but everything to do with family planning.

We must understand that abortion is a central element to what many countries consider family planning. Whether or not U.S. funds pay for the actual abortions themselves, nothing is preventing pro-abortion organizations from spending more of their own money on abortion when U.S. funds are there to fill the caps.

Congress must assure that international population assistance dollars will not support organizations which perform or actively promote abortion as a method of family planning. Representative SMITH'S amendment assures the American taxpayers that their money will not fund any program which not only performs abortions but attempts to change abortion laws in other countries.

This amendment reinstates the Mexico City restrictions on international family planning by prohibiting United States funding to any organization that directly or indirectly performs abortions in a foreign country.

Furthermore, this amendment will prevent the United States Government from funding any aspect of China's horrific population control programs. United States policy must stand against China's brutal policies toward its women and baby girls. But we don't have a chance of succeeding until we stop pouring money into programs that force abortions and sterilizations without consent.

Thomas Jefferson once said, "The care of human life and happiness, and not their destruction, is the first and only legitimate object of good government." I share this commitment to actively support legislation that sustains the Federal Government's traditional goals in family planning.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support Representative SMITH'S amendment which will restore the program's original purpose—promoting family planning, not abortion.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], my friend and colleague.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Smith-Oberstar-Hyde-Barcia amendment. I also want to make it clear, as Members who are

listening, I favor family planning, so I think one can strongly favor family planning and be for the Smith amendment.

Also, this just merely returns us back to the policies of previous Congresses. This is not something dramatic or new, it just previously goes back to where we were, and more importantly, this is the House of Representatives. This returns us to the position of the American people. The American people, if they were voting today in the Congress, would clearly support the Smith amendment.

Third, this is about China. This is about China. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and I were in China together where we talked to people where we had cases of women who were literally tracked down in villages and forced to have an abortion. So this is about China, and it is about forced abortion with regard to China.

Lastly, under the Smith amendment, I believe as someone who strongly favors family planning, there will be more money for family planning, and I strongly urge Members on both sides to support the Smith amendment.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER].

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

We have this debate almost every year here and it always makes me sad. I think those of us who are fortunate enough to live in America where we have good access to health care and information probably do not understand what it is like in a Third World country where one does not have it.

Frankly, I think the harshest kind of birth control on Earth is to live in a place where women kill themselves trying to abort. They have not been able to get the information they need to help space their families or even to plan them, and we rise to the floor year after year after year and say that we don't care.

Is there anything worse than the children who are left motherless because their mother could not face one more child, and we could have helped her, had we been able to give the family planning information that she needed?

I want to give two quotes this morning which I think are very succinct. One of them has to do with the Helms amendment, and I know everybody in the majority strongly believes that the Helms amendment is quite good. The first is no U.S. foreign aid funds are used to perform abortions. It is explicitly prohibited in the annual appropriations law and the underlying statute, which is the Helms amendment. USAID has been scrupulous in complying with the law, and even the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who is my good friend, agrees that the Helms amendment stopped the direct funding of abortions.

The second is what President GORE has said, and I quote,

Our administration believes that the United States Constitution guarantees every woman within our borders the right to choose. We are unalterably committed to that principle, but let us take a false issue off the table. The United States has not sought, does not seek, and will not seek to establish any international right to abortion.

He said that at a national press conference in 1994, and that has not changed.

The Smith amendment is absolutely unnecessary and it is simply again another way to punish women in other countries and to provide some sense in the House that we are helping children, which is absolutely untrue.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, this has to be emphasized. The vote today is not about whether we are pro-choice or pro-life on abortion, it is about whether life for thousands, hundreds of thousands of families who choose to plan their families will include a real chance to do so, not whether or not abortion is available to that family.

I say to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS], yes, I think most Americans support U.S. assistance for voluntary family planning.

Since 1973 the Helms amendment has prohibited the use of U.S. dollars to perform, support, or encourage abortion overseas. That mandate has been followed in good faith by the U.S. Government. And in order to ensure its implementation and sensitive to the argument about fungibility of moneys, when I was assistant administrator of AID, we instituted in the late 1970's a rigorous system to separate out U.S. moneys from other funds spent by organizations receiving American funds, and that practice has been followed assiduously by every administration. Audits show not one dollar of American funds is being used for abortion-related activities overseas.

So this is the basic question. When the United States is fully abiding by the Helms amendment, when the Government has taken every possible step to separate American funds so no American money is being used for abortion-related activities, and when there is no real fungibility as to U.S. dollars, do we want to stop the availability of critical funds for voluntary family planning for millions of families in fast-growing developing countries?

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the answer for each of these is no. I urge a vote against the Smith amendment and for Campbell-Greenwood.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PITTS].

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge Members to support the

Smith amendment. The Campbell amendment merely creates a scheme which frees up more of the organization's own resources for the promotion of abortion overseas. In contrast, the Mexico City policy places a wall of separation between abortion and family planning.

The Smith amendment prevents U.S. funding for such things as China's deplorable population control program, which includes coercion, forced abortion, forced sterilization for Chinese men and women alike. Women all over China are victimized daily due to their ability and desire to bear children. China's so-called family planning policy includes the following methods, and it is documented in this book by the anthropologist Steven Mosher and others, entitled "The Broken Earth". This is the international family planning program the UNFPA has publicly praised.

First, arresting pregnant women and taking them to abortion clinics tied up or in handcuffs. Second, incarcerating pregnant women in barracks until they acquiesce to abortions and/or sterilization. Third, forcing pregnant women to attend study sessions away from their families until they agree to have abortions. Carrying out sterilization or abortion without the consent or knowledge of the women while rendering other medical services. Imprisoning husbands until wives submit to abortion procedures. Cutting off food, electricity, water and wages for couples who refuse to comply with the Chinese Government's barbaric policies. Confiscating furniture, livestock and even homes of families who refuse to comply. And fourth, demolishing the homes of people who refuse to comply as reported in the two Catholic villages at Hepel Province.

Mr. Chairman, this is not family planning. These are outright human rights abuses. I do not believe this is a pro-life or pro-choice issue; this is a human issue, this is a woman's issue, this is a family issue. This is an issue of blatant governmental abuse, and the United States should not be in any way a part of it through the United Nations or any other agency.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Ms. DEGETTE].

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, let us be clear what this amendment is about. This amendment is not about abortion. This amendment is about family planning. If we went to the door of every household in this country and said, do you think our Government should be involved in family planning efforts throughout the world so that women are not forced against their will to have countless unwanted children, children who will be subject to starvation, children who will be subject to disease, so that the women can avoid the pregnancy to begin with, so that the woman can avoid abortion, these families across America would say yes, we think that that is a high use of our taxpayer dollars. We think that America

should be working across the world to prevent unwanted pregnancies and to help increase the quality of life for citizens around the world.

□ 1130

That is a noble purpose. Let us be clear. The current U.S. policy prevents Federal funds from being used for abortions anywhere in the world. This is not going to be changed.

What this amendment will do is prevent women across the world from planning their pregnancies and avoiding unwanted pregnancies. That is not the policy the United States should pursue. That is why just last month or the month before, this Congress affirmed the right of the United States to increase its family planning efforts nationwide.

I urge Members to defeat this amendment, to keep our appropriate policy throughout the world, and prevent unwanted pregnancies to begin with.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAPPAS].

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in strong support of the Smith amendment. My time is short, so let me get to the point: the U.N. funds. My parents had more than one child. Because they had the freedom to do so, I have a wonderful sister named Olga. However, parents in China do not have a similar basic right. Brothers and sisters are illegal. Until the UNFPA strongly condemns and disassociates itself from this brutal coerced abortion policy in China or any other country, no United States tax dollars should go to this misguided program.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise this Congress' and in fact our Nation's attention to this irony of our entire overseas abortion debate. Many of our colleagues who will stand here on this floor and oppose this amendment to restore the successful Mexico City policy are many of the same Members who regularly lambasted this body for not moving campaign finance reform.

If they truly believe in campaign finance reform, this is their vehicle. This is the first campaign finance reform vote of this session of Congress. Vote for the Smith amendment and Members will walk the walk of campaign finance reform. Otherwise, they are saying it is OK for U.S. foreign aid money, America's hard-earned tax dollars, to be used as soft money to lobby and change abortion laws throughout the world.

Make no mistake about it, failure to enact the Smith amendment will be interpreted by the world community that this Congress wants our tax dollars going to foreign lobbyists to change other countries' laws. I am against welfare for lobbyists for the abortion industry, and so is the vast majority of the American people. The Smith amendment will prevent this. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to my colleague, the

gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD].

