

Regula	Sessions	Tauzin
Reyes	Shadegg	Taylor (MS)
Riggs	Shaw	Thomas
Riley	Shays	Thompson
Rivers	Sherman	Thornberry
Rodriguez	Shimkus	Thune
Roemer	Shuster	Thurman
Rogan	Sisisky	Tiahrt
Rogers	Skaggs	Tierney
Rohrabacher	Skeen	Trafigant
Ros-Lehtinen	Skelton	Turner
Rothman	Smith (MI)	Upton
Roukema	Smith (NJ)	Velazquez
Roybal-Allard	Smith (OR)	Vento
Royce	Smith (TX)	Visclosky
Rush	Smith, Linda	Walsh
Ryun	Snowbarger	Wamp
Sabo	Snyder	Watkins
Salmon	Solomon	Watt (NC)
Sanchez	Souder	Watts (OK)
Sanders	Spence	Waxman
Sandlin	Spratt	Weldon (FL)
Sanford	Stearns	Weller
Sawyer	Stenholm	Weygand
Saxton	Stokes	White
Scarborough	Strickland	Whitfield
Schaefer, Dan	Stump	Wicker
Schaffer, Bob	Stupak	Wise
Schumer	Sununu	Wolf
Scott	Talent	Wynn
Sensenbrenner	Tanner	Young (AK)
Serrano	Tauscher	Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—9

Bono	Lazio	Schiff
Engel	Manton	Taylor (NC)
Gonzalez	McCollum	Weldon (PA)

## □ 1110

Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. KASICH, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GEPHARDT and Mr. YATES changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I was necessarily absent during rollcall vote 355. If present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall 355.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 2159) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous materials.

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

There was no objection.

## FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 24, 1997, 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. 2159.

## □ 1113

## 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. 2159) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with Mr. THORNBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday September 3, 1997, the bill had been read through page 94, line 3, and pending was the amendment numbered 38 by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Pursuant to the order of the House of that day, no further amendment is in order except the pending amendment by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]; amendment numbered 1 in House Report 105-184, and the amendment to that amendment, each under the terms of the order of the House of Thursday, July 24, 1997; and the amendment numbered 40 by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Is there further debate on the amendment numbered 38 by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]?

## □ 1115

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

To refresh the Members' memory, last night when we rose, we were debating the Burton amendment which would cut aid to India.

Mr. Chairman, every Member of the House supports the establishment and maintenance of democratic governments throughout the entire world. It is in our national interest and it is in the interest of the people of the world that stable democracies are nurtured and supported. India is the world's largest democracy. Outside of China, it is home to the largest potential free market in the entire world.

Why we would want to jeopardize our relations with India by passing an amendment to cut aid to that country by 25 percent is just beyond me. India is not perfect. Neither is the United States; there is no question about that. But it is also home to half of the poor of the world. Fifty percent of its children are malnourished. Do we want to turn our backs on these problems? Of course, we do not.

Among other things, our assistance program is targeted at economic reform and energy development. The tremendous potential for economic growth and trade with the United States is a key reason for our assistance program and why it should be continued.

Now, the United States is India's largest trading partner. If political disputes with China reduce our trade with that country, where can we turn for an equally large market in Asia? We can turn only to India.

I know human rights problems have existed in India in the past, but I know few countries of the world that have escaped such problems. India has established a national human rights commission, and police and other security force personnel have been successfully prosecuted for human rights violations. Local human rights groups monitor progress in this area and regularly publish their findings.

The United States is also encouraging talks between India and Pakistan to ease tensions between those two countries. It is hard for the U.S. to be an honest broker if we poke India in the eye by adopting this pending amendment.

The House has spoken on this issue before, including the consideration of the 1997 foreign operations bill, when it defeated a similar amendment by a vote of 296 to 127. I urge the House to do what it did last year and to reject this amendment which would cut aid to India.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD a letter from the Indian Ambassador and ask that it be inserted at this point:

AMBASSADOR OF INDIA,  
Washington, DC, July 11, 1997.

Hon. SONNY CALLAHAN,  
U.S. House of Representatives, Rayburn House  
Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CALLAHAN: Almost a year ago when I had just about started my assignment as Ambassador to this great country, I had occasion to write to you on an amendment moved by Congressman Dan Burton on the Foreign Operations Bill. This amendment was not approved by a vote of 296 to 127. It now appears that the House would be moved to consider a similar amendment to the Foreign Operations Bill for FY 1998.

First, I would like to say that my year in Washington has been a most interesting and rewarding experience, the highlight of which has been the encouragement and support that I have received from Members of Congress, like yourself. We have witnessed during this period a further upswing in Indo-US relations and in the growth of bilateral trade making US our largest trading partner as well as the foremost foreign investor in India.

US trade with India which was a mere \$500 million in 1991 is now around \$9.5 billion. Many US companies are considering further expansion of their operations in India. Enron which had to cross many hurdles to commence the \$1.2 billion Dabhol power project is so interested in the opportunities emerging in the Indian market that it has plans to invest an additional \$10 billion over the next decade. Many processed foods with American brand names have become very popular in the Indian market. Automobiles of US design are increasing their presence on Indian roads. Banks and financial institutions too are taking advantage of recently created business opportunities. In the insurance sector also, the door has been opened for starting joint ventures in the field of health insurance.

The coalition of parties ruling at the Centre have not only continued with economic reforms but expanded it into many more areas. Custom duties and other taxes have

been further liberalized to encourage foreign investment in infrastructure and other areas of the economy. The US Administration has included India among the 10 most important emerging markets and this is borne out by the number of major US companies operating in India. A list of these companies is enclosed.

There is now in India much greater understanding and acceptance of the need for foreign investment and technology collaboration for meeting the vast needs of India's developing economy. All sections are agreed that this is necessary to maintain and increase the growth rate of around 7 percent that we have been achieving in record years.

While United States aid funds are relatively much smaller than the inflow of capital into business and industry, they do serve the purpose of enabling very important programmes to be implemented in backward areas for the benefit of the disadvantaged in the field of health, family welfare and education. These programmes involving interaction of American experts and officials with NGOs and Indian volunteers is of great help in enhancing people to people understanding between the two countries.

In a month from now we would be celebrating the 50th anniversary of India's independence and democracy. While we have achieved much during this period by way of consolidation of the nation state, providing adequate food security for the people, and setting the base for economic development, there are still many challenges that we have to face and overcome for providing the desirable level of living to large sections of our people. At this time of review and introspection, we are conscious of the benefits that we have derived by way of bilateral cooperation with the US in the important areas of agriculture, education, science and technology. At this time when we are looking for much greater cooperation in these areas, it is unfortunate that we might have to tackle something of a negative nature in the House.

It was gratifying to see in the debate on the House floor that took place in June last year on a similar amendment, that several Congressmen very ably put forth the following points:

(i) India has made a success of its democracy and established powerful institutions like an independent judiciary, a free press and vigorous political parties providing for consultation and participation in Government in accordance with the rule of law.

(ii) India, which like the US has a multi-religious and multi-ethnic society, has resolved conflict situations in a lawful, democratic manner and taken concrete steps to further improve the human rights situation, including the setting up of an effective National Human Rights Commission.

(iii) Indo-US business and trade relations have improved considerably with the US companies taking good advantage of the opportunities emerging in the Indian market, as borne out by the large number of US companies operating successfully in India.

(iv) The situation in Punjab had been resolved and the situation in Jammu & Kashmir has improved.

All the above points continue to be not only valid, but have acquired even greater force. Investment approvals pertaining to US companies are now of the order of \$8.5 billion. The opportunities existing for US companies in infrastructure sectors like telecom, roads, ports and power have a potential for fruitful investment of over \$20 billion per year.

The US Administration has knowledge of the improved situation with regard to human rights and also cited the problems created by the trans-border support for terrorist activities in India; the most recent ex-

ample of which was the explosion caused in a train in Punjab which killed thirty-four civilian passengers on July 8th with serious injuries to many more. This highlights the need for not doing anything to encourage front organizations created for the sole purpose of mobilizing support and funds for essentially terrorist outfits.

Since last year there have been general elections to the State Assemblies in Punjab with a voter turn-out of over 69% and which brought the Sikh-dominated party, the Akali Dal to power in association with another party, namely, the Bhartiya Janata Party. There could not have been a clearer rejection of the separatist movement in the State of Punjab.

In Jammu & Kashmir too, general elections recorded a good voter turn-out of around 55% and resulted in Dr. Farooq Abdullah gaining majority not only in the Kashmir valley, but also in the regions of Jammu and Ladakh. This democratically-elected State Government has revitalized the Government machinery despite the strains created by terrorist gangs on the law and order machinery with the help of agencies across the border.

Initiatives taken by Prime Minister I K Gujral from the time he was the Minister for External Affairs have greatly helped in improving bilateral relations between India and its neighbors. As part of this policy, special steps have been taken to initiate discussions with Pakistan to tackle all outstanding issues. Agreement has been reached in the talks held so far to set up Working Groups for seeking solution to specific problems including the State of Jammu & Kashmir and terrorism. The House was good enough to applaud these efforts. It is our hope that progress at these talks would help create a better climate for tackling terrorist activity.

This letter has become much longer than I intended, but the subject being very important and your consideration and support of great value to us, I had to put the relevant facts before you. I am confident that with your goodwill and encouragement we shall build upon the strong foundation that has been paid in recent years in our bilateral relations. As always, I and my staff at the Embassy are available to assist you in any way possible. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any question.

Thanks for all your help. Best wishes.

Yours sincerely,

—  
NARESH CHANDRA.

AN ABRIDGED LIST OF UNITED STATES FIRMS  
WITH INVESTMENT AND BUSINESS INTERESTS  
IN INDIA

1. Abbott Laboratories.
2. Allied Signal Inc.
3. American Home Prod. Corp.
4. American Express Co.
5. American International Group.
6. American President Lines, Ltd.
7. Amoco Corporation.
8. AMP Incorporated.
9. Apple Computer, Inc.
10. Asarco Incorporated.
11. Asea Brown Boveri.
12. AT&T.
13. Avery Dennison Corp.
14. Bank America Corporation.
15. Bank of New York.
16. Bankers Trust NY Corp.
17. Bausch & Lomb.
18. Bechtel Power Corp.
19. Beckton Dickinson.
20. Black & Decker Corp.
21. Black & Veatch International.
22. Boeing.
23. Britco Foods.
24. Brunswick Corporation.

25. Caltex.
26. Caraco Pharmaceuticals.
27. Caterpillar, Incorporated.
28. Chase Manhattan Corp.
29. Chevron Corp.
30. Chiquita Brands.
31. Chrysler.
32. CIGNA.
33. Citicorp.
34. Coca-Cola Company.
35. Cogentrix Corp.
36. Colgate-Palmolive Co.
37. Compaq Computer Corp.
38. ConAgra, Inc.
39. Continental Airlines, Inc.
40. Cooper Ind., Inc.
41. Corning Incorporated.
42. CPC Int. Incorporated.
43. Cummins Engine Co.
44. Dana Corporation.
45. Del Monte.
46. Dell Computers.
47. Delta Air Lines, Inc.
48. Digital Equipment Corp.
49. Dow Chemical Corporation.
50. E.I. Du Pont de Nemours.
51. Eastman Kodak Company.
52. Emerson Electric Co.
53. Enron Corporation.
54. Estee Lauder Co. Inc.
55. Farmland Industries, Inc.
56. Federal Express.
57. Fluor Corporation.
58. Ford Motor Corporation.
59. General Electric Company: GE Capital, GE Power Systems, and GE Transportation Systems.
60. General Motors Corporation.
61. Gillette Company.
62. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.
63. GTE Corporation.
64. Harris Corporation.
65. Hasbro Incorporated.
66. Hearst Corporation.
67. Hercules, Inc.
68. Hewlett-Packard Company.
69. Honeywell, Inc.
70. Hughes Network Systems.
71. IBM Corp.
72. InaCom Corporation.
73. Ingersoll-Rand Company.
74. Intel Corporation.
75. International Equity Partners.
76. ITT Corporation.
77. J.P. Morgan & Co., Inc.
78. Johnson & Johnson.
79. Johnson Controls Inc.
80. Kellogg Company.
81. Levi Strauss.
82. Eli Lilly.
83. Lockheed Martin Corp.
84. McDonald's Corp.
85. McDonnell Douglas.
86. McGraw-Hill Co., Inc.
87. Merck & Co., Inc.
88. Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc.
89. Microsoft Corporation.
90. Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing.
91. Mobil Corporation.
92. Monsanto Company.
93. Morgan Stanley Group.
94. Motorola Inc.
95. New Balance.
96. Nordstrom, Incorporated.
97. Northwest Airlines, Inc.
98. Novell.
99. NYNEX Corporation.
100. Occidental Petroleum Corp.
101. Oracle Corporation.
102. Owens-Corning Corp.
103. Parker Hannifin Corp.
104. Pepsico Inc.
105. Pfizer Incorporated.
106. Phelps Dodge Corp.
107. Phillip Morris Companies Inc.
108. Phillips Petroleum Co.
109. PPG Industries, Inc.
110. Proctor & Gamble Co.

111. Raytheon Company.
112. Rockwell International Corp.
113. Rohm & Haas Company.
114. Sara Lee Corporation.
115. Shering-Plough Corp.
116. Silicon Graphics.
117. Sprint Corporation.
118. Sumitomo Machinery Corp.
119. Sun Microsystems.
120. Tenneco Incorporated.
121. Texaco Corporation.
122. Texas Instruments.
123. Textron Incorporated.
124. T.G.I. Friday's.
125. The Tiffany Company.
126. Trans World Airlines, Inc.
127. Turner Broadcasting (CNN).
128. Union Carbide Chemicals.
129. Unisys Corporation.
130. Unocal.
131. US West.
132. USX Corporation.
133. W.R. Grace & Co.
134. The Walt Disney Co.
135. Warner-Lambert Co.
136. Western Digital Corp.
137. Westinghouse Electric Corp.
138. Whirlpool Corporation.
139. Woodward Governor Company.
140. Xerox Corporation.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to join my friend and the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs in opposing the Burton amendment which seeks to cut assistance to India. We have got the 50th anniversary of Indian democracy which we have been celebrating this past month. This is not the time to strain our relationship with the country of India; it is the time to deepen that relationship.

India's policy of market reform has contributed significantly to our improving political and economic relations. Should India's growth rate of 7 percent continue over the next few years, India would be the world's fourth largest economy in 25 years. As the base of growth broadens to embrace more and more economic and social sectors in Indian society, relations with the United States should intensify. Now the United States is India's largest trading partner. We have a small but effective foreign aid program, projected in fiscal year 1998 at about \$56 million, which focuses on economic growth, population and health, environment and humanitarian assistance. Now is not the time to cut that limited aid.

Thirty percent of India's population remains below the poverty level, but this is a major improvement over 1974 when it was 55 percent. If we are going to reach the point at which India does not need foreign assistance, we should be doing all we can now to assist in India's reforms.

The new Prime Minister of India promises to continue the economic reforms of his predecessors. He has moved to try and deal with the leadership of Pakistan to try to solve and work on their bilateral issues. In the state of Punjab, racked by violence

years ago, we have now seen the takeover of democracy where it is thriving in that particular state. They have conducted elections. The elections were won by the opposition, a Sikh party; the Akali Dal now governs in the Punjab. We have had elections in Kashmir. The violence in Kashmir is down.

The Indian Government is worth working with. The Indian country is important to us, and I would urge our colleagues not to take a backward step at this time and support an amendment which would seek to cut that aid.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]. This amendment, as has been pointed out, will ostracize India at a very, very important time. Just as India is set and has, in fact, celebrated its 50th anniversary, this has been brought up as well, India is moving toward very important economic reforms.

The United States relationship with India, the world's largest democracy, is growing stronger every day. It has been pointed out how the investment, U.S. investment, has grown. Just 6 years ago it was 500 million; today it is 5 billion. That is a tenfold increase. This makes India our largest overseas investor and trading partner. Of course, as has been pointed out as well, India is still a developing country. It does have problems, but it is working to resolve those problems. And for all of the shouting, there is no grave threat to India's steadfast commitment to diversity and tolerance.

The Indian Government has taken crucial steps to end any abuse of human rights within its borders. It has established an independent human rights commission headed by a former justice of the Indian supreme court to investigate and to prevent human rights abuses. Last year it prosecuted some 200 violations. In fact, the most recent State Department human rights report praises India, praises India for the substantial progress the country has made in the area of human rights.

Mr. Chairman, India contains within its borders a greater ethnic, linguistic, and religious diversity than all of Europe from Ireland to Russia, and they have more people. Earlier this year, a government dominated by the Sikh minority replaced the ruling party, the ruling party in the state of Punjab. The elections were open and democratic, and over 65 percent of the electorate turned out to cast its vote. Further, around 80 percent of Indians are Hindus, but its presidents have included two Sikhs, one Muslim, and now a Dhalit. I would point out also that there are more Muslims living in India than there are in Pakistan.

I firmly believe that this amendment on the eve of the celebration of Indian independence will have a devastating effect on the growing relationship be-

tween the two countries. Both the chairman and the gentleman from California have pointed that out. It will punish India for making significant efforts to correct its problems. It will bring to a screeching halt United States participation in one of the most important big emerging markets, but most importantly, it will lead us to shut ourselves out of involvement with the Indian Government and hinder our efforts to create a free and prosperous country.

Let us accentuate the positive efforts that India has made. Let us work to eliminate the negative, just as India herself is doing. Let us support a valued friend, not shut the door on a growing relationship.

Once again, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this damaging amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, last year India held the world's largest democratic elections. This election, called epic by the New York Times and extraordinary by the Washington Times, resulted in a peaceful change in government with nearly 300 million people going to the polls. The government in the state of Punjab, a region the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] claims is government repression of a Sikh minority, a Sikh-dominated government, replaced the ruling party in open, democratic elections. Voter turnout was actually over 67 percent. Several Members of Congress were invited to observe these elections.

Like all developing countries, India has experienced human rights problems. However, as the world's largest democracy, it is taking steps to remedy them. India's free press, independent judiciary and vigorous NGO's have been recognized as models for other developing countries. Last year more than 200 security force personnel were punished for their involvement in human rights violations. The most recent United States human rights report praised the commission's independence and noted that India has made substantial progress in the area of human rights.

The Assistant Secretary of State for Asia, Robin Raphel, said in congressional testimony that India's national human rights commission has real teeth to expose the violations of human rights.

Independent national efforts to monitor the situation in Punjab, as well as Jammu and Kashmir, continue. The International Committee of the Red Cross went into Kashmir last year and several Members of the United States Congress have been to Punjab and Kashmir during the past 2 years. Representatives of the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Los Angeles Times, and CNN that have frequently visited Jammu and Kashmir have had unrestricted access to any part of the country. International press reports

underscore that India's security forces labor under constant pressure of international terrorism. Just recently 33 innocent people were killed and 67 injured in a terrorist bomb blast which occurred on a train in Punjab. India recently abolished the Terrorist and Disruptive Prevention Act which was the subject of objections by several human rights groups.

I think the point of these facts to underscore is that when we try to hold India to the same standards that we can hold ourselves, there are not many countries in the world and particularly not many developing countries that can meet that standard. But in the framework that they are working under, I think all of us would agree that there has been a clear effort upon their government to affect the human rights abuses and have made strides and a great deal of progress in those areas. To cut aid at this point in time in this manner would be sending the exact wrong message to the Indian Government and the Indian people.

I urge defeat of the Burton amendment.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, along with the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], I reluctantly rise in opposition to the Burton amendment.

I agree with our good friend from Indiana that India does have a human rights problem in Kashmir. Both Amnesty International and Asia Watch documented proof of severe abuse by Indian security forces. But let us not forget that these same human rights organizations have also denounced Islamic terrorists who receive crucial support from across the Pakistani border.

We know there has been serious misbehavior by India's security forces. We must not lose sight, though, of the context in which that has been taking place. For the past 150 years India has shared a border with Communist China due to Beijing's illegal occupation of Tibet and China added to the tensions along India's border with Pakistan and Kashmir by transferring nuclear weapons production technology and nuclear-capable missiles to Pakistan.

India and Kashmir are between a rock and a hard place. The situation is even more complicated than meets the eye.

□ 1130

While the security forces must be stopped from committing serious abuses, we need to find another way to help end the suffering that has gone on for so long in Kashmir. But cutting off development assistance for democratic India is not the way to do it. It will

simply harm the poor of India that deserve an opportunity to try to improve their lives. An economically sound India is one that will enforce human rights standards to a higher level than a poor India. Our aid moves India in the direction of a more prosperous nation where everyone can live under the rule of law.

Mr. Chairman, along with some of my colleagues, I visited India last month where we participated on behalf of the House in India's independence anniversary, recognizing the world's largest democracy. In our meetings, we raised the issues highlighted by the gentleman from Indiana. We raised those issues directly with the President of India and the Prime Minister of India. In my judgment, India is making progress, beginning to negotiate with Pakistan and beginning to improve human rights. Indian officials are also forging closer ties between our democracy and theirs. Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I urge our colleagues to oppose the amendment by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Burton amendment. Even as the State Department reports again this year that India has made further progress in the area of human rights, the gentleman from Indiana continues to live in the past. His amendment may be appropriate for some countries around the globe, but not for today's India. An India that is the world's largest democracy, an India that has embarked upon a far-reaching and energetic set of reforms to unleash its economic potential, an India whose diplomatic and commercial ties with the United States continue to grow, an India who is a force for regional stability, and an India whose support of free and fair elections and minority rights is a leading light in that area of the world.

As America's most recent ambassador to India, Frank Wisner, said, this is a crucial time for the United States and India. India is ready for a closer relationship with America. She just needs the right signals. Ambassador Wisner is right. The United States and India are on the verge of a deeper and a more beneficial relationship. The signals we send matter greatly. That is why the Burton amendment is so very wrong.

India has made tremendous strides in the last 6 years, yet we would slap this great Nation in the face by cutting aid. Such a move makes no sense and is precisely the wrong signal to send. It boggles my mind in fact, Mr. Chairman, that India is not fast becoming one of our most important allies. As India celebrates its 50th anniversary of independence, the world has long recognized that her commitment to democracy is vibrant and irreversible. Following India's general election of last year, one American commentator

called it the most breathtaking example of government by the people in the history of the world. It is a democracy that is open to all, as evidenced by the recent elections in Punjab, which brought to power an opposition Sikh Party who chose the ballot over the bullet to bring about change in this region.

Respect and dignity for all Indians is further guaranteed by the country's increasing emphasis on human rights. In just a few short years the National Human Rights Commission has made its mark on all facets of Indian society. Following the commission's prosecution of more than 200 violations in 1996, the U.S. State Department commended the panel for carving out an important role in improving accountability for human rights abuses throughout the country. Moreover, several versions of the commission have been set up by state governments, including one in the State of Jammu and Kashmir.

In the international community the Red Cross has conducted seminars and training with paramilitary police and army personnel to further increase understanding and observance of human rights within India's military and law enforcement communities. With each passing day, India becomes a more strategic United States partner in this crucial part of the world. Pursuing the Gujral doctrine and similar initiatives, India continues to be a force for stability and a force for growth in South Asia.

Prime Minister Gujral has already reached various trade, water, and other agreements with Bangladesh, with Nepal and with Sri Lanka. Most importantly, Mr. Gujral and Mr. Sharif are taking concrete steps to lessen tensions between Pakistan and India and have established a formal framework for discussion of the disagreements which have plagued these two great countries for so long. Now with the Burton amendment, we are thinking of punishing India for this progress. We could go on and on about India's accomplishments and her potential. It is clear that closer bilateral ties are in the best interest of India, the best interest of America and the best interest of that region as a whole.

It is also clear that in this year of India's 50th anniversary of independence the world's oldest democracy should be congratulating the world's largest democracy for its achievements. Instead we are debating this very bad idea. One can trot out the same old dated information only so many times. The people of India have moved on to a brighter future and have demonstrated their desire for better United States-India relations. The U.S. Congress should do the same. We should defeat the Burton amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of this very modest amendment by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The Nation of India votes against the United States in the United Nations more than any other nation except for Cuba in the United Nations. More than 90 percent of the time they are on opposite sides than we are in our vote in the United Nations. Not only that and probably much more importantly is the horrendous human rights problems that are continuing to occur within the Nation of India.

I have a very large community of Sikhs formerly from the Punjab within India that live in my district in northern California. They continue to relate the atrocities that take place within their province of their friends and relatives who continue to live there.

Again, I think a minor 25 percent cut on the aid that we are giving to India is a very minor message and at the very least a token of the fact that we expect India to live by the same rules of other countries, to respect human rights within their country, and also that we begin sending a message that we are not going to continue, the taxpayers of this country are not going to continue rewarding countries who are on the opposite side philosophically than we are on major issues.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERGER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

I would like to illuminate this issue a little bit from my colleagues who are getting their information from where I do not know. First of all, India is getting \$52 million in developmental assistance from the United States of America in foreign aid. I know the American people are tickled to death that after 50 years of independence we are still giving \$52 million to India in developmental assistance, and that is not all. We are giving them millions more in other areas as well. All I am saying with this amendment, instead of giving them \$52 million of American taxpayers money, that we cut that to \$42 million.

I would like to have the American people vote on whether they want to give any money to India, but that probably will not happen. But I would also like to ask them if they would like to cut maybe 25 percent of the developmental assistance and cut it to \$42 million instead of \$52 million, and I bet most Americans would go along with that. The American people do not want to give money to a country that has been independent for 50 years.

But let us get to the point of the human rights violations that one of my colleagues just said indicates I am living in the past. On July 12, 1997, that is really living in the past, that is 1 month ago, 1 month ago, in Bombay, India, 33 black untouchables were killed by the Indian police during demonstrations. They still have the caste system over there and if you are black, you are the lowest form of animal life, according to that government, and you

can be killed for just touching a Brahman and they will not prosecute. That is today, not 5 years ago or 10 years ago. And they killed 33 of them just a month ago. That is living in the past.

On July 8, 1997, 36 people were killed in a train bombing in Punjab, and two ministers of the Punjab government have blamed the police for that. That was 1 month ago, and the bombing occurred a day after in July that nine policemen were convicted of murder. That is living in the past.

On March 15, 3 or 4 months ago, 1997, a death squad picked up Kashmir Singh, an opposition party member, he was thrown in a van, he was tortured, he was murdered and they tossed his bullet-ridden body out on the side of the road. That is ancient history. That was 4 months ago.

This guy here was scalped and his fingers were cut off and he was tortured to death. That is not ancient history, that is recently. If there is no problem, why are there still 550,000 troops in Kashmir? Why are there still 550,000 troops in Punjab enforcing martial law where people are afraid to even go out of their houses? Women are still being gang raped. People are being taken out of their homes never to be seen again, found in canals with their hands tied behind their back and their feet tied together and drowned.

That is going on today. Yet we continue to ignore it. My colleagues say they have got a human rights group over there that they have established that is really looking into these things. India has established an Indian human rights group. That is correct. But why will they not let Amnesty International into Kashmir and Punjab?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] has expired.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] be given 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise against the Burton amendment which would limit developmental assistance to India. As we all know, it has been 1 year later, and we are still fighting the same fight, the same bad idea. We defeated a similar amendment last year by an overwhelming margin, 269 to 127.

On August 15, we celebrated India's 50th anniversary of democratic rule. Passage of this amendment will have a devastating effect on the growing relationship between India, the world's largest democracy, and the United States, the world's oldest democracy.

Yes, India has had problems with human rights in the past and in the

present. But this Nation has taken exceptionally strong steps forward. In fact, India's human rights commission, headed by a former Supreme Court justice, has been hailed by our State Department for its, and I quote, "significant progress in resolving human rights problems."

The gentleman pointed out that there are still acts of terrorism. There still are rapes. There still is racial violence. But we also have acts of terrorism and many problems in our own country. Cutting developmental assistance would hurt the poorest of the poor in India. The amendment would directly undermine the stated objectives of India's democratically elected prime minister to improve the living conditions of the country's poorest citizens. And finally, this amendment would be an enormous blow to United States-India relations at the very moment when we should be strengthening ties between our two democracies.

Last year India held a critical and historic election. Three hundred million people went to the polls to vote in what the New York Times writer William Safire called, and I quote, "the most breathtaking example of government by people in the history of the world."

The world's most populous democracy proved that its most powerful weapon is the ballot. We must not pass a punitive, anti-India amendment on the heels of this great election. United States-India relations are strong. American businesses are flourishing in India. The United States is now India's largest overseas investor and its biggest trading partner. The Commerce Department has designated India as one of the most important, and I quote, "big emerging markets for United States exports."

Let us send the world's most populous democracy the right message. Let us vote for progress in India. Let us vote for democracy. I urge a "no" vote on the Burton amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, this Member rises in strong opposition to the amendment of the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]. In that capacity and in that opposition, I join the chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, and other distinguished colleagues that have commented in opposition and will comment.

□ 1145

As mentioned previously, we need to reemphasize that India is the world's largest democracy and it is making dramatic progress. Despite civil unrest and terrorism, it has maintained 50 years of unbroken democratic rule since it gained its independence in 1947.

Indians enjoy the benefits of the rule of law, a strong judiciary, and a vigorous and independent free press.

There are persistent and disturbing human rights problems in India. The Government of India does not deny this fact. But the gentleman's amendment seems to ignore the remarkable progress that this 50-year-old regime has enjoyed.

The improvements in the standard of living for the people of India are undeniable, and India's commitment to democracy and improved human rights has repeatedly been demonstrated.

I noted what the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] had to say about the progress in Punjab, and that is exactly right. There have been several encouraging, specifically encouraging, developments in the past year that deserve to be recognized.

In Punjab, a State racked by violent confrontations in the 1980's and the 1990's, the opposition clearly won an election that was notably well run and inclusive bringing to power the Sikh party. Unrest has now subsided in Punjab. In Kashmir, though violence continues, there is now an elected government which is setting up a state human rights commission.

The United States assistance program to India seeks to promote and institutionalize democratic values and human rights. The United States is working closely with India on population, health care, family, welfare, and environmental concerns. The United States needs to maintain and strengthen this relationship.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to my colleagues, we have had remarkable initiatives and progress from India with respect to Bangladesh, Nepal, and Pakistan in just the last year. The Burton amendment would damage the foundation of our relationship with India on this, the 50th anniversary of its independence, and would achieve nothing but the alienation of the Indian Government from the United States.

Put simply, Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not serve American interests nor promote American influence in India. The arguments for the amendment do not reflect the general trend of human rights practices or progress in India today. We should not have to beat back such amendments every year.

Mr. Chairman, India is a nation of increasing economic and political importance to Asia and to the world. While issues of contention remain between the United States and India, this body will not contribute to the resolution of such contentious issues by cutting off a major part of assistance or all assistance as provided by this Burton amendment or ones that may follow.

Now is the time to send a very positive signal of support and understanding to the Government of India by voting against this amendment. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Burton amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to, first, associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Nebraska. In 1991 I went to India for the first time to look at the AIDS epidemic and what was happening there and talked with then-Ambassador Thomas Pickering about the changes that were coming about in India; the Rau government had come in and made a number of changes; and he said, "Go back to the Congress and start talking about the changes in India, they are real."

Now I have been back to India six times since 1961, the last time in December, leading a delegation, a trade delegation from my own city, to go to India. I have been in 12 of the States of India, including Kashmir and Punjab. I talked to Punjabi farmers on the ground. I have talked to public officials, human rights people, all through the country.

Now the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, who has never been in India, in my opinion, reflects one of the problems of making foreign policy by sitting in the United States and trying to decide what somebody else ought to be doing. We are essentially having the half full, half empty glass of water argument here.

Do they have problems? Yes. Have they moved? Absolutely.

If we take the rupee note from India, on it they have 13 official languages. This is a country where we argue about whether English is the official language. They have six major religions. There are more Muslims there than in any country, except Indonesia. And this is a country that has separated church and state in the same way we struggled with in this country. The division of church and state and keeping a secular government has been an enormous problem.

India was born in violence. The splitting off of Pakistan into what is now Bangladesh at the beginning was a problem they had to deal with from the very start, and they have struggled with this for 50 years.

They have not solved all the problems. No Indian official will say that, no Indian journalist.

India has the same basis of common law that we do, the English system. They have a free press that, in fact, in some ways is more free than our own. Read the Indian press and understand that politicians do not get away with anything there without it being in the newspapers.

So there is no question that they have problems, but they are struggling with them, but the real question here is what kind of relationship do we want to have with India? Is it our idea that we want to alienate them in their year of celebration?

I remember that I think it was Jesus Christ was once cautioning people about how they ought to view things

when he said, "Now you ought to look at the plank in your own eye before you point out the speck in your neighbor's eye."

When my distinguished colleague brings a picture out here and puts it up on the floor and says that is the reason we ought to cut off aid, look at this horrible picture. If some Member of this House put up a tripod here and put up a Rodney King beating picture and then suggested to the House: Well, we ought to cut off small business loans to California because they have human rights problems in California done by officials, we would laugh them off the floor. We would say that is crazy; how could anybody make such a suggestion?

Yet take one example or two or three. Remember India has 900 million people, four times the number in the United States in an area from the Mississippi to the East Coast. One-third of our land mass, they have four times the people. They struggle hard, and I believe that our development assistance is a statement to them that we encourage them.

They have never had a military coup. They have had one democratic election after another. Not only democratic elections, they have a well-established democratic institutional system in the country that does not always function perfectly, but they do not need from us a blackened eye, a slug in the face at their independence celebration by the U.S. Congress.

Mr. Chairman, that is not the message we should send, and for that reason I argue very strongly against the Burton amendment.

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

Before I get into my own remarks, I would like to say that we have heard speaker after speaker opposing the Burton amendment and only one, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] himself, was able to rise up on this point to defend the Burton amendment, and I would just like to express my disappointment that when so many people have spoken against the Burton amendment and Mr. BURTON asked for 2 additional minutes in a unanimous consent that he was not paid the courtesy that we almost always pay our colleagues to permit them just 2 extra minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, just briefly, because this debate has been conducted in, I think, a very civil manner and I just wanted the gentleman to be aware that Mr. BURTON was afforded unanimous consent for 5 additional minutes yesterday to speak longer on his time, and we all graciously granted that without any objection, and there always was the option available to the gentleman for him to speak as he did with additional time.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Reclaiming my time, the people listening to yesterday's debate, perhaps most of the people listening today, did not hear yesterday or the debate before on this, and the fact is that we had a lively debate here, but was only one-sided. Mr. BURTON asked for 2 additional minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, and I will give him additional time, the point is that it is always available for a Member to seek time and yield to our colleagues, as we have done repeatedly in this debate, and I would be pleased to take more time later and yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I have always given my colleagues the courtesy and never stepped forward in unanimous consent and not given them an extra minute.

Anyway, with that said, I support the Burton amendment. I am happy to be the second person in today's debate to step forward supporting a reduction in the taxpayers' dollars that we are sending to India, and of course I agree with my colleague on the China question, but we should be reducing the amount of money asked by the Clinton administration that we would be giving the Government of India for two reasons: No. 1, they do not need it; and, No. 2, we should not be giving this money to a government with such an appalling human rights record.

As to No. 1, the Indian Government maintains a huge military. They have developed nuclear weapons. They have been spending their limited resources on weapons and a huge military, much more than what they need, and after finally rejecting socialism their economy is on an upsurge. So, No. 1, if they are spending money on nuclear weapons and a big army, why should we be giving them aid when they can then spend their own money on weapons?

And No. 2, we are giving someone who is in competition with us, we are providing them aid. Now that is ridiculous for the United States of America to provide aid and assistance to a country that is going to compete and put our own people out of work.

So, as to the second point, there are a half million Indian troops occupying the Punjab and another half a million Indian troops occupying Kashmir, which is considered the most densely occupied territory on this planet. Now, if they have got those numbers of troops up there that are putting money, more and more money, into it, why should we subsidize this effort by giving money to India?

In both of these regions, Punjab and Kashmir, the military forces are recognized by international human rights organizations as routinely committing appalling human rights abuses, murdering civilians, gang raping women, torturing prisoners with impunity.

According to our own State Department, Indian forces in Punjab have received over 41,000 cash bounties for the murder of civilians between 1991 and

1993. Last year, the Indian police reportedly planted explosives in the car of a U.S. citizen, Mr. Babir Dhillon, and he was held up on trumped-up charges for 9 months, and he was tortured, and it was only after the intervention of the U.S. Congress that he was released last January, and these charges were dropped.

The Indian Supreme Court eventually got up to there, and there is a rule of law in India, but what happened was they basically said that Indian police were committing acts that were, quote, worse than genocide, and yes, if Rodney King was just an example, one example even, we would ignore, we would say we are fixing that. But if Rodney King went on and on and on and on every day we had Rodney King beatings, we would be concerned about it. We would say California has got to clean up its act before we extend aid to California, to its State government. And just like in New York where this poor man was brutalized the other day, if the police over and over and over were brutalizing people like this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ROHRABACHER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, there is not any indication that the situation is getting better in India because those people who have studied the situation, we realize the one conflict, the one flame that is igniting the conflict on the subcontinent, is the decision by India not to permit a plebiscite in the Kashmir so those people can determine, as it was mandated by the United Nations, whether they are going to be part of India or they want to be part of Pakistan.

India has refused to have that election. If they would have that, these acts of terrorism they complain about, and this massive military buildup and occupation they have to finance in the Kashmir, would disappear because the democratic process would have worked its will. But they refuse to do that. This is what is causing the problem. This is what is causing the human rights abuses.

As an incentive to the Government of India to abide by policies guided by respect for human rights and civil liberties, we need to send a strong message, and that is exactly what the Burton amendment will do.

□ 1200

We do not need to send a message that they can continue doing what they want, that after 50 years we are going to subsidize them in their development of weapons and their oppression. For us to provide \$135 million in aid, which is the total amount, while it is wasting its own resources on the modernization of its weapons systems and military and its own oppression, it is ridiculous for us to do this. To spend \$135 million in taxpayer dollars to sub-

sidize one of our own competitors, with the economy emerging as a competitor to the United States, which allows them to spend their own money on weapons, even nuclear weapons, is crazy.

I believe in the Burton amendment; I support the Burton amendment. Let us not subsidize India's expenditure on weapons and the military and oppression. Let us let them make their own decisions. If they are not going to improve their human rights, let us say they are not going to get any foreign aid from the United States.

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

Mr. Chairman, last month the people of India celebrated their 50th anniversary of independence and democracy. It takes perhaps a special effort for many Americans to imagine when our democracy was only 50 years old and the great hurdles we had to overcome to try to perfect our legal, political, economic, and social systems.

India today is the world's largest democracy, 950 million people. India is a multi-religious, multi-ethnic society, actively seeking to build a common national identity and overcome religious and ethnic conflict.

In that half century, India has struggled to overcome the legacy of feudalism, followed by colonialism, and all of the problems of underdevelopment and unequal development, including problems of population growth, capital formation, technology development, and infrastructure development.

They have shaped all of the basic institutions of a democratic system, including perhaps most significantly many independent, nongovernmental institutions and organizations dedicated to involving and empowering people.

I rise here today in support of aid to India. Throughout my public career I have worked with the Asian-Indian community. My strong relationship with the Asian-Indian community in Chicago has afforded me opportunities on numerous occasions to meet with Indian officials who have visited Chicago, and this interaction has helped me to understand how important democracy, economic development, and human rights are to India.

While the cold war no longer exists, our relations with south Asia must not be tainted by the cold war legacy. There is a constant state of tension with some of its neighbors who have large and powerful militaries. Several states in India, including Punjab and Kashmir, have in essence been involved in a low-intensity war, involving terrorism with foreign support, as evidenced by the recent bombing of a train in Punjab resulting in 36 deaths. Despite these difficulties, India has proven that she will not tolerate violations of democracy, and has acted to punish those guilty of violations of law and to reduce any such violations in the future.



The United States has become India's largest trading partner, now approaching \$9.5 billion per year, and her largest investor. India has adjusted her tax policies to further encourage trade and has become a significant player in many fields, including computer science. Yet India is still a country in need of assistance and development, especially in the most underdeveloped regions, needing assistance with health and educational programs.

These programs involve financial and technical support from the United States, which is matched by volunteer equity on the part of the people of India. These programs have proven themselves to be successful in addressing the problems of underdevelopment, and also as powerful instruments of international understanding, communication and trust.

It makes sense to continue our commitment to India. India has proven a success in its economic development and is a role model for other developing countries. We can take this opportunity now to improve our foreign policy relations with India. We can illustrate how the United States is a reliable friend and model.

A vote against India in this House is not in the best interests of the United States and its reputation as a world leader. Therefore, I urge that we oppose any and all amendments that would single out India for a limitation on development assistance.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wish to yield the last 2 minutes of my time to my colleague and friend from Indiana for whatever purposes he wishes to use them.

Mr. Chairman, I rise against the Burton amendment. I believe that it is in the interests of the United States to show compassion, to realize we are spending 6.5 cents per person in development assistance in India, and my colleagues' amendment would lower that to 5.5 cents. That is the lowest of any country that receives development assistance. For 800 million people, \$51 million.

I had the privilege to go to India at my own expense last autumn. I went to Bombay and I went down the west coast, and I have never seen urban poverty as I have in Bombay. Earlier when I was in Delhi, I also saw it. And yet I never saw such potential as I saw in Bangalore. As one proceeded southward, I saw the effect of educating the population, of cleaning the water; and the potential is tremendous to do the most amount of good for the neediest people.

I hold up the state of Kerala, for example, as an example of where American assistance and the Indian Government's own action have reaped tremendous benefits in ending human suffering, largely by improving the condition of women, increasing their education, lowering the birth rate.

The amount of money that the United States spends is remarkably small, given how much we spend in other countries.

Let me just illustrate where it goes. It goes to clean water, which eliminates or at least reduces the threat of disease. It goes to education; again, particularly important here is the education of women. It goes to develop financial institutions so that units of local government can float bonds that are then used to finance projects such as the water projects to which I have referred.

Given this potential, it seems to me appropriate that our foreign policy has a compassionate element to assist India.

I am going to conclude now with one last comment. I do intend to yield the last 2 minutes to my colleague.

I might have heard my colleague incorrectly, Mr. Chairman, and if I did, please, I apologize. But if I did not, I do believe the statement was made that "black is the lowest form of life, according to that government," and it would be my assumption that the gentleman meant to say, "according to certain individuals." However, he is certainly free to speak to this himself.

I do not believe that it is the policy of the Indian Government to be racist, nor was it my observation that individuals in the government were racist. But if I quoted him correctly, perhaps he could choose to amplify or clarify.

I wish to close my time, just saying if there is a component in our foreign aid that deals with compassion, if we really mean what we say when we read, "When I was hungry, you gave me to eat; when I was thirsty, you gave me to drink; when I was naked, you clothed me," then we should find that compassion and help India.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Let me say the caste system is still in effect in India, and the lowest caste in India is the Dhalits, or the black people who live there. And the people who are in the higher castes, in the past if they were touched, almost without impunity can inflict pain, suffering, and even kill people in these lower castes.

That is a system that I think we in the United States should abhor, and I think the people, until the Black Caucus who fought for civil rights for so many years and are starting to get a modicum of success, should be very concerned about the prejudice that exists in India. If I implied it was a government policy, that was incorrect, but it is a policy of the system over there that exists; and they look the other way when people are tortured and killed that are from a lower caste.

But the fact of the matter is, I have talked about the repression of that

government, government genocide and government repression. Just recently 1,000 cases of unidentified bodies were documented and cremated by the military. The fact is there still are 550,000 troops in Kashmir and Punjab; women are still being gang-raped, people are being tortured, taken out of their houses in the middle of the night without judicial process, never to be seen again.

These are things we should abhor as a nation. We certainly shouldn't be giving a large amount of foreign aid to a country that continues to perpetrate these kinds of atrocities with government sanctions.

I think my colleague from California, Mr. ROHRBACHER, made a very salient point when he said this country is spending more money, I think, almost than any country from that region, on military hardware and nuclear weaponry; and at the same time, they are asking us for foreign aid. It just doesn't make sense.

All I ask for is we cut the aid by 25 percent.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the Burton amendment which would single out India for cuts in foreign assistance. As this body has done repeatedly in the past, I urge colleagues to vote no on this amendment. Contrary to what the gentleman from Indiana has said, opponents of his amendment are not claiming that no problems exist. We take these problems seriously. But we are also recognizing India's attempt to deal with them, and our country's responsibility to encourage such efforts.

India is the world's largest democracy, a fact we celebrated on July 31 with the passage of House Resolution 157, commemorating 50 years of democracy in India. Last year India conducted the largest free election in history with nearly 300 million people voting. The state of Punjab elected a Sikh government, and the nation's new president is a member of the untouchable caste, tremendous achievements in a developing nation struggling to maintain democracy, to build its economy, and to improve the lot of millions of the world's poorest people.

India's government recognizes that human rights abuses have occurred and has taken strong steps to redress these grievances. The government has established an independent national human rights commission to investigate human rights allegations in the states of Jammu and Kashmir and to pursue suspected abusers. More than 200 security forces personnel were punished last year for involvement in human rights violations. The U.S. State Department notes that the commission is independent and praises India's ongoing efforts to end abuses.

India has abolished the Terrorist and Disruptive Prevention Act and has allowed the international community



free access to observe and report on actions in the Punjab and in Jammu and Kashmir.

At the same time as he has moved forcefully to improve the domestic situation, India's new Prime Minister Gujral has taken unprecedented steps to improve relations with India's neighbors. The prime minister has made landmark agreements with Nepal and Bangladesh, initiated a hot line with the prime minister of Pakistan, and worked with Pakistan to develop a framework for future talks aimed at creating lasting peace between those two countries.