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, if it seems we just had this debate, it is because we just had this debate. On February 13, this House by a vote of 220 to 209 decided to release these international family planning funds. We did so, 44 Republicans, 175 Democrats, and one Independent to 20 in all, so we knew at the end of the day if we are going to achieve the goals that we share, that we all share, including the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] that international family planning funds be available to help empower families to control the number of children that they have, that the only way to get that done is to do it without the entanglements of the Smith language, to pass language that is straightforward, that prevents these funds from being used for abortion, can be adopted by the Senate and signed by the President.

When all is said and done, if we adopt the Smith amendment, we know that one of two things will happen: Either we will come back on another day and undo it, as we have in the past, or we will kill the program. Neither of those, certainly killing the program makes no sense. It makes no sense to do this simply for rhetorical reasons today, and come back and compromise as we have done each and every year.

Let us do what is reasonable. Let us do what is sensible. Let us adopt the compromise which is embodied in the Campbell-Greenwood-Lowey amendment now, get it over with, and move on to the next issue.

I want to particularly address those colleagues who equivocate on this issue to be consistent and vote today as they did in February.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank first of all the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] for his dedication to this issue. While we disagree on the major issue, I think his dedication is certainly something we all commend. I value his participation in our committee.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Campbell amendment. As Members know, I am a strong supporter of voluntary family planning programs. It is important to note that after almost 30 years of U.S. assistance to the voluntary family planning programs, the health of millions of women and children has been improved throughout the world.

I also note that the voluntary family planning programs have led to the reduction of abortions in key countries and in newly independent States of the former Soviet Union, where abortion used to be the only method of family planning.

Mr. Chairman, family planning is good for mothers, for children, for the environment, and for economic growth. The Smith amendment would impact upon voluntary family planning programs by blocking assistance to key providers of family planning programs in the U.N. Fund for Population Activities.

Permit me to review a couple of basic facts about the family planning program. First, the Hyde amendment is part of the current U.S. law which prevents any U.S. funds from being used for abortion. Second, the U.N. Fund for Population Activities no longer has a family planning program operating in China. Accordingly, the Smith amendment is language in search of a problem that essentially does not exist. Please permit me to repeat: United States funds are not now used for abortion and the UNFPA does not have any program in China.

I would also like to bring Members up to date as to how this issue affects the rest of this important issue. The Committee on International Relations, when it met to consider this bill, rejected language offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and included language offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] on this very point. I remind our colleagues that the Committee on International Relations strongly favored the Campbell language and supports the voluntary family planning program.

Accordingly, I urge Members to support the Campbell amendment and oppose the Smith amendment.

I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

MR. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I would remind Members that the U.N. Population Fund was there on the ground in 1979 when the one-child-per-couple policy was crafted. They were one of the cocrafters. Over the years they have praised this coercive population control program, given it highest praise.

Dr. Sadik, the executive director of the U.N. Population Fund, has said it is a "totally voluntary program," a total lie. It is not a voluntary program. It is a coercive program.

Let me also add that they are now in negotiations with the Beijing dictatorship to decide what kind and the scope of any new programs that they will be involved in. We send a clear, non-ambiguous message: Get out of China; do your family planning elsewhere, but do not comanage and support that program.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I just want to congratulate the gentleman from

New Jersey, Mr. CHRIS SMITH, and his associates for bringing this very important issue to the floor. We ought to stop funding the international abortion industry. Family planning and abortion are two separate things. Family planning asks the question, do you want a baby or not? Once you are pregnant, you have a baby. Abortion helps you dispose of that baby by killing it. It has been our policy and it ought to continue to be our policy not to subsidize that function on an international basis.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD] ignores the concept of fungibility. If you give money and say do not spend it for this, only spend it for this, who are you kidding, because it frees up other money to be spent for the forbidden function. It does not matter whether they are using our money or their money. If we give money, we empower all of their activities, so it is a distinction without a difference.

The Mexico City policy simply says that we will continue to generously fund family planning, but we will not subsidize abortion, we will not subsidize organizations that lobby to change laws in countries that forbid abortion, and it is in keeping with, I believe, the best ideals and policy certainly under the Reagan and under the Bush administration. I regret keenly that it was changed.

I ask Members to vote "no" on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD], which is more obfuscation than clarification, which ignores the fact that money is fungible, and if you forbid it for one purpose you free up other money for the other purpose.

I hope that Members will support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. CHRIS SMITH, who has been a real hero in this very difficult fight. When my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] says the United Nations is out of China, that is rather superficial. They are not out of China.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. That is a U.N. program.

Mr. HYDE. They have an office here, and they said they are negotiating for more programs.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute and 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, let us make it very clear. The Smith-Barcia-Oberstar-Hyde amendment does not reduce by one penny the amount spent on international family planning.

It merely ensures that the money we do spend and commit to population control goes to family planning, not to abortion. American taxpayers who believe that abortion is morally wrong should have their voice expressed on this floor in support of this amendment; and likewise, those who believe abortion is acceptable, and that abortion ought to be made safe and rare, ought to have assurance that their tax dollars do not go to groups who do not share that viewpoint, who see abortion as a means of family planning.

Both sides have an interest in the outcome. I believe that our side is on the side of justice, that it is morally wrong for the United States to support with its taxpayer dollars abortion as a means of family planning control, and this amendment will assure that none of those dollars go to that purpose.

□ 1145

That is what we are trying to accomplish; that just as we have pursued the policy at home of not funding abortion with taxpayer dollars, that we should not fund it abroad with taxpayer dollars. Family planning is a legitimate objective, but it should not include abortion as a means of family planning. That is what we are asking. That is what this amendment does. I ask Members to support the Smith-Barcia amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute and 15 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, let me rise briefly to support the Smith amendment and to say that the Mexico City policy that we propagated under the Reagan administration sent a moral message to the world. As I understand it, most of the organizations that heretofore had performed abortions stopped them as an effect and impact of that policy. If we still have that moral policy, and that is my feeling that we do have that and that that is exactly what we are voting on, then we should not support abortions through middlemen. We should not support organizations that support abortion. We ought to keep that message as clear as we did under the Reagan administration, under the Mexico City policy. I would urge a strong yes for the Smith amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, let me remind Members that we do not cut family planning by a dime in this amendment. We condition it. We put on human rights, pro-family, pro-baby conditions. Abortion takes the life of a baby. We do not think that we should be giving to organizations that are promoting abortion overseas. That is the simple reality of what we are trying to do today. Any other characterization misses by a mile.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is right on point. The

facts are that the taxpayers of the United States have a right to put conditions on money that they earn with their hard work that we send to international organizations. This has been one of the important conditions that we historically have put on, and we should put it on whether the organization indirectly supports abortion or does it directly.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore [Mr. NEY]. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Smith amendment and in favor of the Campbell-Greenwood amendment because I, like my colleagues, love children and love families. I have five children of my own, my parents had seven children. Their parents had 14 children. But all those children were born into a world that is vastly different than the world that we are talking about and that would be affected by this amendment.

We in this Nation are so blessed with such prosperity and high living standards that it is often very difficult to relate to people that are born into a world of such abject poverty and desperation that parents would be willing to sell their children into a life of virtual slave labor or prostitution. How can life be so cheap? How can suffering and human degradation be so tolerated?

It is largely because people in that other world have so little control over their lives because they have so little ability to control the size and the timing of their families. Ironically, this amendment further limits that control over their lives. This amendment in effect diminishes the value of those children's lives, when we have a moral responsibility to be increasing, enhancing the value of children's lives, and that is what family planning information is all about. With proper education, those in developing countries can plan their families just as we in the United States do.

It is unconscionable as leaders of the most prosperous, blessed Nation on Earth that we would deny these vital resources to the least fortunate people on Earth. Yet that is precisely what this amendment does. This, the Mexico City policy that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] wants, restricts funding to groups who offer reproductive educational services to families in need of those services.

We decided in February that denying those funds had a negative impact on population control efforts internationally and that decreasing family planning funding increases the number of abortions. This has not changed since our vote in February.

Mr. Chairman, we need to understand that family planning in this other world can prevent about 10,000 deaths that are due to pregnancy complications, low birth weight babies born to

women who are neither ready nor desirous of having children. Defeat the Smith amendment.