The Burton amendment offered this year, as in many past years, takes no account of this progress. The amendment also would damage improved and improving relationships between the United States and India. U.S. businesses are India's number one overseas investor, and U.S. exports to India increased by 40 percent last year alone, making our country India's biggest trading partner. Fortune 500 companies regularly invest in India and many U.S. high-tech firms see India as the most important developing market worldwide for them, eclipsing even China as an investment location.

Mr. Chairman, as our relationship with India grows, the United States must support India's continuing efforts to respect human rights, punish violators, and develop its economy. The issue is not only a matter of development assistance, which amounted to about \$50 million last year. Of far greater significance would be the effort that this amendment represents to stigmatize India just as relations between our countries are blooming.

The Burton amendment would punish a country taking the right steps just as it celebrates 50 years of democracy. I urge my colleagues to support democracy in India by voting "no" on the Burton amendment.

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

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I rise also against the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from Indiana, Mr. BURTON.

As many of you know, every year I have offered a resolution to recognize India's independence. This year I offered it again. Thanks to Mr. BEREUTER, the resolution was made part of legislation, and it has now passed this House; and I am very pleased that after all these years of my offering a recognition amendment, that it has finally passed the House.

□ 1215

When I listen to the debate, there have been a lot of people speaking on both sides. I do not really think the debate is one of U.S. foreign assistance. When we think of the \$50 million we

are giving them relative to the \$12.5 billion in the foreign aid bill, it is a very, very small amount.

I think the issue is not one of foreign assistance. It comes down basically to this sentence. It comes down to whether we want to stigmatize India with passage of the Burton amendment. We have two great powers. These two great powers are working together.

There is another issue I might touch on that was recognized in a Washington Times story on Thursday, July 10, 1997. Let me quote from it: "New Chinese missiles target all of East Asia." That includes India. We have had satellite reconnaissance information, and it is all outlined in this article how India itself is being targeted by China.

We have great interest in protecting India and working with India. At this time we do not want to set up any type of amendment which would create hostility toward India and not continue this working relationship at India's 50th anniversary.

Let me point out that India is one-sixth of the world's population. It is a dominant force in South Asia. Of course, it is an emerging world power. We need to cooperate with this country.

India is a big emerging market. The United States is its leading trading partner and source of foreign investment. India is a nuclear-capable state that has fought three wars with a non-nuclear capable Pakistan, and is a prime focus of U.S. concerns about nonproliferation in reducing regional tension.

I bring this to the attention of my colleagues because this is a larger issue, not just talking about the fiscal side. We are not just talking about foreign aid, we are talking about how these two countries can work together, not only in the area of democracy, but also dealing with our mutual interests and the protection of democracy in that part of the globe.

We need to encourage support for their policies. We need to gain their support for nonproliferation of nuclear capability, and we must encourage its policies that serve both our interests and theirs. We must continue to expand bilateral cooperation, including an enhancement of Indian peacekeeping capabilities.

We need, of course, on the drug side to cooperate on narcotic issues. Improve human rights performance? By all means. They have done that by setting up their commission and trying to be much more forceful in that area.

Lastly, we need to understand that India, above all, is one of the oldest democracies in the world. So I believe the United States should continue its friendship with India. India has tried to strengthen their democracy through free elections. We must strengthen our ties with them and, of course, with all of the South Asia region and the global community.

For this and the other reasons I mentioned, I urge the defeat of the Burton amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, those of us who are friends of India should commend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] for bringing this amendment before us, because it gives this Congress a chance to vote down the amendment by an overwhelming majority, and in doing so, demonstrate our respect for India at its 50th year of independence, and to celebrate the increasingly close relationship between the world's most powerful democracy and the world's largest democracy.

Most of the points that can be made against this amendment have already been made, but I want to review a few of them, and perhaps make a few that have heretofore not been brought to the floor.

We ought to commend the President of the United States for agreeing to go to India to celebrate its 50th anniversary of independence. It was mentioned that India, because it has been independent 50 years, should not need American aid. This is the first time I have heard the idea that there should be a term limit on development aid.

We should point out that the gentleman from Indiana is a strong supporter of United States aid to Turkey, which has been independent for over 500 years. I would point out that most of us support American aid for Ethiopia, which has been independent for well in excess of 2,000 years. The question is not how long has a nation been independent, but rather, what are the development needs and how effectively can the United States work toward those needs.

Several of the other speakers have talked about how important our aid is to India, how effective that aid is, and how we are providing very little aid compared to the needs in India and its total population.

We have heard about Punjab. Yet in the Punjab, we have seen an amazing development, the election of a Sikh Party, the election of a party opposite many of the policies of the national government. What better proof that democracy works in India?

We are told about Kashmir, where indeed there have been some brutal actions. But we are given but one picture, and then statistic after statistic without citation, without enumeration, without calculation, and without foundation. What is really going on in Kashmir is a tragedy, but we should remember that some of the most tragic victims are those who support the Government of India.

Millions of Hindus have been driven from their own villages and from their own neighborhoods and from the State of Kashmir itself. We should remember that the human rights abuses which the Indian government is trying to prevent on its side are more than replicated by those entities that are supported often by Pakistan and other outside forces, which the Indian Government has to contend with. Many of

the most brutal pictures that can be taken in India can be taken of the victims of those who oppose the Government, the terrorists in Kashmir.

I know that the vote will be coming up later this afternoon. I hope those in India recognize that at least 100 of our colleagues would vote against foreign aid to any country at any time. I understand that level of fiscal conservatism. I do not happen to agree with it.

When the vote comes in, as I think it will, 300 to 150 or 300 to 120, keep in mind the first 100 of those votes has nothing to do with India and everything to do with a brand of fiscal conservatism that some of my colleagues embrace; that in fact, when there are 300 votes for India, hopefully, there will be no more than 10 or 20 or 30 opposed to India. We are overwhelmingly in this House in support of a strong relationship between the United States and India.

One final point I want to bring up. That is the idea that our economy is in competition with India. In fact, there are no more two complementary economies in the world. India is still a low-wage country. I have urged businesspeople in the Los Angeles area and elsewhere, importers who are dependent upon goods made in China, to look instead at India, look at India as a source of goods that require a low-wage situation, look at a country where American exports are not discriminated against the way they are in China, look at a country that embraces the rule of law, look at a country that I think will be increasingly economically important to us.

Finally, there was the point made that the "untouchables" or lower caste are somehow discriminated against by the Government of India. In fact, the phrase, and I think it was misused, was "lowest form of animal life." The President of India is from this group, and in fact religious minorities have been at the highest levels of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. SHERMAN] has expired.

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

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

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman made a very good point, but let me correct one misconception that has been portrayed here on the floor, and that is that there is money earmarked in the bill for India. There is no earmark in this bill. Therefore, there is no reason for the fiscal conservatives to vote for this amendment, inasmuch as there is nothing that we are cutting.

They are not cutting foreign aid by voting for this amendment, they are simply instructing the administration that they can only give so much

money, but there is no earmark in this bill in the first place for India, so the fiscal conservatives can join with those of us who support the democratic regime in India and support the gentleman's view. Therefore, there is no reason for even the fiscal conservatives to vote against this issue.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would hope, in fact, fiscal conservatives will vote against this amendment. I do know there will be a perception as people walk into this Chamber that the fiscally conservative vote is to vote for the amendment, and if the amendment gains a number of votes for that reason, those should not be regarded as anti-India votes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would speak very briefly against the Burton amendment. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations, I rise to support the chairman's position and oppose the Burton amendment.

My position, I think, is that of the majority of those of us in Congress, that we support democracy in India. While at times it may be imperfect, it still needs our support. There are a number of good reasons to oppose the Burton amendment, and many of those have been stated very eloquently today and yesterday. The bottom line for me is that India is one of the few true democracies in the developing world. Last year, as it has been said, India held the largest election in the history of the world. The conduct of that election was universally regarded as free and fair, and described by the New York Times as epic and extraordinary by the Washington Times.

As India celebrates 50 years of independence and democracy, the United States should today, through its congressional representatives, be sending a message of encouragement, not hostility. It is a pleasure to support the chairman's position and to oppose the Burton amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Burton amendment. I have just gotten back from India, where I was part of the official American delegation celebrating the 50th year of independence of India. We were in the parliament at midnight in New Delhi as 12:01 came and 50 years was just put into place, and I could not help but looking down and seeing this vibrant democracy.

There are so few democracies throughout the world, and India has been a vibrant democracy. It has some flaws, and who does not have flaws, what nation does not have flaws. But the fact of the matter is India is a vibrant democracy. There are nearly 1 billion people in India, 943 million people. Why would we want to do anything to alienate them or jeopardize the

United States-India relationship? United States investment was over \$5 billion in India last year, a ten-fold increase from just a few years ago.

As we went from celebration to celebration, I could not help but thinking this is a real golden opportunity for the world's largest democracy, India, and the world's longest democracy, the United States, to really forge even closer ties.

We had a meeting with the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Gujral, who wants very, very much to have increased United States-India ties. In fact, he was telling us stories where he feels very neglected, feels that the United States has not devoted enough attention to India in the past years, and is delighted that President Clinton is going to be visiting with India.

So I think we have a golden opportunity, particularly with the end of the cold war, when there had been in previous years some kind of close relationship between the Soviet Union and India that does not exist anymore. So at a time when we are going to former Communist countries like Vietnam and trading with former Eastern Bloc countries and bringing them into NATO, why would we not want to forge closer relations with the largest democracy? By the year 2020 they are going to be the country in the world with the largest population.

So I believe that the Burton amendment goes in the wrong direction, in the opposite direction from that which we should be going. It is not good for democracy, it is not good for U.S. trade, it is not good for U.S. business, and it is not what we should be doing.

The people of India have shown tremendous warmth and affection for the United States. We ought to return that affection. I thought for all the reasons we have been given, the fact that United States and India have an opportunity to forge even a closer relationship in the future, that we share common goals of democracy, India has improved on its human rights violations, and with prodding from the United States will improve even more.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN].

□ 1230

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very untimely and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] brings it up and recites time and time again, as if it were a mantra, things that he continuously mentions on the floor.

Mr. Chairman, I want to yet again extend another invitation to the gentleman from Indiana to come with me and others, if he would like, to actually visit India, to see the things that some of us have seen. To come to the States of Jammu and Kashmir, as I have been several times to travel throughout the region; to go to the Punjab, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL] and I, together with the gentleman

from New York [Mr. GILMAN], our chairman, did just a week or so ago, and see the horrible conditions, the terrible poverty, and the heroic efforts that are being made to meet those challenges, and to see those things with his own eyes so the gentleman from Indiana does not have to rely anecdotally on the experiences of others who have agendas here in Washington, as they are entitled to have, who bring him pictures and photographs so that he can cite one of them on the floor of the House as an example of national policy.

Mr. Chairman, that is not the national policy of India any more than it is the national policy of the Police Department of the city of New York to go at people with plungers. That is a terrible analogy to make, Mr. Chairman, but that is exactly what is happening here. People who work for the government sometimes do terrible things. That does not mean that it is the government's policy or the government does that.

So it is in India, which has a large military, mostly very much under control and cooperating with ours. But to blame it for all of the atrocities that go on, when individuals anecdotally commit horrible crimes, is certainly not fair or proper.

And to further state that the caste system in India, which does exist at least in practice in some places, is the policy of the government just is not the truth, Mr. Chairman. There is racism in America, but that does not mean that the policy of the government is racist.

And to cite the untouchable class as the lowest form of human life is, first of all a mischaracterization.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL] has expired.

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

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman continue to yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I continue yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is a mischaracterization. The people of India have selected as their President a person from the untouchable class. The gentleman from Indiana is misinformed. And I think it behooves us all, when we come to the floor to do things, especially when it deals with the national policy and our relationships with great societies and large countries, and even small countries, to know from whence we speak and to actually visit and see firsthand what these problems are, without relying on lobbyists to provide us with that kind of education.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to point out when we talk about the caste system, that the caste

system is illegal under the Indian Constitution. Twenty-five percent of the members of India's Parliament are so-called untouchables. The President of India, which is the Chief of State, is from the so-called untouchable class, and untouchables are constitutionally protected. Anyone can be prosecuted, and people are prosecuted, if they discriminate against those people of the so-called untouchable caste.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment. I have great respect for my friend and colleague from Indiana, Mr. BURTON, however on this issue we differ.

I believe that India is the United States' largest trading partner, and that if we approve this amendment, it will have serious consequences for the massive investment that we have in India, totaling \$5 billion last year, a tenfold increase from just 5 years before. We play right into the hands of those who would turn back the clock on the major economic reforms that have been instituted. And we are speaking here of great private investment.

The largest democracy in the world is India, one of the few true democracies in the developing world. Last year India held the largest multiparty election in world history. The conduct of this election was universally regarded as free and fair, described as epic by the New York Times and extraordinary by the Washington Times.

Here with the 50th anniversary of independence for India, we need to look to the fact that the elected government has been restored to Jammu and Kashmir. The elected government has established a State Human Rights Commission and democracy is thriving in the Punjab.

United States engagement on the Indian subcontinent through the National Endowment for Democracy, and other efforts, contributes to the strengthening of democratic institutions. Furthermore, human rights problems have existed, but the Indian government is prosecuting such violators and such violations. The National Human Rights Commission is widely regarded as independent and aggressive in pursuing human rights.

India is a nation of increasing economic and political importance for Asia and the world. While challenges remain, India has been a good friend to the United States and has improved its human rights conditions. Now is the time to send positive signals of support and assistance to the Government of India.

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

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I was in India during the winter, and I just wanted to comment briefly on the Bur-

ton amendment. It misses what is happening in the Indian subcontinent.

I was in the Punjab. The Indian record on human rights is not a perfect one, but as the State Department has mentioned in its annual report, India is clearly moving in the right direction and is making substantial progress.

Mr. Chairman, the atmosphere in the Punjab was not one basically of repression, but one of democracy growing under difficult circumstances. We had a chance to read about and to view the work of the Human Rights Commission of India. It, again, is performing a function that is a valuable one and a real one in a democratic society, what is basically a democratic society.

On this 50th anniversary of Indian independence, our country needs to be taking constructive, not destructive, steps in terms of our relationship. And what the Burton amendment does, in my judgment, is to move in a destructive rather than a constructive fashion. We need to, with India and other democracies where there are problems, work with those countries as they need to work with us when we have problems here in America.

That should be the spirit between our two great nations, the two great democracies; not the negative import and context of the Burton amendment. So I very much oppose it. India, on its 50th anniversary, has a record much more to be proud of than ashamed of. It has a history the last 50 years that much moves in the right direction more than in the wrong direction.

Are there blemishes? There are. Is there perfection? There is not. Is there movement in the right direction? Clearly so. And what this amendment does is essentially refuse to recognize the movement in the right direction and instead distort the record of accomplishment.

So, in addition to all of the importance of the economic relationships between our two countries, I think we ought to remember supremely the linkage of the United States and India as two democracies each with its own set of problems, but each moving surely in the right direction when it comes to human rights.

This country is a beacon for India in terms of human rights. It is moving, I think, to meet the test of that beacon, and we should not indicate otherwise through actions like the Burton amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I also rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] to cut development assistance to India, but I do want to state clearly for the record, the gentleman is motivated by the best of all reasons and intentions on this floor today. The gentleman from Indiana has displayed himself a caring advocate of people of human rights around the globe, and those who would suggest, as I heard a moment ago, that he is motivated by some

other reason are absolutely wrong. His heart is in the right place and his interest for people is well-known and his record is distinguished in protecting human rights, whether it is in India or China or anywhere else on the globe where human rights matter, and it matters to this Member.

Mr. Chairman, just recently we have celebrated the 50th anniversary of the independence of India, and it is a thriving democracy. Like all developing countries, India has had its experiences with human rights problems; however, India, the world's largest democracy, is making great strides in addressing the human rights concerns that have been addressed by the gentleman from Indiana.

India's free press, independent judiciary, and vigorous nongovernmental organizations have been mentioned as models for other developing countries. Allegations of human rights violations in Jammu and Kashmir prompted India to form an independent National Human Rights Commission, which has already punished more than 200 security personnel for their abuses.

Assistant Secretary of State for South Asia Robin Raphael has said that India's NHRC "has real teeth" to expose violations of human rights. The most recent U.S. State Department human rights report praised the commission's independence and noted that India "made further progress in resolving human rights problems."

I appreciate, again, I state clearly, the concern for human rights expressed by the gentleman from Indiana. However, while the amendment being debated today will do little to improve India's already significant progress in that area, it will do harm to build strong relationships between the United States and India. And I stress that that is vitally important at this time.

We have witnessed a debate on MFN and China and developing problems in that portion of the world, and we have to recognize India is a friend and a nation of great potential to protect and keep stability in the region; a nation that we can count that we have established great trade opportunities and relationships with.

Mr. Chairman, while problems remain, we need to constructively work with the Government of India, not reproach it. The United States is now India's largest overseas investor, its biggest trading partner, and its preferred source of technology. Let us not needlessly damage this important relationship. Let us work to cement it, but also underscore the concerns of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] and work diligently to protect those people in India, protect human rights, and solve this in a deliberative fashion.

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

Mr. Chairman, in opposing the amendment that is before us, I, of course, mean no disrespect to the sponsor of this amendment. The gentleman

is a respected Member of this House; it is just that we differ on this particular issue.

It seems to me that it is not a wise thing for us now to be reversing a policy of moving in the direction of greater cooperation with India. That is in the interest of the people of the United States as it is in the interest of the people of India and, I believe, generally in the interest of the people of the world.

We have much in common with this country. That, I think, is obvious. We share a common language, we share a basic economic system in common, and we share a basic political system in common.

India is a democracy. That fact has been proven if by no other reason than the recent elevation to the highest office in the land of a person from the lowest strata of society. It shows that there is political mobility based upon democratic principles, democratic ideals that we hold in common with them.

Mr. Chairman, it makes no sense for us to back away from a relationship with this country. By the middle of the next century, India will be the most populous nation in the world, and my remarks are based upon not just observations in the abstract but based upon the fact that I have had the opportunity to be there and to see firsthand the kinds of things that are happening in that country.

□ 1245

Not perfect by any means, a great many things that have to be corrected, obviously and for sure, but progress is definitely being made. We need to continue to work with them on that progress. We have major investments there. India is America's largest trading partner. That trading relationship is only going to grow and it will grow to the benefit of Americans as well.

This is a bad idea. It is something that we ought to reject. We ought to continue to promote better relationships and a closer affinity with the people of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take up a lot of time. I just have been listening. I know there have only been one or two speakers in favor of this amendment. Unfortunately, they have made some really incorrect remarks. The remarks about the caste system, you could look back 2,000 years and know that the caste system has existed in India. But the fact of the matter is that for the last 50 years this democracy has tried to root out the caste system. They have made it illegal under their constitution. They have repeatedly tried to go out of their way to establish affirmative action programs so that those of the so-called lower castes are able to play a significant role in Indian society, the point being the President, the chief of state of India.

In addition, I have heard comments about people being killed recently in a lot of different instances. A lot of that is happening because of terrorists, militant terrorist organizations that continue to operate in India.

The bottom line is, if we were to pass this amendment today, which I know we will not, but if we were, we would encourage those terrorists to continue their activities against innocent people in India. It is those militant organizations that are inflicting a lot of the crimes and a lot of the deaths that are talked about by the gentleman from Indiana.

In addition to that, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER] talked about how there has been no indication that the situation is getting better in India in terms of human rights. Just, in fact, the opposite is the truth. Our State Department annually for the last few years has talked repeatedly about progress. There has been incredible progress.

The human rights commission puts out a report on a regular basis, I brought one of the copies today, where they are prosecuting 200 people annually, more people every day. They have these training programs where they deal with the military forces and they explain to them how they are properly supposed to act. They have been dealing with the situations in rape, with rapes. They have been going against child prostitution.

The very things that the two supporters of this amendment talk about are actually being rooted out by the human rights commission on a regular basis. The Government has been spending money trying to do that.

The problem that we have here with the supporters of this amendment is that they do not look at the facts on the ground in India. They are not talking to the people. They do not understand what is going on. They continue to talk about things that have happened in the past.

I have to say, finally, when you talk about Kashmir and again about the Punjab, in both cases there have been democratic elections in those two states of India. So it is wrong to say that there is no plebiscite. It is wrong to say that there is no democratic process. People have voted, the majority of the people. More people than voted in our elections here in the United States have voted for the governments are against separatism in those states in India.

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

I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana, whom I have worked with on other issues. But on this issue I clearly disagree with him. It is ironic that we offer this amendment to cut assistance India on the 50th anniversary of its independence. This amendment takes a swipe at one of the most vibrant and energetic democracies in the world,

and it is the wrong approach to take. It seeks to punish a country which has been a democracy since its independence, it seeks to punish a country that has improved and is improving its human rights record.

Since 1996, India has been taking positive steps to improve its neighborhood. The amendment comes at a time when both India and Pakistan are working to resolve the disputes that exist between them, including Kashmir, in a bilateral manner. Earlier this year this House passed Concurrent Resolution 16 which congratulated the people of India on reaching a 30-year agreement with their neighbor Bangladesh on sharing water from the Ganges River. These are two of the more conspicuous unilateral efforts India has been making with its neighbors to increase cooperation in south Asia.

The amendment charges that India is a country without respect for human rights, particularly in the states of Jammu and Kashmir and Punjab. Mr. Chairman, it is important to note that the party in charge of Punjab is the Akali Dal, a Sikh-controlled party. They control 74 of the Punjab's 117 seats. They came to power after 69 percent of the eligible voters in Punjab went to the polls. Democracy exists in Punjab and the voters spoke by casting their ballots and electing a new party to power. That is democracy.

Let us not forget Jammu and Kashmir. Under the threat of violence and terror from separatist elements, nearly 55 percent of eligible voters in the Indian states of Jammu and Kashmir went to the polls for state assembly elections last September and October. The people of those specific states went to the polls despite a boycott called by Pakistani-backed separatist rebels and despite the separatist threats on their lives.

Our own State Department notes in its annual country report that during 1996 India made further progress in resolving human rights problems. After 3 years of existence, India's national human rights commission continues to play a key role in bringing accountability for human rights abuses and continues to enlarge its useful role in addressing patterns of abuse.

What we are being asked to do today is to cut funds to India that uses such funds to encourage economic growth, which has a direct correlation to our trading with India, stabilize population growth, enhance food security and nutrition, protect the environment, reduce HIV transmission and educate girls and women.

We cannot forget that we are India's largest trading and investment partner. So let us celebrate India's golden jubilee by defeating this amendment.

India has been a success as a democracy with its independent judiciary, free press, and energetic political system. It sought to address conflicts in a lawful, democratic manner. Instead of pursuing punitive measures against a free and democratic country, we should

be seeking to expand our economic, political and strategic ties with India so that we can move forward together.

We should pursue an agenda which will not worsen the climate in India and south Asia. We should instead stand steadfast to its commitment to free markets, as well as its commitment to human rights. It is in the national interest of the United States to defeat this amendment and to promote those market reforms and democratic government that India has been pursuing.