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

I would ask my pro-life colleagues in the House to oppose the Campbell substitute, which is not a compromise but in fact would continue the current policy of abortion on demand around the world. Organizations can use simple bookkeeping to create the impression that U.S. taxpayer funds are not being used for abortion while in fact they are substituting other moneys for that purpose in their respective facilities around the world. I just hope that our pro-life Members of the House today will cast a strong vote against the Campbell substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has 7½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] has 1½ minutes. The time of gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BARCIA] has expired. There was a half minute yielded to the gentleman from New Jersey by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my support for the Smith amendment. I believe it is appropriate and right, and I want to express my strong support on behalf of the people of my district.

Mr. Chairman, 50 years ago, the Nuremberg Tribunal condemned population control policies enacted by the Nazis as "crimes against humanity," and yet today, not only does China engage in the same barbaric practices but our tax dollars support them.

Every year since 1985, we have denied funds to the U.N. Population Fund because it provides financial support for China's brutally coercive one-child policy. But, Mr. Chairman, in 1993, the administration changed the rules. They reinterpreted U.S. law in order to claim opposition to coercive population control programs, but then actually provide for their financial support.

The administration's policy prohibits our tax dollars from providing direct support for forced abortion and sterilization, but that doesn't stop our money from freeing up funds in other accounts to be used for these barbaric acts. This is an unconscionable deception which must be brought to an immediate end.

Mr. Chairman, the Smith amendment simply interprets United States law as it was originally intended—it stops all payments to the U.N. Population Fund until it withdraws its financial support for China's draconian population control programs. Mr. Chairman, as a nation deeply concerned about China's human rights record, we have no business sending such mixed signals. For these reasons I urge a yes vote on the Smith amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Many of our colleagues were shocked and angered to learn that the big name pro-abortion population control organizations like Planned Parenthood Federation of America, the Alan Guttmacher Institute, Zero Population Growth and others had grossly misled Congress, the President, and the American people about partial-birth abortion. In one letter sent to every Member of Congress signed by those organizations and many others, we were solemnly assured that, and I quote: This surgical procedure is used only in rare cases, fewer than 500 per year. It is most often performed in cases, it goes on to say, of severe fetal anomalies.

Mr. Chairman, we now know that the abortion lobby's campaign to defeat the partial-birth abortion ban was and is riddled with lies and distortions. It is one thing to have an honest difference about policy. Congress after all is a marketplace of disparate opinions and ideas, but do not lie to us.

Mr. Chairman, interestingly, it was one of their own, Ron Fitzsimmons, executive director of the National Coalition of Abortion Providers, who blew the whistle on their fraudulent tactics. Members will recall Mr. Fitzsimmons came forward and said that he was lying through his teeth about the circumstances and the incidences surrounding partial-birth abortion. Having raised serious questions concerning the credibility and the reliability of Planned Parenthood and others, Mr. Fitzsimmons admitted, and I quote, that thousands of partial-birth abortions in the vast majority of cases are performed on healthy mothers with a healthy fetus.

Why is this relevant to the amendment the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BARCIA] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] and I are offering this morning? Because each year Congress authorizes hundreds of millions of dollars; this is not an entitlement, these are discretionary funds, hundreds of millions of dollars for population control organizations. And much of that cash will wind up in the hands of the very same abortion industry that so skillfully lied to my colleagues and me.

After lying through their teeth on the partial-birth abortion ban here in the United States, is it so unreasonable to doubt the abortion lobby's commitment to truth-telling elsewhere? Who then will expose their deceptive tactics in Warsaw or Lima or Cairo or Pretoria or San Salvador? I believe that we need to steer family planning funds to those who will pledge neutrality on abortion rather than promote abortion in foreign capitals.

Today the pro-life laws and policies of almost 100 countries that restrict abortion are under siege, and the engine driving this global pro-abortion

push are the nongovernmental organizations like Planned Parenthood funded by the U.S. Government. Let me remind Members, we provide almost 50 percent of all the money that goes into their coffers. That is why we need to make a difference with the amendment that I and my friends are offering today.

Our amendment permits the flow of funds to those organizations that pledge to provide family planning and only family planning and not abortion. This is all about abortion, Mr. Chairman. The innocent children are held harmless. Who we subsidize, not just what, but who we subsidize and who we give millions of dollars to does matter.

Some Members have argued today that U.S. funds will not be used for abortion. That is already the underlying law. An amendment simply restates current law. But money is fungible. The millions of dollars we give to a group immediately frees up other non-U.S. funds that can be used, and in this case are used, for performing and aggressively promoting abortion around the world. If we give millions of dollars to those for whom abortion on demand is a way to plan family size, we put unborn babies at grave risk of death.

It should matter greatly to each of us not just what an organization does with our specific donation but the rest of its agenda as well. It is a package deal. Many groups use family planning as the Trojan horse to conceal their real agenda, which is abortion.

Let me remind Members of Vision 2000, that abortion manifesto in 1992 that was agreed to by International Planned Parenthood Federation based in London and its 140 affiliates. It said these are their marching orders that they will, quote, "bring pressure on governments and campaign for policy and legislative change to remove restrictions against abortion."

Fred Sai, who used to be chairman of IPPF, a Planned Parenthood group, said, now for the first time the IPPF plan Vision 2000 outlines activities at both the secretary and the family planning association level to further their explicit goal of increasing the right of access to abortion. Again let me remind Members, 100 countries protect their babies. These people to whom we are giving millions of dollars want to bring down those right-to-life laws. Let me give some examples.

In Poland, the chairman of the Parliamentary Group on the Family, Stanislaw Kowolik, recently lashed out at external factions in Poland for meddling in that country and pushing for liberalized abortion. As a result of strong lobbying by family planning groups, Poland recently reversed the pro-life policies of Lech Walesa and Solidarity and put in its place the pro-abortion policy of the Communists.

Another example of backlash over United States and Planned Parenthood pressure to legalize abortion on demand is the Philippines. A headline in

the Philippine Daily Inquirer last July said Senator "Flavier Hits U.S. Pressure on Abortion." And he writes: We had just celebrated our 50th anniversary of independence from America, but we can still see insidious methods of imperialism trying to subvert our self-determination by using funds as subtle leverage," and then he goes on to say he strongly opposes abortion, that his constitution prohibits it. And then he said, finally, "we should be prepared to lose foreign funding rather than be pressured into causing the death of unborn children."

The abortion promotion by Planned Parenthood is so extreme in the Philippines that the head of their IPPF affiliate, the Planned Parenthood president, quit. He said it was because a "hidden agenda of" and that his affiliate was being used as a Trojan horse to legalize abortion. They talk family planning, the real agenda is abortion on demand.

The pro-life safeguards say: We will provide money for family planning. There is not one penny lost as a result of this amendment. But we will give it only to those groups that are committed to family planning and not abortion on demand.

Let me also say on the China provision, since 1979, the U.N. Population Fund has been there on the ground promoting the one-child-per-couple policy. We have heard testimony, Members should be fully aware by now that forced abortion is commonplace in the People's Republic of China. Yet Dr. Sadik, who is the executive director of the UNFPA, has said, and I quote: "UNFPA firmly believes, and so does the government of the People's Republic of China, that their program is a totally voluntary program. It is not. It is a totally coercive program, and the UNFPA has been whitewashing these crimes since 1979."

Let me also point out to my colleagues that the amendment, the substitute amendment, is a fake. With all due respect to my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL], it is cover. It does not stop abortions. It does not do anything meaningful relative to China, and it actually trivializes this crime against humanity, against women, of forced abortion because again in China there is the UNFPA doing its work day in and day out. And we understand now that they are in negotiations for new programs in the PRC. We are saying you can have your \$25 million. Just get out of China. Stop being complicit. Stop the hand and glove relationship with the dictatorship of the PRC.

Mr. Chairman, many of our colleagues were shocked and angered to learn that the big name pro-abortion/population control organizations like Planned Parenthood Federation of America and the Alan Guttmacher Institute, had grossly misled Congress, the President, and the American people about partial-birth abortion.

In one letter sent to every Member of Congress, signed by Planned Parenthood and others, we were solemnly assured that:

This surgical procedure is used only in rare cases, fewer than 500 per year. It is most often performed in the case of wanted pregnancies gone tragically wrong, when a family learns late in pregnancy of severe fetal anomalies or a medical condition that threatens the pregnant woman's life or health.

We now know the abortion lobby's campaign to defeat the partial-birth abortion ban was and is riddled with distortion and lies.

It's one thing to have honest differences about policy—Congress is, after all, a marketplace of disparate opinions and ideas.

But don't lie to us.