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

I have been listening to this debate in my office, and I felt I should come down to the floor just to talk a little bit about some feelings I have about this. I think we forget that, first of all, let us look at history.

India was subject to the most brutal colonial power possible. I talk about this with a little personal knowledge. My mother was in India when the great Mahatma Gandhi was first arrested by the British police. She witnessed and told me as a child of the terrible situation for the people of India under that colonialism.

They threw that off. They have for 50 years been a democracy. Who are we, who are we really to talk about these issues that I hear discussed today?

Rape, I have heard a lot of talk about rape. How I wish, as a woman in the United States, how I wish I could say that there is no rape in this country. How many women live in fear of rape? That is not because we are not a great country. We are, and a good country. But bad people do bad things.

We talk about the brutalism. I have heard all this talk about brutal treatment of prisoners. I would remind us, I would remind us of the treatment by the Los Angeles police of Rodney King. Bad people in good countries do bad things.

Then I have heard a great deal of talk about terrorism. Is each of us in this country responsible for the deaths at Oklahoma City when a terrorist, a terrorist decided to attack innocent people? Who are we to speak of this?

I think what we should do is see what the people themselves have said. And the Indian people have spoken. They have gone to the polls and they have voted this government. The Punjabi people have spoken. They have gone to the polls. They are the ones we should listen to, those who have spoken for their own right to be free people in a free country. That is what democracy is about. That is why India can say it is a democracy.

India would never say it is perfect. Can we in this country say we are perfect? No, we are striving for perfection. We are striving to be the best country in the world. We are the greatest of all democracies but India has gone in only 50 years from the most brutal colonial power ruling everything they did. We must remember that as you struggle for perfection, other countries need to help you on that path.

I oppose the Burton amendment. It is the wrong thing to do. We must support democracies. We must encourage them.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. In doing so, I want to commend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] for shining the bright light of our country on the human rights abuses that take place in India and indeed other places in the world. He has a strong human rights record, and I am not here today to defend any of the alleged actions of the Indian Government or their security forces outlined by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] in his amendment.

I am, however, going to vigorously defend the humanitarian aid programs that are funded through AID and, among other initiatives, help one of the most populous countries in the world deal with family planning issues, among other issues which I will address.

The chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], is the foremost champion in the world on the issue of child survival. It is the keystone of his foreign operations bill. The United States is now engaged with India in providing much needed assistance for child survival, as well as other issues, population planning, the environment, economic reform. This amendment would cut 25 percent of this modest program, the vast majority of which benefits the poorest and most vulnerable portions of Indian society.

I have been and am extremely concerned about the reports of serious human rights abuses in India, particularly in Kashmir and Punjab. The United States has been and remains seriously engaged with the Indian Government on these issues. Limited progress has been made on the human rights front with recent elections in Kashmir and Punjab, as my colleagues have cited, the successful prosecution of the security force personnel and police and military officials and the establishment of a local human rights groups that are now able to monitor events there.

These developments are positive but not definitive. However, the essential point remains: We should not be cutting off aid to help millions of poor in India with some fundamental aid programs that enable them to survive. We should be working with the Indian Government to promote human rights, as we are, and we should know that at risk, if this amendment should pass, is assistance to the women's initiative. Women are a key human resource for economic development and their full participation in a democratic society is an absolute necessity.

The HIV/AIDS activity could be cut back. This would be particularly harmful to the international and global fight against AIDS in view of fact that

India is particularly vulnerable to a dramatic increase in AIDS.

And the environment and energy portfolio would be cut back. There are obvious global pollution implications of a cutback, in addition to the loss of opportunities for U.S. technology providers. It is in our national interest to provide humanitarian assistance to India.

I believe it is important to shine the light of democracy on human rights violations there but I do not think that the Burton amendment is appropriate, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak against the Burton Amendment to H.R. 2159, the Foreign Operations Appropriations for fiscal year 1998, which would prohibit all development assistance funding for India in fiscal year 1998, unless such aid is provided through nongovernmental organizations or private voluntary organizations.

As the world's largest working democracy India is a model for the new world order which is emerging after the collapse of communism in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. The level of diversity in races, languages, ways of life and thought and in its wide disparities in education and illiteracy, in poverty and wealth, India has created a model for others to learn from.

In the 50 years since India's first Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru announced that India, the nation, would be born at the stroke of midnight on August 14, 1947, this great new nation set many standards for progress that is responsible and responsive to the needs of a diverse population.

Democracy and freedom are more than just words put to paper, they are the fabric of government policy and laws which knits together a multitude of people. It provides the ground rules that each must play by in order to be included as a good member of that society or nation.

In the early history of the United States, Thomas Jefferson wrote, "We hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness," in this Nation's Declaration of Independence. This statement did not extend itself to all men nor to women, but in the course of time and with a strong zest for the survival of this new Nation's democracy, those words now do mean all shades of Americans that we have today.

Today should our Nation's entire Federal Government be condemned and labeled because of the attack on the Haitian gentleman who was in the custody of police officers in the City of New York? I would think and hope not, but from the perspective of governments from around the world this view may be dimmed by culture and custom.

There is no perfect Democracy, but a democracy working toward perfection is more likely to find a state of existence that is rewarding to a majority of its people than one which has given up all hope of ever reaching perfection. This goal of perfection will also allow the people who govern to keep a fresh and open outlook on their role and the role of the people in the proper function of a democratic government.

I believe that the Founding Fathers wrote the Bill of Rights with that idea in mind. That they had not created a perfect union of former colonies, but were starting a work of democracy in progress.

Like the United States, our sister democracy in India had also taken great pains to craft a constitution and legal system to sustain itself during times of plenty and times of need. With a long history of contributing to the cultural, political, and religious diversity of the world, India has forged a working democracy.

We should do all that we can in this body to support a democratic India and hold judgment until there is real evidence to the contrary.

I would ask my colleagues to join me in voting against this amendment.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to oppose the amendment offered by my friend and colleague, Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I have been working on issues involving India for probably a decade now. The roots of my interest were India's efforts to counter the plague of terrorism. However, in this process, I have had the opportunity to learn more about India and the importance of its relationship to the United States, and am now the co-chairman of the India Caucus in the House. India has become not only a key trading partner with the United States, but our relationship is also important to U.S. national security.

It is this unique relationship that would be damaged by my colleague's amendment. This amendment would be a slap in the face to an ally with over 4,000 miles of border with China, a very unknown quantity.

Terrorism is a growing threat throughout the world. Much of it is spawned by radical Muslims who see it as a way to accomplish goals and objectives. Some governments in the Middle East and the Near East have permitted and sometimes encouraged the training and arming of terrorists. The U.S. has directly felt these terrorist activities in the bombings of the World Trade Center and more recently, of Khobar Towers in Saudia Arabia where many U.S. servicemen lost their lives. But so too have others felt their acts, India being first among these.

India has the second largest Muslim population in the world. Radical Muslims who use terrorism as their weapon want to control governments of all countries with large Muslim populations. We have an interest in making sure that does not happen.

India and the United States share a lot of bonds in fighting terrorism. We share growing concerns with China, too. And we share an increasingly larger trading interest. Why should this be jeopardized?

I realize that some have pointed to India's human rights situation as a reason to tweak India's nose. I would not deny that there have been some violations in India. But the government is continuing to improve its record in this regard. In fact, there is an independent human rights commission which has brought justice to hundreds of human rights violators. The State Department has gone to great lengths to make note of India's progress by stating that "during 1996, India has made further progress in resolving human rights problems. The National Human Rights Commission has continued to enlarge its useful role in addressing patterns of abuse, as well as specific abuses."

The criticisms raised by my colleague from Indiana are old hat. This amendment has

been defeated soundly and repeatedly in the past while what little rationale there is for it continues to dwindle.

One specific example is in the state of Punjab. This area is mentioned as a place of oppression against the Sikh minority. However, a Sikh dominated government replaced the ruling party in open democratic elections in Punjab. Furthermore, the Indian and Pakistani governments have shown signs that there can be real negotiations on the divisive issue of Kashmir.

Mr. Chairman, India is the world's largest democracy. The human rights record in India is improving—just ask the State Department. Now is not the time to send negative signals to India. They are important strategic allies. India is also a key economic ally with over \$5 billion in U.S. investment in India.

In the end, India has proven itself worthy of its relationship with the United States. This is not the time to support my colleague's amendment to unfairly stigmatize India. I strongly urge a no vote.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose the ill-conceived and highly destructive amendment that has been offered by our colleague from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]. His amendment would cut United States development assistance to India in the next fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, we have had repeated debates for more years than I would care to remember that have been similar to the one we are having today. Our colleague from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has offered this or a similar amendment whenever we have debated the foreign operations appropriations bill and whenever we have debated an international relations authorization bill. The House has repeatedly voted to defeat this unfortunate proposal, and I urge my colleagues again to vote against this distasteful demagoguery.

While this annual exercise has not resulted in reducing the small amount of development assistance that the United States has provided to India, it has become an annual opportunity for a few Members of this body to make unfortunate and harmful remarks about the world's largest democracy.

Mr. Chairman, instead of using this opportunity to bash the Government of India, this should be an opportunity for us to join in paying tribute to the people of India, to join in celebrating the 50th anniversary of the founding of this great country. It was just 50 years ago, in August 1947, that the era of British colonial rule ended in India, and a democratic republic was established. Now, 50 years later, there is ample reason to celebrate India's independence and its statehood.

The institutionalization of democracy in India has had its difficult moments—periods of violence, including the bloodshed which accompanied the partition of India and Pakistan at the time of the establishment of the Republic of India in 1947 and more recently at the time of the tragic assassination of former Prime Minister Indira Gandhi. There have been instances of ethnic and religious violence, but a multiethnic, multireligious state like India is not immune to the sectarianism and racism that has afflicted so many countries around the world.

This is a time, Mr. Chairman, to celebrate and rejoice with the people of India in a half-century of great achievements. India remains a democratic society with a democratically

elected parliament and a democratically elected prime minister. Democracy has flourished in a country that has a population of 900 million people. In a society that is multireligious, multiethnic, and multiracial, in a country that recognizes 16 official languages. Further complicating the effort to maintain and foster democracy in India is the fact that this country has a growing population and it suffers from a low level of economic development. I welcome the economic progress that we are witnessing in India, and I welcome the growing economic ties between India and the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I am not one to underestimate or to minimize human rights violations, and I will not ignore or overlook such problems when they occur anywhere. There are human rights violations in India, and I deplore them. At the same time, however, there is evidence of progress in this important area. The 1996 annual State Department Country Reports on Human Rights notes that advances have been made in resolving human rights problems. The establishment of an independent National Human Rights Commission by the Government of India has been an important factor in this development. The governmental and judicial system of India provides legal and constitutional safeguards for human rights. The serious social tensions and violent successionist movements that exist in India create special problems, and police training is deficient in many cases. These are explanations, but they do not justify human rights violations. The important consideration, Mr. Chairman, is that the violations that do occur are not the consequence of government policies and government intentions. These problems are the result of failures in the system, and these failures are in the process of being remedied.

Mr. Chairman, as political, economic, and other relationships between the United States and India are developing and expanding and improving, it would be unfortunate and extremely counterproductive for this House to adopt the ill-conceived amendment that we are now considering. I urge my colleagues to join me in a resounding vote against the Burton amendment.

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Burton amendment. India has taken great strides in improving its human rights record. As a member of the Congressional India Caucus, I take great interest in issues which directly affect India.

In addition, I am proud to represent one of the largest Indian-American populations in the United States. Should this misinformed, outdated amendment pass, it would have a devastating impact on India; socially, economically as well as politically.

I believe we must continue to fully recognize India's potential as a free, democratic nation, rather than punish them for past human rights abuses.

I am not arguing that India has had a perfect human rights record; however, we cannot turn our backs on the tremendous strides India has made, especially as they celebrate 50 years of democracy and continue to look ahead to great potential for its people.

The United States has played an enormous role in assisting the Indian Government in building itself into a strong democracy and a leader in the Asian region. We should be proud of our strong support of India over the years and the substantial economic doors we have opened for United States businesses.

The United States has benefited greatly through increased investments in India. This amendment would greatly jeopardize the strong business interaction that has flourished between our countries.

I urge my colleagues to continue our current common sense policy toward India. I urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Burton amendment.

Clearly, India's human rights record has been less than perfect, but we must recognize that it is improving, even in the face of some very extraordinary circumstances. In the Indian States of Kashmir and Punjab, terrorist violence has cost the lives of more than 20,000 people. Violence has become a way of life for many who live in this region of the country. International press reports confirm that India's security forces and civilians live under the constant threat of terrorist attack. Just last week, 33 people were killed and 67 injured in a bomb blast on a train in Punjab.

In recognition of international concern, India has taken steps to address these problems. For instance, India has established the National Human Rights Commission, an independent office established to investigate claims of abuse. The commission's work resulted in the prosecution and punishment of over 200 security force personnel last year. In testimony before Congress, Assistant Secretary of State for South Asia Robin Raphael, stated that the watch dog agency "has real teeth." In addition, India has abolished its highly controversial Terrorist and Disruptive Prevention Act [TADA].

Our own State Department, in its annual report on human rights, stated that India has made progress in "resolving human rights problems." The report goes further to state that the "National Human Rights Commission has continued to enlarge its useful role in addressing patterns of abuse, as well as specific abuses."

India has also made great strides in reforming its economy and improving conditions for foreign investment. Since 1990, foreign investment has grown from \$90 million to a record \$10 billion in 1995 with the United States leading the way.

The United States is now India's largest overseas investor. From 1991 to 1996, United States investment in India was 29.5 percent of all foreign investment. United States investment in India totaled more than \$5 billion last year—a 40 percent increase in 1996 alone. The U.S. Department of Commerce has designated India as one of the ten most important "Big Emerging Markets" for American business.

A virtual "Who's Who" of American companies is doing business successfully in India today including: Ford Motor Company, General Motors, Chrysler Corporation, IBM, AT&T, Coca Cola, Levi Strauss, Kellogg Company, Motorola, and Northwest Airlines.

The prospects for continued growth continue. The ruling coalition in India, brought to power last year in the world's largest democratic election in history, has remained committed to the path of economic reform laid by the previous government. In April of this year, India's Prime Minister I.K. Gujral stated, "India can look forward to the continuation of the reform program, and to its deepening, and widening."

Not only has India's Prime Minister made continued economic reform a priority, he is

also committed to reducing tensions between his country and Pakistan. Just last month, Mr. Gujral met with Pakistan's Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif to begin a dialog by which the two countries might be able to resolve their differences. While the two could only agree on incremental steps, the meeting was a positive step toward resolving the differences between these neighbors.

In light of these developments and others, I firmly believe that cutting aid to India is both unwise and unwarranted. Not only would it be a slap in the face to India and the many accomplishments it has achieved, it would have a severe impact on our relationship with the world's largest democracy. Many of the improvements that have been made in the areas of human rights, economic reform and regional stability could be lost. These would be contrary to both our national and economic security interests.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment. It sends the wrong signal at a time of great opportunity for our two countries.

(Mr. CALLAHAN asked and was given permission to proceed out of order for 1 minute.)

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the chairman and to commend him for his professionalism in the handling of this bill. I think he has been very fair and that the Chair has presided in a very professional manner.

Mr. Chairman, I know that the Chair will explain the series of votes, but it is my understanding that the Burton amendment which we have just debated will now be voted upon, that that will be a 15-minute vote.

Then, following the Burton amendment, we will proceed with a 5-minute vote on the additional five amendments that were debated yesterday. After the vote on the Burton amendment and the other five amendments we debated yesterday, we will then proceed immediately to the Smith amendment, which time will be divided on the Smith amendment between Mr. SMITH and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Then there will be an amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] to the Smith amendment.

□ 1300

Following the vote on the six pending amendments and then the vote on the Smith amendment and the Pelosi-Gilman amendment, we will go to final passage. Is that the Chair's understanding of what we are going to do?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.



The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 24, 1997, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

#### SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 24, 1997, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: Amendment No. 38 offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]; amendment No. 76 offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL]; amendment No. 32 offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL]; amendment No. 41 offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX]; amendment No. 17 offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES]; and amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 105-184 offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 38 offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (presiding the short title) the following new section:

#### LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE IN INDIA

SEC. 572. Not more than \$41,775,000 of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act under the heading "Development Assistance" may be made available for assistance in India.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 82, noes 342, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 356]

AYES—82

Aderholt	Crane	Herger
Ballenger	Crapo	Hill
Barrett (NE)	Cunningham	Hilleary
Bartlett	Deal	Holden
Barton	DeLay	Hostettler
Bonior	Diaz-Balart	Hunter
Brady	Doolittle	Hutchinson
Bryant	Duncan	Istook
Bunning	Farr	Jenkins
Burton	Fawell	Jones
Buyer	Fazio	King (NY)
Canady	Gibbons	Klug
Chenoweth	Goodling	Largent
Coburn	Granger	Lewis (KY)
Condit	Hastert	McIntosh
Cox	Hastings (WA)	McKeon

Miller (CA)	Riggs
Myrick	Riley
Nussle	Rogan
Paul	Rohrabacher
Paxon	Ros-Lehtinen
Pease	Salmon
Peterson (MN)	Scarborough
Pitts	Schaefer, Dan
Pombo	Schaffer, Bob
Porter	Sessions
Radanovich	Shadegg
Ramstad	Shuster

#### NOES—342

Abercrombie	Edwards	Klink
Ackerman	Ehlers	Knollenberg
Allen	Ehrlich	Kolbe
Andrews	Emerson	Kucinich
Archer	Engel	LaFalce
Arney	English	LaHood
Bachus	Ensign	Lampson
Baesler	Eshoo	Lantos
Baker	Etheridge	Latham
Baldacci	Evans	LaTourette
Barcia	Everett	Lazio
Barr	Ewing	Leach
Barrett (WI)	Fattah	Levin
Bass	Filner	Lewis (CA)
Bateman	Flake	Lewis (GA)
Becerra	Foglietta	Linder
Bentsen	Foley	Lipinski
Bereuter	Forbes	Livingston
Berman	Ford	LoBiondo
Berry	Fowler	Lofgren
Bilbray	Fox	Lowey
Bilirakis	Frank (MA)	Lucas
Bishop	Franks (NJ)	Luther
Blagojevich	Frelinghuysen	Maloney (CT)
Bliley	Frost	Maloney (NY)
Blumenauer	Furse	Manton
Blunt	Galleghy	Manzullo
Boehlert	Ganske	Markey
Boehner	Gejdenson	Martinez
Bonilla	Gekas	Mascara
Bono	Gephardt	Matsui
Borski	Gilchrest	McCarthy (MO)
Boswell	Gillmor	McCarthy (NY)
Boucher	Gilman	McCrery
Boyd	Goode	McDade
Brown (CA)	Goodlatte	McDermott
Brown (FL)	Gordon	McGovern
Brown (OH)	Goss	McHale
Burr	Graham	McHugh
Callahan	Green	McInnis
Calvert	Greenwood	McKinney
Camp	Gutierrez	McNulty
Campbell	Gutknecht	Meehan
Cannon	Hall (OH)	Meek
Capps	Hall (TX)	Menendez
Cardin	Hamilton	Metcalf
Carson	Hansen	Mica
Castle	Harman	Millender-
Chabot	Hastings (FL)	McDonald
Chambliss	Hayworth	Miller (FL)
Christensen	Hefley	Minge
Clay	Hefner	Mink
Clayton	Hinchey	Moakley
Clement	Hinojosa	Mollohan
Clyburn	Hobson	Moran (KS)
Coble	Hoekstra	Moran (VA)
Collins	Hooley	Morella
Combest	Horn	Murtha
Conyers	Houghton	Nadler
Cook	Hoyer	Neal
Cooksey	Hulshof	Nethercutt
Costello	Hyde	Ney
Coyne	Inglis	Northup
Cramer	Jackson (IL)	Norwood
Cubin	Jackson-Lee	Oberstar
Cummings	(TX)	Obey
Danner	Jefferson	Olver
Davis (FL)	John	Ortiz
Davis (IL)	Johnson (CT)	Owens
Davis (VA)	Johnson (WI)	Oxley
DeFazio	Johnson, E. B.	Packard
DeGette	Johnson, Sam	Pallone
Delahunt	Kanjorski	Pappas
DeLauro	Kaptur	Parker
Dellums	Kasich	Pascrell
Deutsch	Kelly	Pastor
Dickey	Kennedy (MA)	Payne
Dicks	Kennedy (RI)	Pelosi
Dingell	Kennelly	Peterson (PA)
Dixon	Kildee	Petri
Doggett	Kilpatrick	Pickering
Dooley	Kim	Pickett
Doyle	Kind (WI)	Pomeroy
Dreier	Kingston	Portman
Dunn	Klecza	Poshard

Price (NC)	Sherman	Thornberry
Quinn	Shimkus	Thurman
Rahall	Sisisky	Tiahrt
Rangel	Skaggs	Tierney
Redmond	Skeen	Torres
Regula	Skelton	Trafficant
Reyes	Slaughter	Turner
Rivers	Smith (MI)	Upton
Rodriguez	Smith (NJ)	Velazquez
Roemer	Smith (OR)	Vento
Rogers	Smith (TX)	Visclosky
Rothman	Smith, Adam	Walsh
Roukema	Snowbarger	Waters
Roybal-Allard	Snyder	Watkins
Royce	Souder	Watt (NC)
Rush	Spence	Weldon (FL)
Ryun	Spratt	Weldon (PA)
Sabo	Stabenow	Weller
Sanchez	Stark	Wexler
Sanders	Stearns	Weygand
Sandlin	Stenholm	White
Sanford	Stokes	Whitfield
Sawyer	Strickland	Wicker
Saxton	Stupak	Wise
Schumer	Sununu	Woolsey
Scott	Talent	Wynn
Sensenbrenner	Tanner	Yates
Serrano	Tauscher	Young (AK)
Shaw	Tauzin	Young (FL)
Shays	Thomas	

#### NOT VOTING—9

Gonzalez	McIntyre	Schiff
Hilliard	Neumann	Thompson
McCollum	Pryce (OH)	Waxman

□ 1323

Messrs. GANSKE, BALDACCI, RANGEL, and NADLER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. HERGER, DELAY, DOOLITTLE, and ADERHOLT changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall vote No. 356, the Burton amendment, I was unavoidably detained. I would like the RECORD to reflect that I would have voted "no."

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 24, 1997, the Chair announces he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on each further amendment in this series.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 76 OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on Amendment No. 76 offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 76 offered by Mr. CAMPBELL:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. 572. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for "ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND", and increasing the amount made available for "CONTRIBUTION TO THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FUND" as authorized by section 526(c) Public Law 103-306; 108 Stat. 163, by \$25,000,000.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 273, noes 150, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 357]

AYES—273

Abercrombie	Goode	Ney
Ackerman	Goodlatte	Nussle
Allen	Goodling	Oberstar
Andrews	Gordon	Obeys
Bachus	Green	Olver
Baessler	Greenwood	Ortiz
Baldacci	Gutierrez	Owens
Ballenger	Gutknecht	Pallone
Barcia	Hall (OH)	Pappas
Barrett (NE)	Hamilton	Pascarell
Barrett (WI)	Harman	Pastor
Bentsen	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Bereuter	Hefner	Pelosi
Berman	Hilliard	Peterson (MN)
Berry	Hinchey	Petri
Bishop	Hinojosa	Pickett
Blagojevich	Holden	Pomboy
Blumenauer	Hooley	Portman
Blunt	Horn	Poshard
Boehlert	Houghton	Price (NC)
Bonior	Hoyer	Quinn
Borski	Hutchinson	Radanovich
Boswell	Jackson (IL)	Rahall
Boucher	Jackson-Lee	Ramstad
Boyd	(TX)	Rangel
Brown (CA)	Jefferson	Redmond
Brown (FL)	John	Reyes
Brown (OH)	Johnson (CT)	Riggs
Calvert	Johnson (WI)	Rivers
Campbell	Johnson, E. B.	Rodriguez
Canady	Kanjorski	Roemer
Capps	Kaptur	Ros-Lehtinen
Cardin	Kasich	Rothman
Carson	Kennedy (MA)	Roybal-Allard
Castle	Kennedy (RI)	Royce
Chabot	Kennelly	Rush
Christensen	Kildee	Sabo
Clay	Kilpatrick	Sanchez
Clayton	Kind (WI)	Sanders
Clement	Kingston	Sandlin
Clyburn	Kleczka	Sanford
Coburn	Klink	Sawyer
Condit	Klug	Saxton
Cook	Kolbe	Scarborough
Cooksey	Kucinich	Schumer
Costello	LaFalce	Scott
Coyne	Lampson	Sensenbrenner
Cramer	Lantos	Serrano
Crane	Leach	Shaw
Cummings	Levin	Shays
Danner	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
Davis (FL)	LoBiondo	Sisisky
Davis (IL)	Lofgren	Skaggs
Davis (VA)	Lowey	Skelton
DeFazio	Lucas	Slaughter
DeGette	Luther	Smith (MI)
Delahunt	Maloney (CT)	Smith (NJ)
DeLauro	Maloney (NY)	Smith (TX)
Dellums	Markey	Smith, Adam
Deutsch	Martinez	Snyder
Diaz-Balart	Mascara	Spratt
Dicks	Matsui	Stabenow
Dingell	McCarthy (MO)	Stark
Dixon	McCarthy (NY)	Stokes
Doggett	McDade	Strickland
Dooley	McDermott	Stupak
Doyle	McGovern	Tanner
Dreier	McHale	Tauscher
Edwards	McInnis	Thomas
Ehlers	McIntyre	Thompson
Engel	McKeon	Thurman
English	McKinney	Tierney
Ensign	McNulty	Torres
Eshoo	Meehan	Towns
Etheridge	Meek	Traficant
Evans	Menendez	Turner
Fattah	Metcalfe	Upton
Fazio	Mica	Velazquez
Filner	Millender-	Vento
Flake	McDonald	Visclosky
Ford	Miller (CA)	Wamp
Fox	Minge	Waters
Frank (MA)	Mink	Watt (NC)
Franks (NJ)	Moakley	Watts (OK)
Frost	Mollohan	Waxman
Furse	Moran (VA)	Weldon (PA)
Gedjenson	Morella	Weller
Gephardt	Murtha	Wexler
Gilchrest	Nadler	
Gilman	Neal	

Weygand  
Wise

Woolsey  
Wynn

Yates  
Young (FL)

NOES—150

Aderholt	Gibbons	Oxley
Archer	Gillmor	Packard
Army	Goss	Parker
Baker	Graham	Paul
Barr	Granger	Paxon
Bartlett	Hall (TX)	Pease
Barton	Hansen	Peterson (PA)
Bass	Hastert	Pickering
Bateman	Hastings (WA)	Pitts
Bilbray	Hayworth	Porter
Bilirakis	Hefley	Regula
Bliley	Herger	Riley
Boehner	Hill	Rogan
Bonilla	Hilleary	Rogers
Bono	Hobson	Rohrabacher
Brady	Hoekstra	Roukema
Bryant	Hostettler	Ryun
Bunning	Hulshof	Salmon
Burr	Hunter	Schaefer, Dan
Burton	Hyde	Schaffer, Bob
Buyer	Inglis	Sessions
Callahan	Istook	Shadegg
Camp	Jenkins	Shimkus
Cannon	Johnson, Sam	Shuster
Chambliss	Jones	Skeen
Chenoweth	Kelly	Smith (OR)
Coble	Kim	Smith, Linda
Collins	King (NY)	Snowbarger
Combest	Knollenberg	Solomon
Crapo	LaHood	Souder
Cubin	Largent	Spence
Cunningham	Latham	Stearns
Deal	LaTourette	Stenholm
DeLay	Lazio	Stump
Dickey	Lewis (CA)	Sununu
Doolittle	Lewis (KY)	Talent
Duncan	Linder	Tauzin
Dunn	Lipinski	Taylor (MS)
Ehrlich	Livingston	Taylor (NC)
Emerson	Manton	Thornberry
Everett	Manzullo	Thune
Ewing	McCrery	Tiahrt
Fawell	McHugh	Walsh
Foley	McIntosh	Watkins
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Weldon (FL)
Fowler	Moran (KS)	White
Frelinghuysen	Myrick	Whitfield
Galleghy	Nethercutt	Wicker
Ganske	Northup	Wolf
Gekas	Norwood	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—10

Becerra	Foglietta	Pryce (OH)
Conyers	Gonzalez	Schiff
Cox	McCollum	
Farr	Neumann	

□ 1330

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

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. PAUL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 32 offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 32 offered by Mr. PAUL:

After the last section (preceding the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON FUNDS FOR ABORTION, FAMILY PLANNING, OR POPULATION CONTROL EFFORTS

SEC. 572. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available for—

- (1) population control or population planning programs;
- (2) family planning activities; or
- (3) abortion procedures.

RECORDED VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 147, noes 278, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 358]

AYES—147

Aderholt	Graham	Paxon
Archer	Hall (TX)	Pease
Army	Hastert	Peterson (MN)
Bachus	Hastings (WA)	Petri
Baker	Hayworth	Pickering
Barcia	Hefley	Pitts
Barr	Herger	Pomboy
Bartlett	Hilleary	Portman
Barton	Hoekstra	Poshard
Bilirakis	Hostettler	Quinn
Bliley	Hulshof	Rahall
Blunt	Hunter	Redmond
Boehner	Hutchinson	Riley
Bonilla	Hyde	Rogers
Bono	Inglis	Royce
Brady	Istook	Ryun
Bryant	Jenkins	Salmon
Bunning	John	Scarborough
Burr	Johnson, Sam	Schaefer, Dan
Burton	Jones	Schaffer, Bob
Buyer	Kasich	Sensenbrenner
Camp	Kildee	Sessions
Canady	King (NY)	Shadegg
Cannon	Kingston	Shimkus
Chabot	Kucinich	Skelton
Chambliss	LaHood	Smith (MI)
Christensen	Largent	Smith, Linda
Coble	Latham	Snowbarger
Coburn	Lewis (KY)	Solomon
Collins	Linder	Souder
Combest	Lipinski	Stearns
Cooksey	Livingston	Stenholm
Costello	LoBiondo	Stump
Cox	Lucas	Talent
Crane	Manzullo	Tauzin
Crapo	McIntosh	Taylor (MS)
Deal	McKeon	Taylor (NC)
DeLay	Metcalfe	Thornberry
Dickey	Mica	Thune
Doolittle	Moran (KS)	Tiahrt
Duncan	Myrick	Wamp
Emerson	Ney	Watkins
Ensign	Northup	Watts (OK)
Everett	Norwood	Weldon (FL)
Forbes	Nussle	Weldon (PA)
Gillmor	Oberstar	Weller
Goode	Pappas	Whitfield
Goodlatte	Parker	Wicker
Goodling	Paul	Young (FL)

NOES—278

Abercrombie	Chenoweth	Eshoo
Ackerman	Clay	Etheridge
Allen	Clayton	Evans
Andrews	Clement	Ewing
Baessler	Clyburn	Farr
Baldacci	Condit	Fattah
Ballenger	Conyers	Fawell
Barrett (NE)	Cook	Fazio
Barrett (WI)	Coyne	Filner
Bass	Cramer	Flake
Bateman	Cubin	Foglietta
Becerra	Cummings	Foley
Bentsen	Cunningham	Ford
Bereuter	Danner	Fowler
Berman	Davis (FL)	Fox
Berry	Davis (IL)	Frank (MA)
Bilbray	Davis (VA)	Franks (NJ)
Bishop	DeFazio	Frelinghuysen
Blagojevich	DeGette	Frost
Blumenauer	Delahunt	Furse
Boehlert	DeLauro	Galleghy
Bonior	Dellums	Ganske
Borski	Deutsch	Gedjenson
Boswell	Diaz-Balart	Gekas
Boucher	Dicks	Gephardt
Boyd	Dingell	Gibbons
Brown (CA)	Dixon	Gilchrest
Brown (FL)	Doggett	Gilman
Brown (OH)	Dooley	Gordon
Callahan	Doyle	Goss
Calvert	Dreier	Granger
Campbell	Dunn	Green
Capps	Edwards	Greenwood
Cardin	Ehlers	Gutierrez
Carson	Ehrlich	Gutknecht
Castle	Engel	Hall (OH)

Hamilton	McDade	Sabo
Hansen	McDermott	Sanchez
Harman	McGovern	Sanders
Hastings (FL)	McHale	Sandlin
Hefner	McHugh	Sanford
Hill	McInnis	Sawyer
Hilliard	McIntyre	Saxton
Hinchey	McKinney	Schumer
Hinojosa	McNulty	Scott
Hobson	Meehan	Serrano
Holden	Meek	Shaw
Hooley	Menendez	Shays
Horn	Millender	Sherman
Houghton	McDonald	Shuster
Hoyer	Miller (CA)	Sisisky
Jackson (IL)	Miller (FL)	Skaggs
Jackson-Lee	Minge	Skeen
(TX)	Mink	Slaughter
Jefferson	Moakley	Smith (OR)
Johnson (CT)	Mollohan	Smith (TX)
Johnson (WI)	Moran (VA)	Smith, Adam
Johnson, E. B.	Morella	Snyder
Kanjorski	Murtha	Spence
Kaptur	Nadler	Spratt
Kelly	Neal	Stabenow
Kennedy (MA)	Nethercutt	Stark
Kennedy (RI)	Obey	Stokes
Kennelly	Olver	Strickland
Kilpatrick	Ortiz	Stupak
Kim	Owens	Sununu
Kind (WI)	Oxley	Tanner
Klecza	Packard	Tauscher
Klink	Pallone	Thomas
Klug	Pascarell	Thompson
Knollenberg	Pastor	Thurman
Kolbe	Payne	Tierney
LaFalce	Pelosi	Torres
Lampson	Peterson (PA)	Towns
Lantos	Pickett	Trafficant
LaTourette	Pomeroy	Turner
Lazio	Porter	Upton
Leach	Price (NC)	Velazquez
Levin	Radanovich	Vento
Lewis (CA)	Ramstad	Visclosky
Lewis (GA)	Rangel	Walsh
Lofgren	Regula	Waters
Lowey	Reyes	Watt (NC)
Luther	Riggs	Waxman
Maloney (CT)	Rivers	Wexler
Maloney (NY)	Rodriguez	Weygand
Manton	Roemer	White
Markey	Rogan	Wise
Martinez	Rohrabacher	Woolsey
Mascara	Ros-Lehtinen	Wynn
Matsui	Rothman	Yates
McCarthy (MO)	Roukema	Young (AK)
McCarthy (NY)	Roybal-Allard	
McCrery	Rush	

## NOT VOTING—8

English	Neumann	Smith (NJ)
Gonzalez	Pryce (OH)	Wolf
McCollum	Schiff	

Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ROYCE and Mr. SMITH of Michigan changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall vote No. 358, I was mistakenly recorded as voting “no.”

I ask unanimous consent to have it reflected in the appropriate place in the RECORD that I should have been recorded as voting “aye” on this rollcall vote.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 358 I inadvertently voted “yes.” I intended to vote “no.” I have, throughout my service in the Congress, consistently supported international family planning funds, as long as those funds are not used to perform or promote abortions. The Paul amendment would have cut off all family planning funds, a position which I do not support.

□ 1345

## AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. FOX OF PENNSYLVANIA

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 41 offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 41 offered by Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania:

Page 94, after line 3, insert the following:  
SEC. 572. None of the funds made available under the heading “DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE” may be used to directly support or promote trophy hunting or the international commercial trade in elephant ivory, elephant hides, or rhinoceros horns.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 159, noes 267, answered “present” 1, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 359]

## AYES—159

Abercrombie	Gephardt	Morella
Ackerman	Gilman	Nadler
Allen	Goodling	Neal
Andrews	Gutierrez	Nussle
Baldacci	Hall (OH)	Oberstar
Bentsen	Harman	Olver
Berman	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Blagojevich	Hinche	Pascarell
Blumenauer	Hooley	Pastor
Boniore	Hostettler	Paul
Bono	Houghton	Payne
Borski	Hutchinson	Pelosi
Brown (OH)	Jackson (IL)	Pomeroy
Capps	Jackson-Lee	Portman
Cardin	(TX)	Price (NC)
Carson	Kaptur	Rangel
Castle	Kasich	Rivers
Clay	Kelly	Rogan
Clayton	Kennedy (MA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Clement	Kennedy (RI)	Roukema
Conyers	Kennelly	Roybal-Allard
Cook	Kildee	Sabo
Coyne	Kilpatrick	Sawyer
Crane	Kind (WI)	Schumer
Cummings	Kucinich	Scott
Davis (VA)	LaFalce	Serrano
DeFazio	Lampson	Shays
DeGette	Lantos	Sherman
DeLauro	Lazio	Skaggs
Dellums	Leach	Slaughter
Deutsch	Levin	Smith (MI)
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (GA)	Smith (NJ)
Dicks	Lofgren	Smith, Adam
Dixon	Lowey	Snyder
Doggett	Luther	Spratt
Dooley	Maloney (CT)	Stabenow
Engel	Maloney (NY)	Stark
Ensign	Manton	Stokes
Eshoo	Markey	Tauscher
Etheridge	Matsui	Tierney
Evans	McCarthy (MO)	Torres
Farr	McCarthy (NY)	Towns
Fattah	McDermott	Velazquez
Fawell	McGovern	Vento
Fazio	McHale	Visclosky
Filner	McKinney	Waters
Foglietta	McNulty	Waxman
Ford	Meehan	Weldon (PA)
Fox	Meek	Wexler
Frank (MA)	Millender	Weygand
Frelinghuysen	McDonald	Woolsey
Furse	Miller (CA)	Wynn
Gallegly	Mink	Yates
Gejdenson	Moakley	

Aderholt	Gillmor	Pappas
Archer	Gingrich	Parker
Armey	Goode	Paxon
Bachus	Goodlatte	Pease
Baesler	Gordon	Peterson (MN)
Baker	Goss	Peterson (PA)
Ballenger	Graham	Petri
Barcia	Granger	Pickering
Barr	Green	Pickett
Barrett (NE)	Gutknecht	Pitts
Barrett (WI)	Hall (TX)	Pombo
Bartlett	Hamilton	Porter
Barton	Hansen	Poshard
Bass	Hastert	Quinn
Bateman	Hastings (WA)	Radanovich
Becerra	Hayworth	Rahall
Bereuter	Hefley	Ramstad
Berry	Hefner	Redmond
Bilbray	Hergert	Regula
Bilirakis	Hill	Reyes
Bishop	Hilleary	Riggs
Bliley	Hilliard	Riley
Blunt	Hinojosa	Rodriguez
Boehlert	Hobson	Roemer
Boehner	Hoekstra	Rogers
Bonilla	Holden	Rohrabacher
Boswell	Horn	Rothman
Boyd	Hoyer	Royce
Brady	Hulshof	Rush
Brown (CA)	Hunter	Ryun
Brown (FL)	Hyde	Salmon
Bryant	Inglis	Sanchez
Bunning	Istook	Sanders
Burr	Jefferson	Sandlin
Burton	Jenkins	Sanford
Buyer	John	Saxton
Callahan	Johnson (CT)	Scarborough
Calvert	Johnson (WI)	Schaefer, Dan
Camp	Johnson, E. B.	Schaffer, Bob
Campbell	Johnson, Sam	Sensenbrenner
Canady	Jones	Sessions
Cannon	Kanjorski	Shadegg
Chabot	Kim	Shaw
Chambliss	King (NY)	Shimkus
Chenoweth	Kingston	Shuster
Christensen	Klecza	Sisisky
Clyburn	Klink	Skeen
Coble	Klug	Skelton
Coburn	Knollenberg	Smith (OR)
Collins	Kolbe	Smith (TX)
Combust	LaHood	Smith, Linda
Condit	Largent	Snowbarger
Cooksey	Latham	Solomon
Costello	LaTourette	Souder
Cox	Lewis (CA)	Spence
Cramer	Lewis (KY)	Stearns
Crapo	Linder	Stenholm
Cubin	Lipinski	Strickland
Cunningham	Livingston	Stump
Danner	LoBiondo	Stupak
Davis (FL)	Lucas	Sununu
Davis (IL)	Manzullo	Talent
Deal	Martinez	Tanner
Delahunt	Mascara	Tauzin
DeLay	McCrery	Taylor (MS)
Dickey	McHugh	Taylor (NC)
Dingell	McInnis	Thomas
Doolittle	McIntosh	Thompson
Doyle	McIntyre	Thornberry
Dreier	McKeon	Thune
Duncan	Menendez	Thurman
Dunn	Metcalfe	Tiahrt
Edwards	Mica	Trafficant
Ehlers	Miller (FL)	Turner
Ehrlich	Minge	Upton
Emerson	Mollohan	Walsh
English	Moran (KS)	Wamp
Everett	Moran (VA)	Watkins
Ewing	Murtha	Watt (NC)
Flake	Myrick	Watts (OK)
Foley	Nethercutt	Weldon (FL)
Forbes	Ney	Weller
Fowler	Northup	White
Franks (NJ)	Norwood	Whitfield
Frost	Obey	Wicker
Ganske	Ortiz	Wise
Gekas	Owens	Wolf
Gibbons	Oxley	Young (AK)
Gilchrest	Packard	Young (FL)

## ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

McDade

## NOT VOTING—7

Boucher	McCollum	Schiff
Gonzalez	Neumann	
Greenwood	Pryce (OH)	

□ 1353

Messrs. KLECZKA, MCINTYRE, MORAN of Kansas, and SANFORD changed their vote from "aye" to "no." Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. WYNN, Mr. FORD, and Ms. Harman changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. TORRES

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 17 offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 17 offered by Mr. TORRES:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

PROHIBITION ON FUNDS FOR SCHOOL OF THE AMERICAS

SEC. 572. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used for programs at the United States Army School of the Americas located at Fort Benning, Georgia.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 210, noes 217, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 360]

AYES—210

Abercrombie	Dooley	Hooley
Ackerman	Doyle	Hulshof
Allen	Duncan	Jackson (IL)
Baesler	Ehlers	Jackson-Lee
Baldacci	Engel	(TX)
Barcia	English	Jefferson
Barrett (WI)	Eshoo	Johnson (CT)
Becerra	Etheridge	Johnson (WI)
Bentsen	Evans	Johnson, E. B.
Berman	Farr	Kanjorski
Blagojevich	Fattah	Kaptur
Blumenauer	Fawell	Kelly
Boehlert	Fazio	Kennedy (MA)
Bonior	Filner	Kennedy (RI)
Borski	Flake	Kennelly
Boucher	Foglietta	Kildee
Brown (CA)	Foley	Kilpatrick
Brown (OH)	Forbes	Kind (WI)
Bunning	Ford	Klecza
Camp	Fox	Klink
Campbell	Frank (MA)	Klug
Capps	Franks (NJ)	Kucinich
Cardin	Frost	Lampson
Carson	Furse	Lantos
Clay	Gejdenson	LaTourrette
Clayton	Gephardt	Lazio
Clement	Gibbons	Leach
Coble	Gilchrest	Levin
Coburn	Goode	Lewis (GA)
Conyers	Goodling	Lipinski
Costello	Gordon	LoBiondo
Coyne	Green	Lofgren
Cummings	Greenwood	Lowe
Davis (IL)	Gutierrez	Luther
DeFazio	Gutknecht	Maloney (CT)
DeGette	Hall (OH)	Maloney (NY)
Delahunt	Harman	Manton
DeLauro	Hefner	Markley
Dellums	Hinche	Mascara
Dixon	Hinojosa	Matsui
Doggett	Holden	McCarthy (MO)

McCarthy (NY)  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHale  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Miller (CA)  
Minge  
Mink  
Moakley  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Morella  
Nadler  
Neal  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Paul  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Peterson (MN)  
Petri  
Pomeroy

Porter  
Poshard  
Price (NC)  
Quinn  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Rivers  
Rodriguez  
Roemer  
Rothman  
Roukema  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Sabo  
Salmon  
Sanchez  
Sanders  
Sawyer  
Scarborough  
Schaffer, Bob  
Schumer  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Shays  
Sherman  
Skaggs  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)

NOES—217

Aderholt  
Andrews  
Archer  
Armey  
Bachus  
Baker  
Ballenger  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bateman  
Bereuter  
Berry  
Bilirakis  
Bishop  
Bliley  
Blunt  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bono  
Boswell  
Boyd  
Brady  
Brown (FL)  
Bryant  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Canady  
Cannon  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Chenoweth  
Christensen  
Clyburn  
Collins  
Combest  
Condit  
Cook  
Cooksey  
Cox  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crapo  
Cubin  
Cunningham  
Danner  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (VA)  
Deal  
DeLay  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doolittle  
Dreier  
Dunn  
Edwards  
Ehrlich  
Emerson

Ensign  
Everett  
Ewing  
Fowler  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gekas  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gingrich  
Goodlatte  
Goss  
Graham  
Granger  
Hall (TX)  
Hamilton  
Hansen  
Hastert  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Herger  
Hill  
Hilleary  
Hilliard  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Hoyer  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Istook  
Jenkins  
John  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Kasich  
Kim  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaFalce  
LaHood  
Largent  
Latham  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Livingston  
Lucas  
Manzullo  
Martinez  
McCrery  
McDade  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntosh  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
Meek  
Menendez

Smith, Adam  
Stabenow  
Stark  
Stokes  
Strickland  
Stupak  
Talent  
Tauscher  
Taylor (NC)  
Thompson  
Thurman  
Tierney  
Torres  
Towns  
Traficant  
Turner  
Upton  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Walsh  
Waters  
Watt (NC)  
Waxman  
Wexler  
Weygand  
Woolsey  
Wynn  
Yates