Interestingly, it took one of their own, Ron Fitzsimmons, Executive Director of the National Coalition of Abortion Providers, to blow the whistle on their fraudulent tactics. You will recall that Mr. Fitzsimmons admitted "lying through (his) teeth" in spouting the pack of lies dished out by the abortion lobby. Having raised serious questions concerning the credibility and reliability of Planned Parenthood and others, Mr. Fitzsimmons admitted that of the thousands of partial-birth abortions "in the vast majority of cases, the procedure is performed on a healthy mother with a healthy fetus * * *"

Why is this relevant to the amendment Messrs. BARCIA, OBERSTAR, HYDE, and I are offering today?

Because each year Congress authorizes hundreds of millions of dollars for population control organizations—and much of that cash will wind up in the hands of the very same abortion industry that so skillfully lied to you and me. After "lying through (their) teeth" on the partial-birth abortion ban here in the United States, is it so unreasonable to doubt the abortion lobby's commitment to truth-telling? Who then will expose their deceptive tactics in Warsaw of Lima or Cairo or Pretoria of San Salvador? We need to steer family planning funds to those who will pledge neutrality on abortion rather than the promotion of abortion in foreign capitals.

Today, the pro-life laws and policies of almost 100 countries that restrict abortion are under siege and the engine driving this global pro-abortion push are the nongovernmental organizations funded by the U.S. Government.

My amendment permits the flow of funds to those organizations that pledge to provide only family planning, not abortion. The innocent children are held harmless.

Who we subsidize—not just what—but who we give millions of dollars to, does matter. Some Members will argue today that no U.S. funds will be used for abortion. But money is fungible. The millions of dollars we give to a group immediately frees up other non-U.S. funds that can be used—and, in this case, are used—for performing and aggressively promoting abortion. If we give millions of dollars to those for whom abortion on demand is a way to plan family size, we put unborn babies at grave risk of death. It should matter greatly to each of us not just what an organization does with out specific donation, but the rest of its agenda as well. It is a package deal. Many groups use family planning as the Trojan horse to conceal their real agenda—abortion on demand.

I urge Members to carefully consider the 1992 International Planned Parenthood Federation abortion manifesto called Vision 2000, a global strategic plan that Planned Parenthood and its 140 country affiliates adopted

and have been implementing ever since to promote abortion in every corner of the world.

The Vision 2000 strategic plan says, and I quote, that family planning organizations should "bring pressure on governments and campaign for policy and legislative change to remove restrictions against abortion." Can anything be more clear? Pressure governments to nullify their pro-life policies. Campaign for abortion on demand. And we are providing many, many millions of dollars to this group.

Fred Sai, who is the former chairman of International Planned Parenthood, put it very succinctly:

Now, for the first time, the IPPF strategic plan, Vision 2000, which was unanimously adopted at the Members' Assembly in Delhi, outlines activities at both the Secretariat and FPA level to further IPPF's explicit goal of increasing the right of access to abortion.

IPPF has plans of action, as they call them, to promote abortion in Central and South America where unborn children are now legally safeguarded. They have plans to repeal the pro-life laws in Africa, the Muslim countries in the Middle East, and several Asian countries.

In Poland, the chairman of the Parliamentary Group on the Family, Stanislaw Kowalikveouk recently lashed out at external factions in Poland for meddling in that country and pushing for liberalized abortion. As a result of strong lobbying by family planning groups, Poland recently reversed the pro-life policies of Lech Walesa and Solidarity and put in its place, the pro-abortion policy of the Communists.

Only last week's action by Poland's high court stopped the new abortion law from going into effect.

Another example of backlash over United States and Planned Parenthood pressure to legalize abortion on demand is the Philippines.

A headline in the Philippine Daily Inquirer last July: "Flavier Hits U.S. Pressure on Abortion." The article quotes Senator Juan Flavio:

We had just celebrated our 50th anniversary of independence from America, but we can still see insidious methods of imperialism trying to subvert our self-determination by using [population control] funds as subtle leverage * * *. I strongly oppose abortion. It is prohibited by our laws and the Philippine Constitution. Hence, we should be prepared to lose foreign funding rather than be pressured into causing the death of unborn children.

The abortion promotion by Planned Parenthood is so extreme in the Philippines that the president of IPPF's affiliate—the Family Planning Organization of the Philippines [FPOP]—resigned over what he called International Planned Parenthood Federation's "hidden agenda" and use of his affiliate as a Trojan horse to legalize abortion.

The use of family planning as cover—the use of family planning as a Trojan horse for abortion law liberalization is now commonplace and must be stopped.

Let me remind Members that the pro-life safeguards included in my amendment are nothing new; they were in effect for almost a decade. And they worked.

The pro-life safeguards often referred to as the Mexico City Policy were in effect during the Reagan and Bush years as a principled way to fully fund family planning without promoting abortion.

Specifically, the safeguards say this: We will donate funds only to those organizations that will not perform abortions except in the cases of rape, incest, and life of the mother. Funds may go to those organizations that will not lobby for or against abortion.

We should have no part in empowering the abortion industry to succeed in its war on the unborn.

If Members want to promote abortions, be up-front and legislate that. But don't hide behind counterfeit amendments like the Campbell substitute. The Mexico City Policy makes it very clear that there ought to be a wall of separation between abortion and family planning. The Campbell amendment—with all due respect to its author, a friend of mine—is a fake and a counterfeit.

The second part of our amendment relates to forced abortion.

Every day, forced abortion and forced sterilization devastate the lives of women and families in China while the U.N. Population Fund provides political cover and sustenance to those who practice these abuses. The Government of China compels women to abort their so-called unauthorized, illegal unborn children. It starts with intense persuasion using all of the economic, social, and psychological tools a totalitarian State has at its disposal. If these methods fail, women are taken physically to abortion mills. Forced abortions are often performed very late in pregnancy, even in the ninth month. Sometimes the baby's skull is crushed with forceps as the baby emerges from the birth canal. Other times the baby gets an injection of formaldehyde or some other poison into the baby's cranium. The mass murderers, euphemistically called family planning cadres, are at it every day—killing babies, devastating women's lives.

Forced abortion was properly construed to be a crime against humanity at the Nuremberg war crimes tribunal. Today, it is employed aggressively and with chilling effectiveness and unbearable pain upon women in the People's Republic of China. Women in China are required to obtain a birth coupon before conceiving a child. Chinese women are hounded by the population control cadres and even their menstrual cycles are publicly monitored as one means of ensuring compliance.

The New York Times has pointed out in an exposé that the authorities, when they discover an unauthorized pregnancy, an illegal child, normally apply a daily dose of threats and browbeating. They wear the women down. Eventually, if the woman does not succumb to the abortion, she is physically forced to submit.

In the mid-1990's, the PRC issued a decree on eugenics which nationalizes discrimination against the handicapped. In a move that is eerily reminiscent of Nazi Germany, the Communist Chinese Government is implementing forced abortion against handicapped children simply because they suffer an anomaly like Downs Syndrome, and forced sterilization against parents who simply do not measure up in the eyes of the State. Since 1979, the U.N. Population Fund has provided funds, materiel, people on the ground and what no money could buy, the sort of shield of respectability that the PRC Program so desperately wants.

Mr. Chairman, in July 1995, victims of the Chinese forced abortion program testified to the truth. Our Subcommittee on International

Operations and Human Rights heard the testimony of three women who testified that they had been forced to have abortions.

One of those witnesses, Li Bao Yu [Lee Bough You], told us how her troubles started in earnest after she removed an IUD that the population cadres had forced her accept, but which had been making her sick. She became pregnant. The family planning program officials, who came to inspect every woman in the village several times a year—the involuntary inspections a serious violation of each woman's privacy—discovered her pregnancy and threatened that if she did not have the abortion, her first child would be denied education and health care. In her own words,

They threatened me that I do not agree to have this abortion, then my first child will forever have no chance of being a registered, normal citizen.

Mr. Chairman, this is the human cost of the shameful program that for years has been assisted, praised, coddled, and protected by the U.N. Population Fund, the UNFPA. The supporters of this amendment argue that if it were not for UNFPA, the Chinese program would be even worse. But this is an assertion without evidence. UNFPA officials including Nafis Sadiq have repeatedly praised the Chinese program. UNFPA has provided demographic capabilities—a tracking system that hunts down women bearing babies—a system that enables the Beijing population commissars to tell where they need to enforce their program more vigorously. They have trained thousands of cadres—the implementors of this egregious policy. They have provided major elements of the infrastructure that systematically oppresses the women of China and murders their babies. They are part of the problem, not part of the solution.