Thornberry  
Thune  
Tiahrt  
Visclosky  
Wamp  
Watkins

Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
White  
Whitfield

Wicker  
Wise  
Wolf  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Bilbray  
Gonzalez  
Houghton

McCollum  
Neumann  
Pryce (OH)

Schiff

□ 1402

Mr. WISE and Ms. BROWN of Florida changed their vote from "aye" to "no." So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. THORNBERRY). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3 in House Report 105-184 offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] on which further proceedings were postponed and on the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. STEARNS:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING COSTS OF THE PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE PROGRAM AND NATO EXPANSION

SEC. 572. It is the sense of the Congress that all member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) should contribute their proportionate share to pay for the costs of the Partnership for Peace program and for any future costs attributable to the expansion of NATO.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 425, noes 0, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 361]

AYES—425

Abercrombie	Boehner	Clement
Ackerman	Bonilla	Clyburn
Aderholt	Bonior	Coble
Allen	Bono	Coburn
Andrews	Borski	Collins
Archer	Boswell	Combest
Armey	Boucher	Condit
Bachus	Boyd	Conyers
Baesler	Brady	Cook
Baker	Brown (CA)	Cooksey
Baldacci	Brown (FL)	Costello
Ballenger	Brown (OH)	Cox
Barcia	Bryant	Coyne
Barr	Bunning	Cramer
Barrett (NE)	Burr	Crane
Barrett (WI)	Burton	Crapo
Bartlett	Buyer	Cubin
Barton	Callahan	Cummings
Bass	Calvert	Cunningham
Bateman	Camp	Danner
Becerra	Campbell	Davis (FL)
Bentsen	Canady	Davis (IL)
Bereuter	Cannon	Davis (VA)
Berman	Capps	Deal
Berry	Cardin	DeFazio
Bilbray	Carson	DeGette
Bilirakis	Castle	Delahunt
Bishop	Chabot	DeLauro
Blagojevich	Chambliss	DeLay
Bliley	Chenoweth	Dellums
Blumenauer	Christensen	Deutsch
Blunt	Clay	Diaz-Balart
Boehlert	Clayton	Dickey

Dicks	Johnson, Sam	Paul
Dingell	Jones	Paxon
Dixon	Kanjorski	Payne
Doggett	Kaptur	Pease
Dooley	Kasich	Pelosi
Doolittle	Kelly	Peterson (MN)
Doyle	Kennedy (MA)	Peterson (PA)
Dreier	Kennedy (RI)	Petri
Duncan	Kennelly	Pickering
Dunn	Kildee	Pickett
Edwards	Kilpatrick	Pitts
Ehlers	Kim	Pombo
Ehrlich	Kind (WI)	Pomeroy
Emerson	King (NY)	Porter
Engel	Kingston	Portman
English	Klecza	Poshard
Ensign	Klink	Price (NC)
Eshoo	Klug	Quinn
Etheridge	Knollenberg	Radanovich
Evans	Kolbe	Rahall
Everett	Kucinich	Ramstad
Ewing	LaFalce	Rangel
Farr	LaHood	Redmond
Fattah	Lampson	Regula
Fawell	Lantos	Reyes
Fazio	Largent	Riggs
Filner	Latham	Riley
Flake	LaTourette	Rivers
Foglietta	Lazio	Rodriguez
Foley	Leach	Roemer
Forbes	Levin	Rogan
Ford	Lewis (CA)	Rogers
Fowler	Lewis (GA)	Rohrabacher
Fox	Lewis (KY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Frank (MA)	Linder	Roukema
Franks (NJ)	Lipinski	Roybal-Allard
Frelinghuysen	Livingston	Royce
Frost	LoBiondo	Rush
Furse	Lofgren	Ryun
Gallegly	Lowey	Sabo
Ganske	Lucas	Salmon
Gejdenson	Luther	Sanchez
Gekas	Maloney (CT)	Sanders
Gephardt	Maloney (NY)	Sandlin
Gibbons	Manton	Sanford
Gilchrest	Manzullo	Sawyer
Gillmor	Markey	Saxton
Gilman	Martinez	Scarborough
Goode	Mascara	Schaefer, Dan
Goodlatte	Matsui	Schaffer, Bob
Goodling	McCarthy (MO)	Schumer
Gordon	McCarthy (NY)	Scott
Goss	McCrery	Sensenbrenner
Graham	McDade	Serrano
Granger	McDermott	Sessions
Green	McGovern	Shadegg
Greenwood	McHale	Shaw
Gutierrez	McHugh	Shays
Gutknecht	McInnis	Sherman
Hall (OH)	McIntosh	Shimkus
Hall (TX)	McIntyre	Shuster
Hamilton	McKinney	Sisisky
Hansen	McNulty	Skaggs
Harman	Meehan	Skeen
Hastert	Meek	Skelton
Hastings (FL)	Menendez	Slaughter
Hastings (WA)	Metcalf	Smith (MI)
Hayworth	Mica	Smith (NJ)
Hefley	Millender-	Smith (OR)
Hefner	McDonald	Smith (TX)
Herger	Miller (CA)	Smith, Adam
Hill	Miller (FL)	Smith, Linda
Hilleary	Minge	Snowbarger
Hilliard	Mink	Snyder
Hinches	Mollohan	Solomon
Hinojosa	Moran (KS)	Souder
Hobson	Moran (VA)	Spence
Hoekstra	Morella	Spratt
Holden	Murtha	Stabenow
Hooley	Myrick	Stark
Horn	Nadler	Stearns
Hostettler	Neal	Stenholm
Houghton	Nethercutt	Stokes
Hoyer	Ney	Strickland
Hulshof	Northup	Stump
Hunter	Norwood	Stupak
Hutchinson	Nussle	Sununu
Hyde	Oberstar	Talent
Inglis	Obey	Tanner
Istook	Olver	Tauscher
Jackson (IL)	Ortiz	Tauzin
Jackson-Lee	Owens	Taylor (MS)
(TX)	Oxley	Taylor (NC)
Jefferson	Packard	Thomas
Jenkins	Pallone	Thompson
John	Pappas	Thornberry
Johnson (CT)	Parker	Thune
Johnson (WI)	Pascrell	Thurman
Johnson, E.B.	Pastor	Tiahrt

Tierney	Waters	Whitfield
Torres	Watkins	Wicker
Towns	Watt (NC)	Wise
Traficant	Watts (OK)	Wolf
Turner	Waxman	Woolsey
Upton	Weldon (FL)	Wynn
Velazquez	Weldon (PA)	Yates
Vento	Weller	Young (AK)
Visclosky	Wexler	Young (FL)
Walsh	Weygand	
Wamp	White	

## NOT VOTING—8

Gonzalez	Moakley	Rothman
McCollum	Neumann	Schiff
McKeon	Pryce (OH)	

□ 1411

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

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, on roll-call No. 359, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the last word.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], and I thank the gentleman for taking this time and opportunity to discuss the funding for the U.S. Man and the Biosphere Program.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman and I are both aware, the U.S. Man and the Biosphere Program operates through the State Department with funding from 15 different Federal agencies. Despite the fact that this program is 100-percent taxpayer funded, it has never been authorized by Congress. And in fiscal year 1996, the last year for which figures are available, the State Department, the U.S. Agency for International Development, and the Peace Corps contributed through interagency transfers over \$311,000 to the U.S. Man and the Biosphere Program. Almost a third of that total was funds appropriated under the Foreign Operation Appropriations Act.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to ask whether the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations had appropriated such funds for or supports such interagency transfers for the U.S. Man and the Biosphere in the fiscal year 1998 appropriations.

□ 1415

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

Mr. COBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would like to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN] for bringing this matter to the attention of the full House. In answer to his question, no, the subcommittee did not appropriate funds for such interagency transfers for fiscal year 1998 or any other year of which I am aware.

As to whether or not the House supports the interagency transfer to U.S. Man and the Biosphere Program, I would have to answer, no, based upon the fact that the House passed Foreign Affairs Authorization Act, H.R. 1757.

As our colleagues are aware, on June 11 of this year the House passed by a vote of 222 to 202 the Coburn amendment to the Foreign Affairs Authorization Act. This amendment prohibits funds authorized by that act from being used in support of the U.S. Man and the Biosphere Program or other related programs. Based upon the actions of this body, no funds appropriated by H.R. 2159 should be used in support of the U.S. Man and the Biosphere Program. Consequently, no Federal agency funded under this act should attempt to transfer funds to the U.S. Man and the Biosphere Program.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for that clarification. As the Members of this body are aware, the U.S. Man and the Biosphere Program has raised a number of questions ranging from violations of private property rights to misuse of tax dollars. Without specific congressional authorization that defines the role of the Biosphere Program and without congressional oversight, it is impossible to answer any of these questions. I can guarantee my colleagues that it is reassuring to my constituents and those of many other Western States to know that their tax dollars will not be used in support of a program which is not accountable to Congress.

On behalf of myself, our colleagues, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PETERSON], the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. EMERSON], the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], all of whom have assisted in bringing this program to light and assuring the proper use of Federal funds, I would like to thank the gentleman for providing this guidance to the agencies funded under this act.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I am pleased to have had this opportunity, and I thank the gentleman for engaging me in this discussion.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise to state my position with regard to this program and to respectfully disagree with my distinguished chairman and the maker of this, the initiator of this colloquy.

I do not agree that the statements accurately reflect the status of the Man and the Biosphere Program. Funding for the Man and the Biosphere Program was requested and has not been prohibited in this bill. I therefore want to clarify that, despite the statements made here this afternoon, and I rarely disagree with my distinguished chairman, funding for this project can move

forward if Congress takes no further action, no further definitive action on it.

The citation to the Foreign Affairs Authorization Act does not apply, because that is not even the law. So at this time, this afternoon, at the time of this colloquy, there is no prohibition on Congress' spending funds for the Man and the Biosphere Program.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. There has been a great deal of discussion over whether Congress has given proper statutory guidance and authorization to the Man and the Biosphere Program and whether Congress has exercised enough oversight. These are of course functions and duties of Congress rather than the responsibility of the Man and the Biosphere Program and thus should not be cited as a reason for terminating funding for the program. These are also matters I have sought in good faith to address. The Man and the Biosphere Program is a program of scientific research, education, and training.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN] has expired.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the last word.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Continuing with my remarks, Mr. Chairman, the program does not regulate private property rights, and I am aware of absolutely no evidence that Federal officials have misused taxpayers' funds in carrying out this program.

I would point out that about two-thirds of the program is research conducted by a dozen or more different Federal agencies under their existing authorization to conduct research and does not need to be separately authorized by this legislation or any other. However, I would like to reiterate my areas of agreement with the gentleman from Oklahoma.

In view of the controversy that appears to surround the program, I do believe that it is appropriate to enact a specific organic statute for the program. I have introduced such legislation in the form of H.R. 1801, which, I might add, enjoys bipartisan support. I have also requested the Committee on Science to conduct oversight hearings on this program, and I might also point out that we are the only committee which has ever conducted oversight on this program, although it has been several years ago. Although it is somewhat rare to focus this level of legislative attention on such a small pro-

gram, I am in full agreement that it would be healthy.

Finally, I would point out that nearly all of the funding expended by the Man and the Biosphere Program is for scientific research. The gentleman's expressed concern, however, is the impact of biosphere designation on private property rights. I would question the wisdom of killing off good peer-reviewed scientific research based on what is essentially an administrative concern. I suggest that it would be far more constructive to simply place a moratorium on new biosphere designations until these concerns are met rather than terminate ongoing scientific research. In fact, I recognize that the gentleman from Oklahoma is a supporter of good research, and I commend him for that.

This is the type of compromise, the one that I am suggesting, that I believe could be accommodated if the gentleman would join me in my efforts to advance H.R. 1801.

May I say further with regard to this whole debate that I want to commend the gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from Alabama for the way in which it has been conducted. I feel that we have considerably enlightened the other Members with regard to this program. I want to thank them for their cooperation.

There has been a great deal of discussion on the floor of the House regarding the merits of the Man and the Biosphere Program and whether Congress has provided adequate legal authority to the executive branch to carry out the program.

In the fiscal year 1998 foreign operations budget request, as in previous years, the Man and the Biosphere Program is specifically detailed as a component of the international contributions for scientific, educational and cultural activities account. The foreign operations appropriations bill on page 37 and report on page 61 indicate no change to the President's request for this program. The principles of appropriations law are clear here—the effect of the bill and past appropriations bills has been to provide the requisite authority to the executive branch to expend funds on the program. When a lump sum appropriation is made for a collection of requested programs, and no specific intent is indicated to provide funds in addition to or less than the request, the executive branch may expend the requested funds. A conflicting intent expressed in another bill, in this case the foreign operations authorization bill, does not have any effect whatsoever on this authority if it is not enacted into law.

If, as the opponents of this program have implied, this is not the case and Federal officials have illegally expended such funds in the past, this would be a very serious violation of law. It would also mean that our somewhat elaborate system of checks and balances to ensure financial integrity within the executive branch has failed and that the chief financial officers for the participating agencies, the Comptroller General and others have been derelict in their duties. I do not believe this to be the case but if that is in fact the allegation that is being made, I would suggest that this be accompanied by a more serious showing of evidence and facts.

In addition, opponents of this program have questioned the authority of the executive branch to make interagency transfers in order to aggregate funds for common scientific purposes. Not only does this make good sense in reducing overhead and interagency duplication of effort, it is a principle that has long been followed and rests on a solid legal basis. The Economy Act of 1932, U.S.C. 1535, provides authority for Federal agencies to effect such transfers.

In addition, 22 U.S.C. 2656 authorizes the Secretary of State to conduct foreign policy including the coordination and oversight of science activities between the United States and foreign countries. Together, these statutes clearly provide the necessary administrative authority to carry out the Man and the Biosphere Program and no further authority is needed in appropriations bills. Thus, it can be said that the appropriations bill such as the foreign operations bill does not provide specific authority for the Man and the Biosphere Program simply because it is not needed.

Likewise, literally thousands of other Federal programs are included in appropriations bills that have not been authorized and are not based on specific organic statutes. To insist that each such program be based on a separate and unique enabling statute would place an unreasonable burden on the legislative process.

For example, the Committee on Science authorizes about \$25 billion per year for programs under our jurisdiction. If each program of magnitude of the Man and the Biosphere Program received a separate organic statute and hearing, this would entail over 1 million hearings and bills per year.

However, given the obvious policy questions that have been raised over the Man and the Biosphere Program, it is entirely appropriate that just such special attention be given it in the legislative process. Thus I have introduced H.R. 1801 in an attempt to clarify what this program should do and what it should not do.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN].

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's graciousness in bringing forth his offer.

I think that the American public still needs to recognize that this is a program that has never been authorized by anybody, House or Senate. It has never had recent oversight. The line item appropriations have never been approved in any appropriation process, and the House has voted four times already this year to totally eliminate any funding and any authorization for this program. So I will join the gentleman in bringing forward his bill. I am not sure that I will support it, but I will fully support that we should have a vote on whether or not this should be an authorized program.

That has been my point from the start. If it is unauthorized, it should not be paid for. We should come forward with a bill to authorize it, if that is the will of this House.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the last word.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to respond to the gentlewoman from California. We seldom disagree. Many times we disagree on issues which is what this body is all about. But let me just give you a brief history of where we are on this.

First of all, it was because of my request to this House under a unanimous consent, that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN] was unable to present his amendment, even though he had filed it in a timely manner. If the amendment had been allowed to come to the floor, very obviously the House would have voted the same way they voted on the foreign relations bill, and indeed there would have been a prohibition in this bill.

My response to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN] in our colloquy was simply, he asked, was there any money designated in this bill for the Man and the Biosphere Program. And the answer is, no, there is nothing in here. If there is any authorization in here for transfer, no, there is no authorization for transfer. So I think that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN] and I represent a majority of the views of this House that it is not the will of the U.S. Congress to spend money on this program. In my colloquy, that is what I said. I simply said that based upon the vote on June 11, I have to answer no. It is not the direction of this House to spend money on this program.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding to me and appreciate his elucidation of his previous remarks. However, the authorization bill, as the gentleman knows, is not the appropriations bill. While it is interesting for us to speculate as to what the will of the body is, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN] regretfully did not have the opportunity to present his amendment and have a vote on it to legitimize the point of view and to have support one way or another registered.

I was only pointing out that there was no action taken by this House and by the Congress, that the law does not prohibit the funding of the Man and the Biosphere Program. I was making a more general statement that no such prohibition exists at this time despite the vote in the authorization.

Mr. CALLAHAN. There is no prohibition against spending a lot of this money in the State of Alabama, but they are not going to do it. And there is no prohibition, that is true, on this program. But it is the will of the House, based upon the June 11 vote, that obviously 222 Members of this body feel it should not be spent.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, as an

appropriator, I want to protect our prerogatives. And as appropriations chairman, I would hope that the gentleman's statement in favor of the position of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN] would not therefore apply to all other amendments or provisions passed through the authorization process to, therefore, be foisted onto the appropriations process as law, just protecting the prerogative of the Appropriations Committee for those amendments that are not the law.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman again for yielding.

I commend the chairman, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, for the precise language that he has used and which I think is correct. I should point out, however, that the Senate, the other body, in its own wisdom, rejected this language in connection with the interior appropriations bill, and in all likelihood this will remain to be resolved in conference.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman would further agree that the wisdom of the House is generally superior to that of the Senate.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I would always agree, but it does not always prevail.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the last word.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a colloquy with the distinguished chairman, the distinguished ranking member, and I want to state that Bucheit International, a company in my district, at the urging of the Vice President, the State Department and the Commerce Department and Builders for Peace was granted political risk insurance from the Overseas Private Investment Corporation [OPIC], to build a concrete molding plant in Gaza, and they are the first to have done so at the request of the administration and try to bring some investment American dollars to Gaza.

In 1995, the company received a \$1.1 million OPIC loan. After they invested \$4.4 million, the company has experienced unethical if not illegal treatment, and activity which has resulted in almost a default of this OPIC loan. In addition, the company was never reimbursed for any value-added taxes collected on goods headed for Gaza as it was supposed to have been. The company had been promised a 5-year tax moratorium. That was not granted.

The Palestinian Authority agreed to establish and supervise a monetary au-

thority in Gaza, Mr. Chairman, in accordance with international banking law. However, the Bucheit International Co. has found the banking system to be below international standards. For example, I want to cite for the Record and for the gentleman's cognizance and understanding the importance of this issue as a microcosm of other investment in that region.

Corporate accounts of Bucheit International were opened without proper corporate documentation. Corporate checks denominated in dollars were endorsed and cashed by individuals without first being deposited into the corporate account. Canceled checks were not returned. Corporate funds in excess of \$100,000 were used to guarantee an overdraft of a private individual without knowledge or approval of the corporation.

□ 1430

And a letter of guarantee was written by a bank without notifying the company, in violation of the management's strict instructions at the time of the process. Here is exactly what I am saying, Mr. Chairman. I had a number of amendments and I agree with the gentleman that legislating in appropriations bills is not the vehicle. We have the authorization chairman here and I am glad he is listening to this. But I ask for the gentleman's help in the conference report, to direct the administration, the Clinton administration and the executive branch, to look into this issue and resolve these lax standards of international banking law and the fact that this first company that was motivated and urged on behalf of the administration to make an investment, could get some justice, some fairness. They have been ripped off.

I am asking that there be some appropriate language placed in the conference report that would at least direct the administration to resolve these issues, to state these issues on the fact, as I believe this is the beginning, and if the Palestinian Authority wants to join the brotherhood of nations, they are going to have to be upfront and honest businesspeople. They cannot have banking systems that are going to rip off American investors who have been encouraged by the White House to make investments there.

I have no other choice here, and I have no other recourse for my company. The Palestinian Authority should not shirk its duties and obligations by blaming any individuals or any bank. I think it is imperative that we as a Congress must insist that Chairman Arafat take immediate steps to reimburse OPIC and the company for the investment before any further damages or any American company decides it is not worth investment in Gaza.

With that, I know it is a very complicated issue, but it is the beginning, Mr. Chairman, and there will be other American companies that will be



ripped off because the precedent has been set. It has been un-American, to say the least, and downright illegal. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the gentleman's support.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. I appreciate the gentleman from Ohio bringing this matter to my attention. Hopefully we can begin the process of resolving this issue even before conference, because I have already instructed my staff to contact the administration to ask that they expeditiously look at this problem that the gentleman contends exists, which I am sure it does if he says it does, and to hopefully resolve it before that. But if indeed the gentleman's allegations are correct, and I have no reason to believe they are not, then we should take immediate steps to have it corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. TRAFICANT was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from California, the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I am pleased to follow the lead of our chairman on this issue. He has been a champion for American business investment abroad and has called to the attention of foreign leaders problems that our businesses have had in newly emerging democracies and countries where we are encouraging investment. I know he has established his expertise and his standing on this issue, and I am pleased to follow his lead as he stated in the colloquy.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, and I am also glad the chairman of the authorizing committee is here because I plan to sit down with the authorizers to see if we could address some general language so that these types of problems can be resolved through a proper authorizing mechanism as well. I again thank the chairman of the subcommittee for his leadership and his courtesy.

I would like to engage Chairman CALLAHAN in a colloquy on Bucheit International, a company in my district that has investments in Gaza.

In 1994, Bucheit International, with the support of the Office of the Vice President, the U.S. Department of Commerce, and Builders for Peace, was granted political risk insurance from the Overseas Private Investment Corporation [OPIC] to build a concrete molding plant in Gaza.

In 1995, Bucheit received a \$1.1 million loan from OPIC for the purchase of additional equipment and working capital.

After investing \$4.4 million in the area, however, Bucheit has experienced transportation and standards barriers, a mismanaged system of regulations, and unethical, if not illegal, ac-

tivity, which has resulted in Bucheit's default on the OPIC loan.

In addition, Bucheit has never been reimbursed for any value-added-taxes [VAT] collected by Israel on goods headed for Gaza.

Bucheit has had difficulty obtaining proper invoices from Gaza suppliers, so simply day-to-day accounting has become an impossible task. Bucheit currently has a \$75,000 payment pending.

Moreover, Bucheit had been promised, a 5-year tax moratorium by the Palestinian Authority which was never granted. Rather, Bucheit income taxes are automatically deducted on all final payments by the Palestinian Ministry of Finance.

The Palestinian Authority agreed to establish and supervise a monetary authority in Gaza, in accordance with international banking law. However, Bucheit has found the banking system to be well below international standards.

For example, Bucheit has discovered that: corporate accounts were opened without proper corporate documentation, corporate checks denominated in dollars were endorsed and cashed by individuals, without first being deposited into the corporate account, canceled checks were not returned, corporate funds in excess of \$100,000 were used to guarantee an overdraft facility of a private individual, without knowledge or approval by the corporation, and a letter of guarantee was written by a bank without notifying Bucheit, in violation of Bucheit management's strict instructions.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for your commitment in including report language in the conference report on this bill, directing the Clinton administration to settle this matter between Bucheit, OPIC, the Cairo Amman Bank, and the Palestinian Authority—in favor of Bucheit.