The Campbell amendment would delete the pro-human rights language in my amendment and insert a substitute that looks good and does next to nothing. UNFPA could spend all the money it wanted in China so long as it kept a separate set of books that showed our money going only for projects outside China. There would also be a reduction in the U.S. contribution—but past experience has shown that a reduction is not enough. The language of the amendment is almost identical to language that has been adopted in the past by the Appropriations Committee, and when this language has been adopted, UNFPA has stayed in China. Only when there was a real threat of serious action—an absolute condition that UNFPA get out of China or lose our money—did UNFPA even go through the motions of getting out. So the substitute language is simply not enough. It absolutely trivializes these crimes—it should not be enough for those of us who are pro-life, and it should not be enough for those who think of themselves as pro-choice. If there is anything UNFPA's involvement in China is not about, it is not about free choice.

This House has voted countless times to condition United States funding for UNFPA on its disengagement from the PRC forced abortion program. Last year, we gave UNFPA some flexibility. They insisted they were no longer giving grants in China. They still had an office there, which they said they were using to administer old grants. Now it turns out that they are actively negotiating with the Chinese Government for future grants and contracts. So we were misled last year: UNFPA was not

getting out of China and, unless we take decisive action, has no intention of getting out of China. Congress gave UNFPA the flexibility their supporters said they needed. This is as far as we can go. Loyalty to these women—these victims of unspeakable torture—will allow us to go no further.

□ 1200

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I address to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], one simple question. I have 1 minute, so if he could please confine his answer, if he can.

Under the gentleman's amendment, if the U.N. spends one dime to advise one person in China about contraception, would not all United States assistance to U.N. family planning throughout Africa and Latin America be terminated?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that the language in our amendment says if the President can certify that there is no more forced abortion, and if they get out of China, which is what we are advocating, because they have had this duplicitous, egregious policy, working hand in glove with the dictatorship, we are saying get out and they get their full \$25 million. And there will also probably be about \$400 million of other family planning money that is also in the bill that is conditioned by the first part of the amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, is the answer to my question yes?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If the gentleman will continue to yield, unless the forced abortion is ended, sure. They have had a hand-in-glove relationship.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

My colleagues, we have heard the fundamental problem with the Smith amendment. It is not simply Mexico City. It terminates all United States contribution to all family planning around the world, in Africa, in Latin America, in Indonesia, in desperately poor parts of this world, all of it, if the U.N. spends a dime for family planning in China. It was crafted with that intention and it is cruel and wrong.

For whatever motive we have regarding China, to punish the destitute, the poor, the needy in Africa and Latin America, compassion suggests a "no" vote on the Smith amendment and a "yes" vote on the Campbell-Greenwood-Lowey amendment.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment and in opposition to the amendment by the gentleman from New Jersey.

I have some concerns about the fact that we are even debating this issue today; especially since most of the foreign aid sections were stripped from this legislation.

I am also disappointed that the gentleman from New Jersey has insisted on offering his

amendment. The legislation that was reported out of the International Relations Committee would have provided women and families worldwide with the maximum access to essential family planning services. At the same time, it called for a dollar-for-dollar reduction in United States funding to the UNFPA for any amount spent in China. I think we can all agree that U.S. funds should not be used to pay for "forced abortions" in that country.

The gentleman from New Jersey will attempt to equate support for family planning with support for abortion. That is simply not the case. U.S. law already prohibits the use of Government international family planning funds for promoting or providing abortion services. These programs are carefully monitored to ensure that U.S. policy is strictly followed. At the same time, studies have shown that the availability of family planning services actually reduces the incidence of abortion.

The support for international family planning is instead equivalent to the support of women and families and of sustainable economic growth worldwide.

I have long been interested in the cause and effect relationship between rapid population growth and movement and worldwide environmental degradation, dwindling natural resources, urban poverty, malnutrition, and social unrest.

This is especially disconcerting given that more than 90 percent of the annual population increase of 100 million people is in the developing world.

International family planning funds allow women and families to make responsible and informed choices about when and whether to have children. These are choices that many Americans take for granted; they are also choices that many parents in the developing world do not realize they have.

Giving people in the developing world the resources to make informed reproductive choices can help to control the population growth in those countries and decrease the strains that such growth would place on society and on natural resources.

It is in our national interest, and in the global interest, to support voluntary international family planning. Efforts to slow population growth, elevate the status of women, reduce poverty, and promote sustainable development will lead to a more stable global system.

In short, it bears repeating: in so many important ways, family planning saves lives.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment by the gentleman from New Jersey to restrict international family planning.

We should not, we cannot return to the days when the so-called Mexico City policy dictated the flow of America's family planning dollars. That policy had a chilling effect on family planning in developing countries.

There is no evidence that Mexico City restrictions reduced abortions in developing countries. On the contrary, there is strong evidence that gag rule increased abortions and decreased the quality of life for many women.

The Mexico City policy denied many women access to family planning. Without these services, women lack the help they need to protect themselves from disease and to regulate childbearing.

The Mexico City policy restricted women from learning how to reduce unintended pregnancies. And, in the developing world, 40 per-

cent of unintended pregnancies end in abortion.

Clearly, the Mexico City policy is at odds with itself. We would be wrong to restore it.

Nor should we ban aid to the U.N. population fund.

The U.N. population fund does not support abortion as a family planning method. It does not fund abortions. And it does not condone coerced abortions in any country.

But, the U.N. population fund does provide women in 140 countries with family planning services.

These services help women choose the number and spacing of their children. In doing so, the U.N. fund has saved women's and children's lives, and reduced population growth.

Population growth affects all of us through its impact on the economy, environment and national security.

Population pressures on ecologically fragile areas lead to increased environmental degradation. Unchecked population growth where job opportunity is lacking threatens the political stability of the entire planet.

The Smith amendment would undermine years of progress in battling unchecked population growth and the problems it causes.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Smith amendment. Oppose a return to the past. And vote in favor of the future.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Campbell-Greenwood-Lowey substitute to the Smith amendment. This is a commonsense measure which restates current law and will protect the lives of women and children around the world.

This vote is not about supporting abortion. Under current law, not \$1 of U.S. family planning funds can be used to perform—or even counsel women to obtain—abortions anywhere in the world. The substitute would retain that prohibition. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the substitute. Vote to prevent abortion. Vote to improve the health of women and children. Vote to save lives.

U.S. family planning aid saves the lives of women. Around the world, 600,000 women die in childbirth every year. Access to family planning in the developing world would reduce unintended pregnancies by one-fifth, and could save the lives of as many as 120,000 of those women.

U.S. family planning aid saves the lives of children. Family planning allows women—and men—to choose how many children they want and when to have them. Spacing children further apart and breast feeding them can improve a child's chance of survival by up to 20 percent in most developing countries. Evidence from across the developing world shows that increased contraceptive use reduces abortion, raises families out of poverty, and increases the life expectancy of all of the children in the family. The Smith amendment, which would halt U.S. family planning aid, condemns hundreds of thousands of women to poor health and possibly death.

If we fail to pass this substitute today, family planning and health clinics across the developing world will close. For many women, these health clinics are the only source of preventative health care that can detect diseases such as cervical cancer in the early stages and save lives.

By voting "yes" to this substitute, you vote to save the lives of women. You vote to reduce unwanted pregnancies. You vote to reduce abortions across the world. You vote to

improve children's health and life expectancy. Support women's health. Support children's health. Vote "yes" on the Campbell-Greenwood-Lowe substitute, and vote "no" on the Smith amendment.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak out against the Smith amendment which seeks to reinstate the so-called Mexico City restrictions on international family planning and to cut funding for the U.N. Fund for Population Activities [UNFPA]. This is really nothing more than a global gag rule.

First of all, no U.S. foreign aid funds are used to either promote, or perform abortions. So this amendment is really unnecessary and antifamily planning. The amendment also seeks to ban aid to UNFPA based on its past involvement in China. But UNFPA is in no way linked to reported family planning abuses in China.

UNFPA does not support abortion and has never funded an abortion. The UNFPA does work in 140 countries where people are desperately seeking assistance in preventing unintended pregnancies. Holding these funds hostage hurts women, children, and families around the world.

UNFPA programs have achieved better nutrition, better health, longer life expectancy and a reduced toll of infectious disease for people all around the world. Their programs have increased the use of family planning from about 15 to 60 percent of couples. And they ensure that young women, whether in Bangladesh or Botswana, have access to reproductive and other basic health care services.

A basic principle that has governed UNFPA's work for many years is that abortion should never be promoted as a method of family planning. Families which lack access to adequate public health services deserve our understanding and our help. Vote "no" on the Smith amendment. Vote "yes" on Campbell-Greenwood.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Smith amendment and I congratulate the gentleman from New Jersey for offering this important amendment to reinstate what we refer to as "The Mexico City Policy."

The wording in that policy is direct, simple, and straightforward, and from 1985 to 1993 this "Mexico City" language protected the American taxpayers from having their tax dollars spent on abortion. For 8 years, this language assured that our great Nation would not, directly or indirectly, support or promote abortion throughout the world. With all the world's great crying needs, we should not spend our scarce foreign aid dollars to subsidize and promote abortion.

The world looks to America for moral leadership. The world looks to America for justice for the weak and the disenfranchised. We should respond to this call for leadership not by promoting abortion for the children of the poorest peoples of the world, but rather by helping them develop the economic and political infrastructure that encourages development, peace, and progress.

I urge my colleagues to support the Smith amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] 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.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 158, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NETHERCUTT

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NETHERCUTT:

At the end of the bill add the following section:

SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO THE ABDUCTION AND DETAINMENT OF DONALD HUTCHINGS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Al-Faran, a militant organization that seeks to merge Kashmir with Pakistan, has waged a war against the Government of India.

(2) During the week of July 2, 1995, Al-Faran abducted Donald Hutchings of the State of Washington, another American John Childs, and 4 Western Europeans in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. John Childs has since escaped.

(3) Al-Faran has executed one hostage and threatened to kill Donald Hutchings and the remaining Western European hostages unless the Government of India agrees to release suspected guerrillas from its jails.

(4) Several militants have been captured by the Indian Government and have given conflicting and unconfirmed reports about the hostages.

(5) Donald Hutchings and the 3 remaining Western European hostages have been held against their will by Al-Faran for nearly 2 years.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the militant organization Al-Faran should release, immediately, Donald Hutchings and 3 Western Europeans from captivity;

(2) Al-Faran and their supporters should cease and desist from all acts of hostage-taking and other violent acts within the State of Jammu and Kashmir.

(3) the State Department Rewards Program should be used to the greatest extent possible to solicit new information pertaining to hostages; and

(4) the governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany, Norway, India, and Pakistan should share and investigate all information relating to these hostages as quickly as possible.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I am introducing this amendment today for myself and for the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, who has worked with me, with the two Senators from the State of Washington, Senator GORTON and Senator MURRAY, as well as the gen-

tleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MCHALE, the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico, the former Congressman, Bill Richardson, who is now Ambassador Richardson, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HAMILTON, and certainly the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. GINGRICH, the distinguished Speaker of the House, over the last 2 years to raise the awareness about a constituent of mine, Donald Hutchings from Spokane, WA, who was taken hostage nearly 2 years ago on foreign soil.

On July 2, 1995, Donald Hutchings was on a mountain climbing expedition in Kashmir with his wife and other climbers when they were abducted by a shadowy group of militants known as Al-Faran. Don's wife, Jane Schelly, was released immediately, and another American, John Childs, escaped his captors.

This group has repeatedly threatened Donald Hutchings, to kill him, and the other three remaining Western European hostages, unless the Government of India agreed to release suspected guerilla fighters from its jails. One hostage was found brutally murdered in August 1995, but the location of the other hostages is unknown. A number of militants have been captured by the Government of India, but they have given conflicting and unconfirmed reports about the hostages.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, expresses the sense of Congress that Al-Faran should immediately release all the hostages from captivity and cease all violent acts in India. It urges the use of the State Department Rewards Program, which this bill, H.R. 1757, improves by raising the cap on available funds in order that those funds can be used to solicit new information pertaining to the hostages.

The Nethercutt-Pallone amendment also urges that the Government of the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany, Norway, India, and Pakistan continue to work together to share all investigative information relating to these hostages.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment also sends a strong message to Al-Faran that the United States believes such terrorism is reprehensible, we condemn it; and, at the same time, it encourages the flow of new information which will allow Don's courageous wife, Jane Schelly, to know where her husband is being held.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the gentleman from Washington that it is an excellent amendment, the committee agrees to accept the amendment, and I think the minority has also expressed a willingness to accept the amendment.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I am delighted the chairman would do that. I would just conclude by saying that Jane Schelly

has been halfway around the world in order to raise the level of the interest of this amendment and in the finding of her husband.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington as well as the chairman of the committee. I totally support this amendment.

I am not going to repeat the background of what occurred there and the brutal killing of the second hostage that was mentioned by the gentleman, but I do feel that we need to send a message to the Al-Faran and I believe that this will accomplish that.

I just wanted to say that while I was in India, I talked to former Prime Minister Devde on the hostage situation, and he informed me he could not confirm nor deny the status of Donald Hutchings, but he did assure me he would continue to investigate the situation and the Indian Government would do all it can to find and release the hostages.

Before my trip to India this year, I had the opportunity to meet with Donald Hutchings' wife, Jane Schelly. Obviously, she was upset and would like the safe return of her husband, and although the safe return of her husband does not look promising, she continues to hope. In her heart she believes her husband is alive and will return back to home in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot lose hope. We need to support this amendment and we must urge the State Department to work with India, Pakistan, the United Kingdom, Germany, and Norway in securing the release of these hostages. I think the gentleman's amendment will help in that regard and thank him for sponsoring it.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey, and I would hope we can have a recorded vote on this to make certain the whole Congress weighs in very heavily on the importance of this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT].

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

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 159, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT] will be postponed.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to advise the House that late last night, when the Committee of the Whole was meeting, there were three Members, I believe,

three Members at most, in the Chamber. One of our colleagues introduced an amendment to the legislation that is being debated at this point which is replete more than with irony, with cynicism.

It was an amendment introduced by a gentleman from New York that says more or less the following: If the terrorist state, the Cuban terrorist state, complains about any United States citizen, makes a complaint, then the State Department, paid for by United States taxpayer funds, will have an obligation to report to Congress on the complaints of the Cuban terrorist state.

I have rarely seen examples of such advocacy directly, directly in favor of a state on the terrorist list of the State Department. That is the amendment that was introduced last night by one of our colleagues.

So I want to advise the House that I will demand a separate vote in the House at the time that the Committee of the Whole rises on this unfortunate amendment.

I think that it is important for our colleagues to know, for this House to know what was introduced into this legislation last night. It was truly unfortunate, and it was truly something that I think should be and, hopefully, will be stricken at the time that the Committee of the Whole rises and we have a separate vote in the House.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we will soon be voting on final passage and I alert my colleagues that, as my colleague from Florida has stated, we will be calling for a recorded vote on the amendment introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO] last night. For various reasons, the Committee felt it was best to allow a voice vote and wait until final passage to raise the question of recorded votes.

This amendment does not even belong within the scope of a debate concerning U.S. foreign policy and the protection of U.S. national security interests. The amendment places a greater emphasis on the false and distorted allegations of a terrorist regime, a pariah state, than on safeguarding persons of the United States. It places the activities of the U.S. Government in jeopardy and potentially endangers the lives of some U.S. Government personnel who risk their lives every day in Castro's Cuba in an attempt to assist human rights dissidents and the pro democracy movement inside the island.

The Serrano amendment would essentially turn our U.S. State Department into an instrument of Castro's propaganda machine. It will waste thousands of U.S. taxpayers' dollars, forcing the U.S. Government to act based on the rumblings and idiotic attacks of officials from a regime which is desperately trying to cling to the reins of power.

Time and time again Castro officials have accused falsely the United States

Government and falsely accused United States nationals of the most ridiculous actions, such as the United States launching of biological warfare against the Cuban people. That was an actual Castro accusation. They have also said that we have launched insect warfare to destroy Cuba's agricultural sector.

This is what Fidel Castro has actually accused the U.S. Government of doing. This is absolutely ridiculous, and the Serrano amendment, introduced last night, would want us to pay attention to and would tell the State Department to monitor such attacks. So if Castro says the United States is waging a chemical war against the Cuban people, which is exactly what Castro has said, we, the taxpayers of this country, would have to foot the bill to make sure that will we monitor these criticisms.

□ 1215

I think it is the wrong action for the U.S. Congress to take and that is why we will be calling for a vote on this Serrano amendment at the proper time.

So to force the State Department, our own Government, to turn against our own people, U.S. citizens, falls dangerously close to doing the same things that Castro's apparatus intimidation does on a daily basis. For anyone to suggest that this body should violate the privacy of the American people for the purposes of granting credence to the rantings of oppressors and terrorists is ludicrous. It is shameful, it is ridiculous. It is so far beyond the stretch of the imagination that it does not even merit further discussion in any serious debate of U.S. foreign policy objectives and national security interests.