In many ways, the establishment of a lasting peace in the Middle East hinges on the ability of the Palestinians to develop the economies of the West Bank and Gaza strip. That development, to a large degree, will depend on U.S. investment in the region. Bucheit took a considerable risk in investing in Gaza.

Through no fault of its own, Bucheit has endured significant losses. Unless our Government takes strong action to redress this wrong, it will be extremely difficult to convince other U.S. companies to invest in Gaza and the West Bank.

#### ADDENDUM FROM PETE BUCHEIT

1. The Palestinian Authority issues all bank charters and is responsible for monitoring and governing their local operations. Bucheit was a locally registered company with all employees.

2. The PA and the U.S. Government have a signed agreement wherein the PA guarantees and holds harmless U.S. companies (from what has happened to Bucheit, i.e., expropriation of its bank account which ultimately caused the OPIC loan default and the expropriation of its \$4.4 million plant).

3. The PA should not shirk its duties and obligations by blaming individuals or the Cairo Amman Bank. Bucheit has complained to the PA for 1½ years to act and they have ignored all requests.

4. We demand that Chairman Arafat take immediate steps to reimburse OPIC and Bucheit for the money they invested in Gaza before damages (political and financial) go out of control.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 105-184 offered by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

FOREIGN ORGANIZATIONS THAT PERFORM OR PROMOTE ABORTION OVERSEAS; FORCED ABORTION IN THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

SEC. 572. (a) Section 104 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection.

“(h) RESTRICTION ON ASSISTANCE TO FOREIGN ORGANIZATIONS THAT PERFORM OR ACTIVELY PROMOTE ABORTIONS.—

“(1) PERFORMANCE OF ABORTIONS.—

“(A) Notwithstanding section 614 of this Act or any other provision of law, no funds appropriated for population planning activities or other population assistance may be made available for any foreign private, non-governmental, or multilateral organization until the organization certifies that it will not, during the period for which the funds are made available, perform abortions in any foreign country, except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the pregnancy were carried to term or in cases of forcible rape or incest.

“(B) Subparagraph (A) may not be construed to apply to the treatment of injuries or illnesses caused by legal or illegal abortions or to assistance provided directly to the government of a country.

“(2) LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.—(A) Notwithstanding section 614 of this Act of any other provision of law, no funds appropriated for population planning activities or other population assistance may be made available for any foreign private, non-governmental, or multilateral organization until the organization certifies that it will not, during the period for which the funds are made available, violate the laws of any foreign country concerning the circumstances under which abortion is permitted, regulated, or prohibited, or engage in any activity or effort to alter the laws or governmental policies of any foreign country concerning the circumstances under which abortion is permitted, regulated, or prohibited.

“(B) Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to activities in opposition to coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization.

“(3) APPLICATION TO FOREIGN ORGANIZATIONS.—The prohibitions of this subsection apply to funds made available to a foreign organization either directly or as a subcontractor or subgrantee, and the certifications required by paragraphs (1) and (2) apply to activities in which the organization engages either directly or through a subcontractor or subgrantee.”.

(b) Section 301 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(i) LIMITATION RELATING TO FORCED ABORTIONS IN THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.—Notwithstanding section 614 of this Act or any other provision of law, no funds may be made available for the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) in any fiscal year unless the President certifies that—

“(1) UNFPA has terminated all activities in the People's Republic of China, and the United States has received assurances that UNFPA will conduct no such activities during the fiscal year for which the funds are to be made available; or

“(2) during the 12 months proceeding such certification there have been no abortions as the result of coercion associated with the family planning policies of the national government or other governmental entities within the People's Republic of China.

As used in this section, the term 'coercion' includes physical duress or abuse, destruction or confiscation of property, loss of means of livelihood, or severe psychological pressure."

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 24, 1997, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] will each control 20 minutes.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment pursuant to the Solomon unanimous-consent request of July 24.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment to the amendment.

The text of the amendment to the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GILMAN pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of July 24, 1997 in lieu of amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 105-184 to the amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 105-184 offered by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Strike all after the title heading 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 appropriated or otherwise made available 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) LIMITATION ON LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available 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 apart 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 Population 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.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 24, 1997, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] will each control 20 minutes.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, a "Dear Colleague" letter signed by my good friends and colleagues the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD] came to my attention by a colleague who came this close to being deceived by it. The bold headline read and I quote from the letter, "Gilman-Pelosi-Campbell-Lowey-Greenwood-DeLauro-Slaughter oppose abortion and support voluntary family planning." I looked at that headline again and again and thought, that looks just like one of my letters.

Did the leading activists in the abortion rights cause, did the seven Members whose abortion advocacy is so extreme that they are opposed even to the partial-birth abortion ban that was before this body recently, had they done an about face and joined the pro-life cause? Are the seven most pro-abortion Members of this House really offering a right-to-life amendment? I mean, that would be truly historic.

I do not think so. In judging their amendment, you might for starters afford them the same amount of credibility to offer a right-to-life amendment that you would give to me or to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] or to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BARCIA] or to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] if we tried to convince you that we were offering a pro-abortion amendment. Somehow you would know that if you really wanted to promote abortion around the world, you should vote against an amendment by some of the most prominent pro-life leaders in the Congress no matter what we decided to call it. It would not pass the straight face test. And you would be right. And if

you really want to protect unborn children, you will know enough to vote against this amendment, the so-called amendment offered by my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], offered again by some of the most prominent leaders of the abortion rights movement.

The "Dear Colleague" letter, and I say this with all due respect to its authors, simply does not tell the truth. Perhaps it is unwitting, but do not take my word for it. Look at the language.

It says, and I quote, that the "Gilman-Pelosi-Campbell-Lowey-Greenwood-DeLauro-Slaughter amendment prohibits all U.S. funds from being spent on abortion or abortion counseling overseas." That is simply not true. Current law does that, but the plain letter of the language that is being offered says nothing of the kind. It was misleading, and at least one Member came to me suggesting that he had been misled by that.

Let me also point out, Mr. Chairman, the letter states that the Gilman, Pelosi and company amendment prohibits U.S. family planning assistance from going to foreign NGO's and multilateral organizations that promote abortion as a method of family planning.

My question is, would an abortion done for so-called health reasons, such as mental health, be considered or construed as an abortion done as a method of family planning? And of course we all know the answer to that. What about a woman whose birth control method has failed? It is interesting that Planned Parenthood itself says that no abortion is ever done as a matter of birth control. Adopt this amendment offered by my good friend the gentleman from New York, and you render the policy of the underlying language absolutely meaningless.

As it relates to the Mexico City Policy, and I would remind Members during the Reagan and Bush years, abortion as a method of family planning had a precise definition, the definition that is contained in our amendment, the Hyde - Barcia - Smith - Oberstar amendment, and that is no funding except in cases of rape, incest, or life of the mother.

My simple question to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] today is, and I would ask him to respond if he would, is that his definition? That is the longstanding definition of the Mexico City Policy. Is that his definition, which again is clearly delineated in our amendment?

Mr. GILMAN. If the gentleman will yield, I would reserve the opportunity to respond as part of my remarks, and I will be pleased to respond to the gentleman's question.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I would hope the gentleman would define it in detail.

Let me just say that there is vagueness in the language that is contained before us promoting abortion as a

method of family planning. When we look at it, it is not even the worst thing about the so-called perfecting amendment. There is one point that there is no ambiguity about it. If the amendment is adopted, it will absolutely be legal for U.S. family planning grantees and contractors to perform abortions, as many as they like, under whatever circumstances they like overseas.

The Mexico City Policy I would remind Members had two important prohibitions to it. First, foreign organizations could not get U.S. family planning money if they performed abortions overseas except in rape, incest, and life of the mother situations. Second, they could not get the money if they promoted abortion overseas, again with the same three exceptions.

As I have pointed out, I believe that this amendment that is being offered by my friends on the other side of this issue is vague and it will give the Clinton administration a blank check to do whatever it wants to do in the area of promotion of abortion. But to take out the performance part, which this amendment guts, means that again they can perform abortions for gender selection or for any other reason and still get a fat payday from Uncle Sam.

The Smith-Barcia-Hyde-Oberstar amendment on the other hand is clear and nonambiguous. The pro-abortion killer amendment injects sweeping vagueness and gives the administration a blank grant of authority to pour hundreds of millions of dollars into the overseas abortion industry, which means in the end, Mr. Chairman, more dead babies and more injured mothers.

Let us not kid ourselves. The Gilman-Pelosi amendment is a killer amendment and if it were to pass today, and I do not think it will, but if it were I would ask every pro-life Member of this Chamber to vote no on the underlying amendment because I think that is better than adopting a sham.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to vote "no" on this perfecting amendment and yes on the underlying amendment. Let us erect that wall of separation between abortion and family planning and then the money can flow unfettered to those organizations that will no longer be in the abortion business.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer this amendment on behalf of myself, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD], the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER], the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL], the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] and the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Our amendment marks a significant turn in the seemingly endless debate about the Mexico City Policy. Under our amendment, Mr. Chairman, the supporters of voluntary family plan-

ning programs would accept the Mexico City Policy but would apply it only to organizations that promote abortion as a method of family planning. We would accept the restrictions blocking funds to organizations which lobby for or against abortion laws but would apply this restriction only to organizations that promote abortion as a method of family planning.

Most important, we agree to cut off all funds to the U.N. Population Fund if the fund restarts any program in China. As we all know, we have worked tirelessly on behalf of human rights in China, many of us have done that, and I have joined the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] on countless efforts to help the victims of human rights abuses in China.

Recognizing the serious situation there, we are willing to send a message to the United Nations that no U.N. population program should move forward until the situation in China changes in a major way. I think that is a major concession. In past bills we offered to reduce our contribution to the U.N. Population Fund by the amount it spent in China. Now we are willing to accept a total cutoff of funds if a program is restarted.

I will remind Members that as of today, the U.N. Population Fund has no program in China. The previous program has expired and the Fund has only an office in Beijing that is used to manage its program in Mongolia. If a program is started, then we would agree with the gentleman from New Jersey to cut off all such funding. That should put the matter of China to rest.

The key issue before us is whether or not our Nation will continue its 30-year lead supporting voluntary family planning. Family planning reduces population pressures that damage our environment, destabilizes governments, and suppresses economic growth. Most important, voluntary family planning has proved to be the best way to improve the survival of mothers and children by increasing the interval between births. Voluntary family planning also frees women to choose when they will have children, allowing them to advance in school and the workplace where unintended pregnancies have held them back. Most important, the best way to stop abortions is to stop unintended pregnancies.

□ 1445

Voluntary family planning is the best way to stop unintended pregnancies, and, therefore, Mr. Chairman, any opportunity for abortion.

With regard to the gentleman's inquiry about abortion used as a method of family planning, I note that this was common in many countries, especially the former Soviet Union.

I will also note our amendment alternative has teeth. It accepts the major portions of Mr. SMITH's amendment.

I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD],

the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL], the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER], the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO], and the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] for working with us to craft this bipartisan amendment, and I urge Members to adopt this amendment to the amendment by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. Chairman, to control the balance of my time, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD], who has done so much to support children, to support their mothers, in our voluntary family planning program.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Gilman-Pelosi-Campbell-Lowe-DeLauro-Slaughter-Greenwood amendment, and associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations in acknowledging the bipartisan nature of this amendment, and commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD] for his leadership on it and in strong opposition to the Smith amendment.

Our effort, and we worked hard and long on this, was the result of listening, listening, listening to our colleagues' concern about this issue over the years. As a result, our amendment has two parts to it.

The first part says that if the U.N. family planning is involved in China, they will receive no funding. We yield that point to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. He has fought that fight. Members on both sides of the aisle expressed their concern about the forced abortion policies in China. We concede that point because that was a time when that point was being reconsidered.

Second, Members have said they want a separation between family planning and abortion. We do, too. We reject abortion as a form of family planning. We say that family planning is the best way to reduce the number of abortions, and this amendment would disqualify any organization from any assistance here for any foreign and nongovernmental and multilateral organization that, with U.S. funds or with their own funds, promote abortion as a method of family planning. It would also prohibit U.S. family planning assistance to organizations unless they use those funds to prevent abortion as a method of family planning.

We have built this firewall. We have separated abortion and family planning as is appropriate. We have cut off funding unless it can be certified that the UNFPA is not involved in the program in China.

I urge my colleagues to accept this, I believe, smart alternative to the gentleman from New Jersey's [Mr. SMITH], which accomplishes all that we want to do to reduce the number of abortions while promoting international family planning which in turn will reduce the abortions.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and I would ask the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] if they would answer this: Under the Agency for International Development's policy, during the 1980's and early 1990's, before Mr. Clinton, there was a clear definition as to what abortion is, a method of family planning. It was abortions except in cases of rape, incest, or life of the mother.

Now to legislate ambiguity and vagueness and just toss it all over to the White House and say, "You decide," I asked AID how they would define the Gilman amendment. They do not have a clue. They said, "Look at what goes on on the House floor." I would hope during the course of this debate that my friends on the other side will say yes, there is health abortions, gender-selection abortions, so-called sex-selection abortions. What are we talking about?

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. On the gentleman's time, I am pleased to answer the question that he just posed, what are we talking about? The gentleman asked what do we mean by abortion as a form of family planning. Abortion as a method of family planning in the Gilman-Pelosi amendment means abortion that is used as a substitute for contraception.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Reclaiming my time, this is the problem. When the administration says that it does not know what it means, and we sent them a copy of the amendment exactly as it was proposed, it suggests to me that we are playing a game here that we will then act as if we are doing something when, frankly, my colleagues, we are doing absolutely nothing.

As my colleagues know, I have been in this body 17 years, and it galls me, and it should gall each of us, when we do not legislate with preciseness, and that is what our amendment does. It says there are three instances: rape, incest, and life of the mother; they are exceptions. But after that we are talking about no promotion of abortion.

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

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I come forward today to express my strong support for the Smith-Barcia-Hyde-Oberstar amendment that would essentially restore the two policies that were in effect during the Bush and Reagan administrations.

One concerns future U.S. funding of the United Nations Population Fund, and the second is intended to prevent U.S. funding of nongovernmental organizations which performs and promotes

abortion as a method of family planning.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2159, as reported from the House Committee on Appropriations, would allow hundreds of millions of U.S. taxpayers' dollars to fund the international abortion industry.

Today, we will hear that we must protect the lives and help the women and children across the globe by providing the necessary economic relief, and we will be told that supporting population funds is not a vote about abortion. But, Mr. Chairman, this is false and misleading. U.S. family planning funds are subsidizing groups in foreign countries that do provide abortions. Millions of U.S. taxpayers' dollars have enabled organizations to expand their field of operations and perform even more abortions.

In fact, the International Planned Parenthood Federation and other organizations, heavily subsidized by U.S. dollars, have been active and outspoken in trying to change the laws of countries regulating or prohibiting abortion.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is necessary and consistent with our system of laws and heritage. We must not be fooled by the false claims of many international population groups who claim that this is not an abortion issue because it clearly is.

As lawmakers, we have a responsibility to protect the lives of the very youngest, most vulnerable of American citizens, and, in addition, we must protect the sacred little lives in foreign countries where we are providing financial assistance for international family planning programs. As such, we must prevent the abuse of taxpayers' dollars from providing excessive subsidies to organizations that perform and promote overseas abortions.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues today to support responsible family planning and vote for the Smith amendment and against the Gilman-Pelosi-Campbell-Lowey amendment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY], a cosponsor of the amendment.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Smith amendment and in support of the Gilman-Pelosi amendment.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is just an extreme piece of legislation that aims to end family planning aid overseas. What our amendment will do is ensure that voluntary preventive family planning services continue.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] claims that his amendment simply cuts abortion funding. What he has not told us is that abortion funding overseas has been prohibited since 1973. His amendment would cut abortion funding from zero to zero. Therefore, the amendment offered by the gen-

tleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] must be after something more, and 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 and the aid we provide is both valuable and worthwhile. Nearly 600,000 women die each year of causes related to pregnancy and childbirth, most living in developing countries.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from New Jersey for his leadership in this very difficult and complicated issue, but actually this issue we are dealing with today is not all that complicated. The difference is between two words, perform and promote.

The amendment that the gentleman from California and the distinguished gentleman, and I do not see him here now, from New York [Mr. GILMAN] is offering goes halfway. It denies funds to organizations that promote abortion. Unfortunately, it does not use the word "perform," and I do not care what they promote, it is the performance that counts. That is where the homicides occur or the feticides occur, that is where the unborn children are destroyed, in the womb.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. The gentleman knows full well because he has been such a leader in this field that U.S. law prohibits any funds from going to any organizations for the performance of an abortion.

The law prevents that. We are just going beyond that.

Mr. HYDE. The gentlewoman from California would have no objection then to including "perform" along with "promote" in the amendment?

Ms. PELOSI. It is already prohibited. It is already prohibited.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The problem here is that performance, the Helms amendment of 1973 said very simply, direct funding. What was found to be very infirm about that language, and that is why the Mexico City policy was constructed in the early 1980's under the Reagan administration, was that it was like Swiss cheese. It was not stopping the performance of abortions by the very people that we heavily subsidize in the developing world. They were the abortion mills. We were giving them \$500,000 here, and then they would say, and it is not totally concluded that they did not do this, they would say, "Oh, we're not going to use your money to kill the unborn babies, we'll use our own."

The problem with that is who we give to does matter. If they were absconding with funds and theft was the issue, this so-called lying of accounting would be meaningless.

The issue comes down to whether or not we want to give to organizations that are promoting and doing abortions on demand, and that is the essence of our amendment and it is simplicity. Their amendment absolutely guts it.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman further yield so I can answer his question?

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I would rather the gentlewoman from California use her time.

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I got left?

The CHAIRMAN. Fifteen seconds.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield me an additional 15 seconds?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I just want to take issue with a line in the Planned Parenthood fact sheet that says there is no evidence that abortions exist for gender selection, a problem that does not exist. I recently read a news article about families in British Columbia of the Sikh religion who when the females get pregnant they have a determination as to whether it is a little male or a female. If it is a female, they travel into the State of Washington where an abortionist has a clinic, a mobile clinic, to perform gender-selection abortions, because their custom is to have a rather large dowry with the little female girl when she gets married and they cannot afford it so they have a gender-selection abortion.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD] will control the time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

There was no objection.

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

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Smith amendment and very much in favor of the Gilman-Pelosi et al. amendment.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] strikes directly at women's rights to access family planning information to space and time their pregnancies to suit the needs of their families.

As my colleagues know, access to family planning information and contraception decreases abortion. The gentleman from New Jersey, by cutting off funding of organizations solely because they have an opinion on abortion will deny money to those groups which have been most effective in preventing unwanted pregnancies.

□ 1500

The amendment would endanger women's health, deny women and cou-

ples access to family planning information, and increase, not decrease, abortions.

On the other hand, the Gilman-Pelosi et al. amendment would emphasize U.S. commitment to prevention of abortion. Organizations could continue their current uses of USAID population funds to increase family planning information and services, along with supportive investments in related health and population activities, which together result in more couples using contraceptive methods, and therefore, in prevention of unintended pregnancies and abortions.

Furthermore, under the amendment, funding would be prohibited to any organizations that "promote abortion" as a method of family planning.

We in this Chamber have discussed this before. We know that this vote is about family planning, not abortion. We know that to reduce abortion, we must increase access to family planning. We know that women with access to family planning space their pregnancies, producing healthier children; and we know that lack of access to contraceptives leads to abortion, legal or otherwise.

Access will reduce maternal deaths from illegal abortions. Almost 600,000 women die annually during pregnancy and childbirth, including 75,000 due to unsafe abortion, UNICEF figures.

There are many more facts that we have with regard to the fact that family planning will prevent abortion. Vote for the Gilman-Pelosi amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina, [Mrs. MYRICK].

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Chairman, I urge a yes vote on Smith-Barcia-Hyde-Oberstar, which will restore the pro-life Mexico City policy; and a no vote on the Gilman-Pelosi-Campbell-Lowey-Greenwood-DeLauro-Slaughter amendment, which would substitute vagueness for clarity and, therefore, defeat the purpose of this important pro-life policy.

The question before the House is simple: Should the United States give many millions of dollars for family planning programs to organizations actively engaged in performing abortions overseas?

When we choose the surrogates in foreign countries, the groups that will represent our country in matters related to family planning and population control, do we really want to choose organizations that are known primarily as abortion providers? What message does this send about American values?

The substitute amendment would substitute a vague, and therefore, unenforceable standard, promoting abortion as a method of family planning for the clear and precise standard in the Smith-Barcia amendment.

Under the substitute language, U.S. family planning grantees can promote

abortion as vigorously as they want, so long as the Clinton administration was willing to certify that these abortions were not done as a method of family planning. The Smith-Barcia amendment, in contrast, would prohibit our grantees from either performing or promoting abortion, except in three cases clearly defined: rape, incest, and danger to the life of the mother.

Mr. Chairman, when it comes to protecting human life, we must choose precision and clarity over vagueness and uncertainty. Please vote no on the substitute, and yes on the Smith-Barcia-Hyde-Oberstar amendment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER].

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

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the substitute and against the Smith amendment.

Without the support of U.S. international family planning funds, countless millions in developing countries will have no access to information and services that most of us take for granted. This information is especially important in the developing world, where population, driven by an uncontrolled demographic inertia to explosive levels of growth, threatens the fragile stability of political and social systems.

Population stability is essential to ensuring adequate resources for future populations and real sustainable development.

United States assistance is grounded in a fundamental American value, the freedom of people to choose their own future, to space and plan their families, to reduce infant mortality, and to give children a healthy start in life. That is what this is really all about.

Family planning saves lives. It reduces abortions, reduces infant and childbirth-related mortality, and helps those in developing countries live healthier lives.

The Smith amendment would end family planning services and lead to more unintended pregnancies, more unsafe abortions, tragically, and more infant and childbirth-related mortalities.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote to save lives and to vote for the Pelosi substitute against the Smith amendment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1¼ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I heard the discussion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and I would like to quickly respond, to put this in perspective.

When I was Assistant Administrator of AID in the late 1970's, we faced this very issue of fungibility, so we set up methods to make sure that American dollars were insulated from any expenditure for abortion-related activities.

We faithfully carried out the Helms amendment. It mostly related to IPPF. It does not spend any substantial amount of its own funds, its central funds, on abortion-related activities. It has affiliates that spend its funds. These are essentially semiautonomous or autonomous affiliates who raise their moneys in countries where abortion is legal.

The result of the Mexico City policy is, we could not give any funds to any organization that had any affiliate that spent the funds it raised for anything relating to abortion. That meant we would prevent an organization from being in family planning because, in a third degree, some affiliate spent some money it raised in its local country for something that was legal in this country.

That is why this effort really strikes at family planning throughout the world, and why we should turn it down.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas, [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Smith-Barcia-Hyde-Oberstar amendment. Our tax dollars should not support countries and organizations that use abortion as a family planning tool.