In fact, if this amendment were to pass on a recorded vote, that would mean that our own State Department would have to then report on the activities of this very body. Why do I say that? Just last week, on Friday, the president of Cuba's national assembly, a nondemocratically elected group, denounced this very bill as, quote, anti-Cuban actions and rendered an official complaint, which is the only criteria required by the Serrano amendment. So according to this amendment introduced last night, our very own State Department would have to investigate us and put us on the State Department list.

I know, Mr. Chairman, that my colleagues will vote against the Serrano amendment and I reiterate our call for a recorded vote against it. I wish that the Member of Congress who proposed this amendment would instead be trying to pass legislation calling for free elections in Cuba. I wish that our colleague on the other side of the aisle would instead be denouncing the human rights violations that occur daily in Cuba. But instead he is doing Castro's work for him in this body. I think that he should rethink that decision and I know that this body will

rethink our vote on that amendment, and that is why we will be proud to call for a recorded vote at the proper time.

I ask Mr. SERRANO, shouldn't U.S. taxpayer money be put to better use? Wouldn't U.S. foreign policy objectives be better served by requesting reports on human rights abuses; on Castro's narcotics trafficking; on Castro's support for terrorism worldwide?

I know this would be a better use of funds, time, and effort for the U.S. Government and specifically the State Department.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. BROWN OF FLORIDA

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. BROWN of Florida:

At the end of title XVII insert the following new section:

SEC. 1717. SENSE OF CONGRESS CONCERNING THE RIGHTS OF PRISONERS IN ANDEAN COUNTRIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Several American prisoners have spent years in Ecuadorian prisons on drug-related offenses without having received a trial.

(2) The prisoners include James Williams, a United States citizen who has been held for 9 months without any findings, and Sandra Chase, who has been held for more than 18 months and has never seen a judge.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the Governments of the Andean countries of Peru, Ecuador, Bolivia, Columbia, and Venezuela, should respect the rights of prisoners, including United States citizens, to timely legal procedures and abide by international standards of due process.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, my amendment addresses one of the most basic issues that ties together every country in this globe. This issue is respect for human rights—including the rights of people accused of crimes. My amendment expresses the sense of Congress that the Governments of the Andean countries, including Peru, Ecuador, Bolivia, Columbia, and Venezuela, should respect the rights of prisoners, including United States Citizens, for timely legal procedures and international standards of due process. This is a simple amendment—one that would be difficult to vote against because it simply asks for due process, nothing more.

On my recent trip to Ecuador, I witnessed extreme human rights violations in this nation's prisons, and in their justice system. I traveled to Ecuador to visit American prisoner James (Jim) Williams in the Guayaquil Penitentiary. Jim Williams is a businessman from Jacksonville, FL, and he has been held in this prison for the past 9 months. On my trip one factor became very apparent. Like several other South American countries, Ecuador's judicial system—including the courts and prisons—is in shambles. It is a country where poverty is the norm and typewriters are a luxury. Thousands of people linger in prisons for years without a trial.

Officials related to me that because of U.S. pressure for drug suspects to be apprehended, there is a focus by an overwhelmed local police force to bring in anyone suspected of drug use, drug trafficking, or money laundering. Local police lock up persons who associate with even suspected drug dealers. Hence, prisons are overcrowded with sus-

pected drug users, drug dealers, or money launderers. But because of the rampant, corruption and bribery, the most dangerous narcotics offenders—the traffickers—are able to buy their freedom.

Because of the rampant corruption and bribery, most people sit in jail for years without every going to trial. And some of the most dangerous drug dealers buy their way out of the system.

Within this corrupt system are Jim Williams, Sandra Chase, and 40 other Americans. They are in jails where most people have no toilets. There are only six public defenders for 10 million people. Most prisoners become hopelessly lost in a broken judicial system. Children grow up in prisons with imprisoned mothers.

The prison I visited in Guayaquil has 2,500 prisoners; only 400 have ever received a trial. Because of the extensive bribery, simply getting a trial can cost the prisoner up to \$30,000. Wealthy people simply buy their way out. But Jim Williams has insisted on proving his innocence. Unfortunately, those who plead innocent spend more time in the system battling the charges than if they had first plead guilty to the crime and served their time.

The good news is that we can make a difference. When I was in Ecuador, I met one prisoner who had been in jail for 4 years on charges that he had a single marijuana cigarette. He was 16 when he entered this prison. Last week, he and 11 other prisoners who spent years in jail without a trial, were released.

I believe this is a direct result of the publicity we brought to these prisoners, and I am even more committed that we can work with our neighbors in Latin America to ensure that all people have access to due process.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment, and send a message to our neighbors that the U.S. Congress will not stand by while prisoners lie suffering, waiting indefinitely for justice.

Ecuador's judicial system is in shambles. There are few typewriters, cases lie in paper heaps on office floors where there is no air conditioning and the humidity is usually at very high levels.

Poverty in Ecuador is the norm.

U.S. officials in Ecuador have an overriding role to combat drug trafficking.

Local police lock up persons who associate with even suspected drug dealers.

Because of bribery, wealthy drug offenders go free.

Forty Americans are imprisoned within this system.

Ecuador has 6 public defenders for 10 million people.

One prisoner was in jail for 4 years without a trial for having one marijuana cigarette.

The jails have no phones and no toilets.

Children grow up in prison with imprisoned mothers.

Each lingering case represents a person out of work and a family that suffers.

I visited a prison with 2,500 prisoners—only 400 had ever received a trial. A trial can cost \$30,000.

COMITE DE INTERNOS,
DEL C.R.S.V.-G.,
Guayaquil, 31 de Mayo de 1.997.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN,
Congresswoman of the U.S.A.,
Washington.

MY DEAR LADY: Thanks to your visit to this Penitentiary some changes have occurred

and we, the inmates, wish to thank you for your kind intervention and interest in our plight

First of all, we wish to inform you that the inmate Jose Ayala Gomez, after 4 years and 6 months of prison, for possessing one marijuana cigarette, was finally released. He went to the press and T.V. to publicly thank you for your help.

On the other hand, we have seen that judges have started to take depositions from the inmates and some progress seems to be underway. This all has happened after your visit to this center.

Two thousand prisoners that have been relegated and remain without sentence for years are still waiting for justice.

We wish to ask you to keep your kind interest in our suffering so that the international organization of Human Rights pressures the Ecuadorian authorities to comply with the law and cease the abuse of the civil and human rights of Ecuadorian citizens.

We are pleased to remain yours very truly.

FRANCISCO BAQUERIZO

VILLAO,

President.

ROBERT VERA,

Secretario.

Guayaquil, 31 de Mayo de 1.997.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN,
Congresswoman U.S.A., Washington.

DEAR LADY: I wish to send you by this letter, my deep feeling of gratitude for my release from prison.

After four years and six months I have managed to get out of hell, thanks to your kind help. I will always remember the beautiful lady that came here as an apparition from heaven.

Now I must seek my wife and three children that I have lost. I will also try to recover my health. Hundreds of companions that are left behind wait also for justice.

I pray so hard that you are well and that your efforts be successful.

FRANKLIN AYALA GOMEZ.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentlewoman from Florida yield?

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support our colleague from Florida, Ms. BROWN, in offering this amendment. I have been monitoring closely the case of James Wilson who is being held in prison in Ecuador. Without prejudging the merits of any particular case, I am proud to join the gentlewoman in expressing the sense of Congress that all such persons should be afforded timely legal procedures. And by passing this amendment, we would be making a strong unequivocal statement in favor of justice and due process. I commend the gentlewoman for her amendment and I would like to note to the gentlewoman that the majority accepts the amendment.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. BROWN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was in my office listening to the comments by the two

Members from Florida on an amendment that was passed last night concerning the ever-present and sad Cuban issue. Let me first set the record straight.

I presented the amendment because I felt it was right. I printed it under the rules of the House. I presented it under the procedures set up by the Republican majority, the amendment was voted on by voice vote and it was passed. If they desire now to quiet me and quiet the issue by bringing up the vote, that is fine; they have a right to do that. But I think we have to understand what is going on here. This bill includes provisions that ask the administration and other agencies to report to the Congress every 3 months on how the administration is enforcing the Cuban embargo. I am an opponent of the Cuban embargo. I feel it is improper and I feel it is foolish and it has not gained any success for our country.

Therefore, in a desire to strike some balance, I have said on many occasions that there are complaints that come from the Cuban Government that deal with the behavior of some American citizens and American residents, complaints such as, on more than 10 occasions before the tragic downing of 2 airplanes flown by Florida residents, on more than 10 occasions prior to that time, the Cuban Government had officially complained to our Government that these planes and planes from the same organization were violating Cuban air space.

On that July, prior to that tragic incident, the Cuban Government had complained officially to the United States and to the rest of the world, if anybody wanted to listen, that planes from that organization had flown over Havana, dropped leaflets, dropped paint, and incited or attempted to incite a riot. Now please understand what I am talking about. If Cuban airplanes flew over the capital, each one of us would expect our Government to shoot them down immediately. And I would be the first one to say that that would be the proper action to take, but because it is Cuba and it is the desire of this country and of some people to continue to press them until they come begging forgiveness for their different form of government, nothing gets done.

So all my amendment does, the amendment that was passed properly last night, is to say every 3 months tell us what official complaints have been brought forth by the Cuban Government, complaints that deal with violation of air space, complaints that deal with American citizens or residents who enter Cuban territory, complaints that deal, official complaints with ships getting beyond international waters into Cuban territory, and recently complaints that deal with American residents or citizens that have been accused by the Cuban Government of being involved in what we would call terrorist actions.

What is it that some people want to hide that they do not want simply the

truth to come out? I am not suggesting in my amendment that we do anything about those actions. Interestingly enough, I am not suggesting in my amendment that we arrest anyone, I am not suggesting in my amendment that we stop anyone from doing these things. All I am suggesting is that we know as Members of Congress so that we can balance the Cuban issue and the Cuban approach.

Now, there are people who stand on this floor and accuse my amendment of being the worst amendment they ever saw and accuse my actions of being the worst actions any Member can take, but let me say something. I strongly believe that we are wrong in our policy toward Cuba and I will not rest until my country, this country, realizes that the best way to deal with this issue is the way we dealt with the Soviet Union, the way we are dealing with China, the way we are dealing with Vietnam, the way we are dealing with Korea.

If there are Members that do not like that, I apologize for bringing grief upon their lives. But I will not move back, nor any approach on their part will make me move back from this that I believe so strongly. What is right is to let the amendment go through. What are we afraid of? To learn the truth?

The vote will be taken today. I would hope that all Members on both sides take into consideration the fact that an amendment properly presented before this House was approved. If they want to kill it, there are other ways to do that, in conference, in the Senate, but they should let this amendment go through because I presented it properly and it was approved properly.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield to the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN].

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to engage our colleague from New York, Mr. SERRANO in a series of questions about some of the statements that he has made. For example, he said that the amendment that we passed yesterday had to deal with how the United States is monitoring Cuban embargo. That is not the case.

The amendment that we will pass deals with how the State Department is or is not administering the laws that the U.S. Congress has passed with almost 400 votes in favor in a strong bipartisan way. We would like the State Department to administer the law. The U.S. Congress approved it. We would like the State Department to approve it, to implement it.

Furthermore, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO] is saying that Castro was so upset about the U.S. planes flying so close to his territory. Too bad that the facts of the case are that every international body, including the United Nations, that has looked at this incident has said that it

was an unarmed, humanitarian flight that took place in international waters and Castro killed American citizens, shot them from the sky.

But my colleague is not concerned with that. He is concerned with Castro's accusations. He is not concerned about our constituents that died, and he is not concerned about the thousands of Cubans that die every year trying to get to liberty. He wants to do Castro's work in the U.S. Congress.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention, in coordination with our committee's ranking minority member, Mr. HAMILTON, to move at a subsequent time to seek an agreement to limit consideration of any further amendments to this bill, the bill that is now before us.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON].

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I was just trying to understand what the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] was saying. Would he repeat, please. I apologize, I was distracted.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I intend to move at a subsequent time to seek an agreement to limit consideration of any further amendments to this bill.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HAMILTON. I commend the chairman for his statement. I think it is important that we give Members notice that we are going to cut off amendments to this bill. I think the chairman is taking the right approach on it, and I will work with him on it.

REQUEST FOR MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCARBOROUGH TO TITLE XVII, FOREIGN POLICY PROVISIONS

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to make a technical amendment on my amendment regarding Sudan to add the sentence: "This restriction shall not be interpreted to restrict humanitarian assistance or transactions relating to normal diplomatic activities."

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment offered by Mr. SCARBOROUGH:

At the end of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] insert: "This restriction shall not be interpreted to restrict humanitarian assistance or transactions relating to normal diplomatic activities."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

□ 1230

Mr. HAMILTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I understand the amendment has been adopted. The gentleman is seeking a unanimous-consent change in the text of the amendment. I just had it handed to me. I do

not want to object to the gentleman's request, but I would request that we be given a little time to examine it. It is new to me. I would like to check it out. May I request that the gentleman withdraw his unanimous consent and let me have a couple of hours here to check it and renew it at a later point?

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. If the gentleman will yield, I thank the gentleman for asking. This vote is going to be coming up early this afternoon, after 1:30. The objection last night was that this would somehow affect NGO's. We actually have talked to NGO's that are going into Sudan. They have said this would not have any impact on them whatsoever. But we wanted to just bend over backwards to make sure that everybody knew that humanitarian assistance was cleared.

Let me just say that after this passes, we will certainly be glad as we go to conference to do whatever it takes to make sure that the minority has no concerns regarding it.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, I do not have any doubt about the gentleman's intent here, but since I have only had a very few minutes to look at it, I still feel like I need some additional time to review it, so I would be constrained to object to the unanimous consent at this point. However, I would anticipate we could work this out.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. If the gentleman will yield further, would the gentleman agree to possibly, if I come back to amend it before the vote, when we come back in later today, would that be all right with the gentleman?

Mr. HAMILTON. Yes. I understand there is a vote pending on the gentleman's amendment. I do not want to delay that. Let us proceed quickly here to find out about it. Then the gentleman can renew his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HAMILTON. I will be back in touch with the gentleman.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER) having assumed the chair, Mr. NEY, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1757) to consolidate international affairs agencies, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1469, 1997 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR RECOVERY FROM NATURAL DISASTERS, AND FOR OVERSEAS PEACEKEEPING EFFORTS, INCLUDING THOSE IN BOSNIA

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-120) on the resolution (H. Res. 162) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1469) making emergency supplemental appropriations for recovery from natural disasters, and for overseas peacekeeping efforts, including those in Bosnia, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 84, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1998

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 160 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 160

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 84) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1998 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. The conference report shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 160 is the customary rule for considering a conference report on a budget resolution.

The rule waives all points of order against the conference report to accompany House Concurrent Resolution 84, the budget resolution for fiscal years 1998 through 2002, and against its consideration.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate on the conference report, divided equally between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Budget. This 1 hour is instead of

the 5 hours called for under section 305(a) of the Budget Act. However, a review of the budget conference report rules over the last decade or so reveals that most of them provided for only 1 hour of debate, so this is customary, what we are doing here today.

Finally, the rule does not address the issue of a motion to recommit, since section 305(a)(6) of the Budget Act states that a motion to recommit the conference report is not in order under the rules of the House. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this is a customary rule for the consideration of a budget resolution conference report.

Turning to the conference report itself, it is extremely important to recognize that this is a dramatic and a very positive shift in the direction of this country. This improvement is in large part due to the steadfast leadership and the committed drive of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and the bipartisan members of the Committee on the Budget. They and the other Members who worked with them deserve our commendation.

Our former colleague and leader, Bob Michel, used to say on this floor that "in political decision-making, we must never let the perfect become the enemy of the good." This sage advice I think applies here today.

Mr. Speaker, this balanced budget agreement is not perfect and it does not reflect the complete priorities of any one Member of this House. In fact, I think that I can say with certainty that every Member of the House would probably have written this differently if he or she were the only one making that decision.

I know that if I were writing this budget, I would have had deeper spending cuts, much deeper. I would have had more tax cuts, more entitlement reform to get these entitlements under control, and certainly more spending for defense, which is really why this Congress exists, is to provide for a common defense for the 50 States against those that would take away our freedoms.

However, it is important to recognize once again that the nature of a democracy rests on the art of compromise, a compromise not in principle but in approach and in process. This principled compromise is epitomized in the leadership of the Committee on the Budget in crafting a bipartisan agreement that reflects the principles of balanced budgets, lower taxes, lower spending, and a smaller Federal Government. That is what this budget is all about.

Second, on balance it is a good budget. It is built upon permanent spending savings and permanent tax cuts. These are specific changes that are being written into the law by the adoption of this budget, something radically different than the procedural spending caps and deficit targets included in previous budget agreements such as Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, and my colleagues all know that that did not work at all.