Every year since 1985 we have denied funds to the United Nations Population Fund because it provides financial support for programs that support overseas abortions.

Mr. Speaker, in 1993, the administration changed the rules and reinterpreted U.S. law in order to claim opposition to coercive population programs, but then actually provide for their financial support. The administration does this by prohibiting our tax dollars from providing direct support for forced abortions or sterilizations, but that does not stop our money from freeing up funds in other accounts to be used for these inhumane acts. This deception must end.

The Smith amendment simply interprets U.S. law as it was originally intended. It stops all payments for organizations that support and provide abortion services.

As a nation deeply concerned about human rights abuses, we have no business sending such signals. For these reasons, I urge a "yes" vote on the Smith amendment.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California, [Mr. CAMPBELL].

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, the important distinction between what the Smith amendment provides and the Pelosi-Greenwood amendment provides is this: Many women seek family planning counseling after they realize that they are pregnant. I wish it were not so, and I am sure everybody agrees with me that they wish it were not so. But as a result, if you deny any opportunity for the United States to assist

with the family planning agency because it also offers advice on abortion, you would prevent the opportunity for giving family planning advice that would prevent second abortions, third abortions, fourth abortions.

Let me get into some of the statistics, because it is fascinating how the use of family planning has prevented those subsequent abortions.

The AID studies tell us that in Tanzania, Egypt, Turkey, Kazakhstan, Hungary, and Russia, studies they have made in each category of each country, when opportunities were available for contraception, incidence of abortion dropped dramatically.

It would be the wish of everyone in this debate that the incidence of abortion be eliminated in this world. But we face today an imperfect world, and if you say to a woman, you may go and seek advice, but the agency from which you seek advice cannot offer you help on abortion, she will not go there. And then that woman may have a second, third, and fourth abortion, the horrors that my colleagues have presented to us.

So in good faith, if your concern is to prevent the incidence of abortion, then please support family planning and recognize that you cannot have it both ways. If you wish to encourage women not to have an abortion, then get them into family planning counseling, a family planning clinic, family planning advice, as quickly as possible, and do not tell them that if you go to this particular family planning counseling, advice, service, you cannot receive the advice you seek because of U.S. law.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN].

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment a little bit on what we have heard here today.

First of all, I would like to make clear, as a practicing physician and obstetrician, I believe in family planning. I believe that women should be counseled and offered the opportunity. But I also do not believe that one of those options ought to be the termination of the life. And as the gentleman from California just alluded to, it is his hope we would prevent further abortions, that is not really what happens. Oftentimes they come and get talked into an abortion; and then they are very upset about that after the fact.

So if we, as a country, truly are concerned about women in the Third World and their ability to have a choice of not reproducing, then what we ought to do is do the best we can and, at the same time, offer real concern that this body has had for a long period of time that this other option, with which we have much difficulty ourselves in terms of our debate in this body.

I would agree with what Mr. CAMPBELL said. The real problem is unintended pregnancy. It is not abortion. It is a shame that our body continues to get hung up on this issue. But we have

to be truly honest about what the real issue is.

It is like Ms. PELOSI's amendment. Is it a straightforward amendment that addresses the issue that we are talking about, or is it an amendment that is somewhat less than straightforward so we can cloud the issue?

We all want the same thing. We just disagree on how we get there. And I have the utmost respect for Ms. PELOSI and her views, and she represents a very different part of the country than I do. But we ought to keep in mind that we do want the same thing, and that there is a large body in this country and in this House that says this is a worrisome area to us, this idea of abortion.

So let us be very, very honest about what we are doing and not try to trick the American public. The fact is, there are some disagreements on how we do it. Let us vote to make sure we get family planning money there.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COBURN. I would just like to finish my point, and if I have any time left, I will be happy to. I think the gentlewoman controls some time on her side.

Ms. PELOSI. The gentleman was questioning the honesty of our proposal.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentlewoman has plenty of time to answer that.

Mr. Chairman, I would even propose that we might increase those funds. But I think we ought to be very careful about what we want and what the truth is in terms of what really happens in international family planning.

I will support the will of this House, regardless of how this vote comes out, because I think it is important that women do have this service.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond briefly to the gentleman, who was questioning the integrity of our proposal while saying that he recognized the need for international family planning. It is interesting to hear him say that in light of the fact that he just voted for the Paul amendment which would have eliminated all the funding for international family planning in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER], a member of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Somebody has to speak for the millions of women around this world who desperately want access to family planning. Even with the family planning money, we don't reach enough of them.

Pregnancy and childbirth are very risky propositions for women in many parts of this globe that lack electricity, running water, medical equipment or trained personnel. In Africa, a woman has a 1 in 16 chance of death from pregnancy and childbirth during their lifetime—585,000 women die from

bodies that are worn out from child bearing, child after child, who simply cannot take another.

And there are complications from pregnancy. For each one that dies, 100 others suffer from associated illnesses and permanent disabilities, including sterility.

Studies indicate if we can space a child for 2 years apart, we can prevent an average of 1 in 4 infant deaths.

We are talking about saving people's lives here. Who are we in the United States, where we have so much and so much has been given to us, that we can say to people who have almost nothing, we are not going to give you the information or the knowledge that you need to save your life and to save your family's?

This is the cruelest kind of family planning of all, to let women die from excess pregnancies or self-induced abortions.

□ 1515

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond briefly that nothing in my amendment or the amendment offered by the gentleman Illinois [Mr. HYDE] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BARCIA] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] cuts family planning. It holds harmless the amount of money.

This policy, known as the Mexico City Policy, first announced at a U.N. conference in 1984, separates abortion from family planning. So you can have it both ways. You can say you are pro-life and also pro-family planning, because the money will flow to those organizations that divest themselves of killing unborn children with suction machines or with injections of high concentrated salt or any of the other hideous methods that are used to kill and abuse and destroy unborn babies.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, for his tremendous leadership on this issue, and thank him for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, the Gilman-Pelosi amendment will allow family planning services in the Third World to continue, while safeguarding the fungibility of funds for abortion services. This amendment will allow U.S. funds to be used only by private and multilateral organizations that do not promote abortion as a method of family planning. I do not know, Mr. Chairman, how this could be any clearer. The Gilman-Pelosi amendment provides this important funding and addresses the concerns of those who would support the Smith amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this debate is not about abortion, it is about women. It is about whether women, poor women in the developing world, will be allowed to use their minds and choose their future. Today, they gather the firewood,

they gather the water, they till the fields, and they tend to the children. They have no other opportunity to participate in family and community development beyond these tasks. These women are not offered the opportunity to be educated, no chance at all; They are not given the chance to bring anything economically to the table, to their families, where it is valued.

It seems to me it is time that we value women across the world. They should be valued for their minds and their potential to add to the global community. It seems to me as long as we prevent women from being able to space and number their children through voluntary family planning, which is what the Smith amendment will do, we are undervaluing them in a way that is cruel and wrong.

It is time that we stand up for voluntary family planning throughout the world. Abortion is not an issue in this. None of us favor abortion as a method of family planning. All of us oppose the use of any funds, especially public funds, for abortion in any way. We support voluntary family planning because we support women and their role in society.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Ms. DEGETTE].

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, I guess I do not understand some of the arguments in favor of the Smith amendment, because it seems to me that if we oppose unnecessary abortions, as I do, and as I think everyone here does, then we would support the Gilman-Pelosi amendment and oppose the Smith amendment.

The Smith amendment would cause women in developing countries to face more unwanted pregnancies, more poverty, and more despair. What it would do is prevent birth control information and family planning information from going to women in developing countries who desperately need it. It will increase abortions and it will jeopardize the health of millions of women and children internationally.

The Smith amendment will deny funding to international family planning organizations who are giving women desperately needed reproductive health services and delivering vital pre- and post-natal care. I do not see anybody else who is going to do that, other than the fine organizations who are performing those services now. For that reason, I would oppose the Smith amendment and support the Gilman-Pelosi amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Ms. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN].

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his many years of leadership on this important issue for us in the House.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to reiterate my support for the rights of the unborn, and to state my strong opposi-

tion to the use of taxpayer funds for the promotion and performance of abortions. The Smith amendment would prevent the use of U.S. taxpayers' moneys, which now give large subsidies to organizations that provide or lobby for abortions at any time.

We must not allow our hard-earned money to go to these groups. By passing the Smith amendment today, we will in fact prevent hundreds of millions of U.S. taxpayer dollars from being used to fund the international abortion industry, for it is an industry.

Specifically, the amendment would, first, prohibited funding of the U.N. Population Fund if it continues to comply with China's coercive and abusive abortion program. It is not a family planning program, it is an abortion program.

Second, it would restore the Mexico City policy, which prohibits international family planning groups from receiving our taxpayer dollars if they in fact promote abortion as a so-called method of family planning.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to pass the Smith amendment today, so our hands and our dollars are not further tainted with the worldwide killing of the innocent unborn. We must put an end to infanticide. Abortion is not family planning, it is murder. I urge my colleagues to reject the bogus Pelosi amendment, which is being presented today as a pro-life vote.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey began his remarks by indicating that he found it disingenuous that those of us who have drafted this amendment would advertise it as an amendment designed to prevent abortion.

The gentleman's argument seems to rely on a myth. The gentleman's myth is that there are two kinds of Americans. There are Americans who are opposed to abortion and want fewer of them, and there are Americans who want more abortions, who favor abortions. That is the myth, that is the damning myth that makes this debate so difficult to overcome.

The fact of the matter is that there is one kind of American on this issue, and those are all of us Americans who want fewer abortions in this country and around the world.

This language is offered as a compromise. We acceded to the gentleman's view on China because we share his concern about coercive abortion in China. We have a difference of opinion, probably, about what the effect of the American presence might be on that coercive abortion, but we acceded to that. That is a huge compromise on our side.

Then we said this. When all the myths are put aside and we look at the real world, here is what happens in the real world. In a place like Kazakhstan, in a place like Romania, in a place like Russia, where family planning is not



available, women have repeated abortions. It is a horror. It is bad for their health. It is bad for their mental health. It is no way to prevent pregnancy. It is no way to plan the number of children in a family.

The language of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], unamended by that of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], says when you have that situation, fold up our American tents and go home; turn your head away, put it in the sand, do not be there, do not be part of the solution. Just let those abortions, let those Russian women, Romanian women, have abortion after abortion after abortion, the thing they decry with such passion.

What our amendment says is we are going to be there. We are going to be there for one reason and one reason alone. That reason is to convert these women into women who will use contraception as a method of family planning, and not abortion.

So there are two options on this vote. Members can vote against the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], and they turn away from the rest of the world and they say, have as many abortions as you want, because we will not be there to help you with family planning, and you will have no other choice.

Or Members vote with the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] and myself, the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER], the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL], and you say, we are going to be there to help those little agencies in those backward countries to enter the modern age, and empower women to plan the size of their families using contraception.

Mr. Chairman, if we vote down the Gilman amendment, here is what will happen. We throw the compromise away. This language will be unacceptable to the Senate, unacceptable to the administration. We will be back here voting this over and over and over again. It will be the last thing that keeps us here. It will keep us here in gridlock, and we will be voting it in February.

If Members accept this compromise, we will put this issue behind us. We will save women's lives, and we will move ahead.

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

First of all, if it does cause inconvenience, that is unfortunate, but saving a child's life from the cruelty of abortion, dismemberment, chemical poisoning is worth inconvenience. I know these votes are inconvenient, but that is just a simple fact of the matter.

Let me also point out that during the Reagan and Bush years we provided more than 40 percent of the population control family planning funds going around the world with the Mexico City Policy intact. What we had was contraception, birth control, separated from abortion, and that is all our amend-

ment does. It does not expand or contract the pool of funds available for population planning.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, so often when we write legislation in this body it is complex, and is made up of provisions that are so arcane our explanations when we go home are really convoluted. But in this case I can go home and say I am voting for Pelosi-Greenwood for exactly four words as a reason: Family planning saves lives. It frees women from the risk of disease and then death from pregnancies when their bodies just cannot take one more pregnancy. It frees children from the dire consequences of losing that parent in an undeveloped region. It absolutely frees struggling nations to devote more of their resources to improving the lot of their people. That is what this is all about.

Far from promoting abortion, this amendment explicitly continues current United States law which prohibits this use of our funds. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD] for being so eloquent in his explanation of where we are today, and what the Pelosi amendment does to the Smith amendment.

This whole debate disappoints me so profoundly. For years in this country the best of our people in our communities, Republicans and Democrats, all were for family planning. We put it now in the abyss of the litmus test on this very difficult debate.

I thank those who brought us to this point, and vote, please, for the Pelosi amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], the distinguished whip.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I really thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] for all his hard work in these areas. There is no greater champion for the unborn than the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. Chairman, as the world's last remaining superpower, the United States plays a very important role in international affairs. Everything it does is scrutinized and interpreted, and in many cases, our country is looked up to as a role model. Therefore, we have to take everything very seriously, and the decisions that we make we have to take seriously, especially those decisions about the kinds of policies we want to pursue in other countries.

In this particular case, the debate is about the kinds of family planning organizations we want to assist with funding. According to the State of World Population, 1997, compiled by the U.N. Population Fund, the United States is the largest donor to international family planning programs, contributing about 47 percent of all the external population control moneys worldwide.

□ 1530

So, therefore, it is even more important that we in the United States pursue international family planning principles that are consistent with the kinds of values we want to represent and promote.

Now, President Clinton has already made very clear the kinds of values he would like to promote abroad. In 1993, the Clinton administration abandoned long-standing pro-life policies because of his belief that legal abortion is, and I quote, "a fundamental right of all women and part of the overall approach to population control."

Mr. Chairman, I disagree with those values. I do not believe population should be controlled by abortion, and that is why I stand in strong support of the Smith amendment and strong opposition to the Pelosi amendment.

The Pelosi amendment, and we all know what it is, it is a killer amendment and we have to defeat it. It provides, in my opinion, a lesson in ambiguity, as its prohibition on funds going to organizations that promote abortion as a method of family planning is open to all kinds of interpretations, particularly from this pro-abortion White House.

The Smith amendment is very clear. No mistake about it. No United States funds will go to organizations that provide or lobby for abortions at any time for any reason. Now, that is not vague. There is no vague issue regarding the intention of an organization's participation in abortion or the reasons for providing it.

Other than in cases of protecting the life of the mother or forcible rape or incest, the intentions are irrelevant. Intentions are irrelevant. What is relevant is the position the United States is going to take as the largest provider of funds to the international population control programs.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the United States should stand for life. And as the Reagan-Bush years proved, there are hundreds of organizations that are willing to agree to the conditions that they neither perform nor actively promote abortion in order to receive America's taxpayers' dollars.

These organizations are perfectly capable of providing the family planning services called for by the proponents of the Pelosi amendment that are so valuable to the poor throughout the developing world, and these are the ones that we should be supporting.

So I just urge my colleagues to separate the issues and look very strongly at what the two amendments do. One is the Pelosi amendment, an amendment of ambiguity. And there is no mistaking what the Smith amendment does. So I urge my colleagues to support the Smith amendment and oppose the Pelosi amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], using my own time, if he would respond to a

question. I was concerned about the characterization of the Pelosi amendment and I had some ambiguity on my mind about the position of the gentleman from Texas on international family planning.

Mr. Chairman, I would inquire if the gentleman supports international family planning?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentlewoman that I support the international family planning that is included in this bill with the Smith amendment added to the bill.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, then one would wonder why the gentleman from Texas voted with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL] to remove all international family planning from the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate my remarks with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD] and respectfully disagree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], my colleague. I am shocked to find that there would be any ambiguity on any legislation considered by this House.

But, Mr. Chairman, I think this is an honorable compromise. We are going to have disagreements over abortion in this House and in future Congresses.

Let us talk about what this really is. This is about whether or not we are going to have an international family planning program sponsored by the United States. And it is about whether or not we, as the last remaining superpower, as the gentleman from Texas just said, we are willing to step up to the plate on this issue, willing to take the lead, as we should as that superpower, on the question of family planning.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD] was very appropriate in saying that we could stick our head in the sand and ignore these problems. I think that would be a mistake for this country and a mistake for the world.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleagues to cut through the ideological purity issues of this and look at pragmatism of the Gilman-Pelosi amendment and adopt it.

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, I come before the House today to urge my colleagues to vote for the Smith amendment and against the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

The pro-life safeguards of the Mexico City policy were in effect during the

Reagan-Bush years as a way to fully fund family planning without promoting abortion. And the Mexico City policy, which the Smith amendment would reinsert, is both pro-family and pro-life.

During those years the policy was in place, in excess of 350 family planning organizations, including Planned Parenthood affiliates in 57 States and countries, accepted those conditions.

If the bill is passed without the Smith amendment, the House will appropriate \$385 million for international population control without the pro-life safeguards. Opponents of Mexico City will argue that this policy is not necessary because we already have the Helms amendment in law. But, Mr. Chairman, the Helms amendment was found to be infirmed. Yes; it stopped direct funding, but there were loopholes and the pro-abortion groups used those loopholes very effectively.

Under current law, U.S. taxpayer dollars go to the international abortion industry which performs abortion on demand, which actively lobbies to overturn foreign country's laws on abortion. This is a fact and our law protects against this blatant misuse of American family tax dollars.

Mr. Chairman, this issue is about abortion. Abortion is violent. It is violence against women. It is violence against their unborn children. We need family planning without abortion. Abortion hurts women. It is humiliating. It is painful. It is demeaning. It is disruptive. It breaks the heart of a woman.

We need to do family planning without abortion. We can live without it. Let us stop our taxpayer dollars from funding this type of international violence. It is our moral obligation to reinstate Mexico City. Vote for the Smith amendment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] deputy whip as well as a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the bipartisan amendment. This debate is not about promoting abortion. Not one penny of U.S. funds can be used for abortion. This vote is a vote to prevent abortion, to improve the health of women and children, and above all, to save lives.

U.S. family planning aid saves the lives of women. UNICEF says that it reduces unintended pregnancies by one-fifth. It would reduce abortions and could save the lives of as many as 120,000 women who would die in childbirth. If the Smith amendment passes, family planning and health clinics across the world will close. Women will be denied Pap smears and will suffer from cancers which could easily have been treated if caught early. Sexually transmitted diseases will go undiagnosed and untreated. More mothers, infants, and children will die.

For 30 years, the United States has been an international leader in reduc-

ing the number of maternal and child deaths through its support for family planning. We need to renew this commitment. Vote to reduce abortions, vote to reduce maternal and child death. Vote to support Gilman-Pelosi.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Smith amendment. This amendment will prevent taxpayers' dollars from being spent on abortions overseas. I find it very disturbing that each year, the Federal Government sends millions of taxpayer dollars to family planning organizations in foreign countries that, in turn, use the money to pay for abortions. In essence, these are taxpayer-funded abortions.

Surveys have shown time and time again that whether they are pro-life or pro-choice, the vast majority of Americans do not, and I repeat, do not support federally funded abortions, whether in the United States or overseas.

As a Member of Congress, we are elected to represent and to serve the American people. It is wrong to go against the American people's will and to continue to spend their tax dollars on abortions in foreign countries.

That is why it is critical that we pass the Smith amendment. Without this amendment, American dollars will still be used to fund forced abortions in the People's Republic of China. This is not only a very important human rights issue, it is also a matter of protecting the lives of innocent children around the world.

I personally do not think that Americans should ever have to fund abortions with their tax dollars, especially in foreign countries. But now more than ever during this time of fiscal responsibility and budget tightening, the Federal Government has no business sending American dollars to destroy the lives of innocent children overseas. I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Smith amendment.

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

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Smith amendment. I find the restrictive Smith amendment to be superfluous. We all know that the 1973 Helms amendment which prohibits any U.S. funds for abortion in international planning is part of the permanent foreign aid statute.

Furthermore, there is no evidence that any recipient of U.S. funds, any recipient of U.S. funds, has ever violated the terms of the Helms amendment. This is unnecessary layering of restrictive law and can only work to harm women and children worldwide by denying them the various health services provided by international family planning organizations.

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. Seventy-five thousand of these deaths are associated with self-induced, unsafe abortion."

Do we want the blood of these women on our hands? If my colleagues vote for the Smith amendment, that is what they will get.

In addition, the Mexico City policy serves as a threat, a gag order, that results in failure to assist women in need. For example, if a woman is suffering from a life-threatening infection that is the consequence of a self-induced abortion, members of an international family planning organization might fear that treating such a woman could result in a loss of funds. Is this the result we want?

Family planning is a very critical and complex issue. It is prenatal care; it is child nutrition; it is followup with preventive care; and the education provided by international family planning is often what enables children to survive their first year and enables women to survive their pregnancy.

We must not impose this gag order. We must provide the world with family planning education that works to eliminate the need for abortion.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to please support the Gilman-Pelosi secondary amendment.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, the Smith amendment would work irreparable harm for women and children throughout the developing world. Gilman-Pelosi is a literal direct response to the concerns of antiabortion advocates. It is almost impossible to sustain a principled position against abortion, without supporting voluntary family planning as it appears in Gilman-Pelosi.

Mr. Chairman, we must have one standard for family planning throughout the world. I would want the same standard there as I would want for myself and my constituents. Family planning is one of the great success stories in economic development. It is not in agriculture; it is not in trade. It is family planning which has been the essential key to economic development itself in the developing world.

Denying family planning is like denying food to children, because that is exactly what happens when families in the developing world have more children than they can support. Gilman-Pelosi is the rational response that is consistent with the values of the American people who strongly support family planning.

□ 1545

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRADY].

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Smith amendment.

The principle involved here is a serious one, that of the sanctity of a human life. The policy we debate is one of accountability. Do we enforce the law of the American land or do we reward agencies who circumvent our laws?

We are giving agencies overseas who pretend to do family planning a choice, to accept our dollars to conduct true family planning or, as they seek to do, to seek dollars under the guise of family planning to conduct, encourage, and support the promotion of abortion.

To us, to the hard-working people in my district who work very hard for their taxes, who want accountability, we support the Smith amendment and believe it is the best, not just for this country but for every country as well.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I support family planning both at home and internationally because I think it is the best way to prevent abortions.

The last time the Smith amendment was before the House, I supported it because I thought that he was right and I was personally fed up with the way that the administration and the United Nations continued to finance and apologize for the coercive abortion policy in China. So I voted with the Smith amendment.

I, at that time, asked the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] in the future to please separate the issue of Mexico City from the issue of China because I thought that would at least guarantee some positive steps forward with respect to the Chinese issue. That has not been done in his amendment, but it has been done in the Pelosi amendment.

The Pelosi amendment in essence will say that unless the U.N. population program gets out of China, and there is no question that they practice coercive abortion policies in that country, that we will get our money, we will take our money out of the United Nations population program. That is what ought to happen.

I urge support for the Pelosi amendment.

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 for yielding me the time.

I rise in support of the Smith amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to vote in support of it and against the Pelosi option. The Mexico City policy was established by Ronald Reagan in 1984. It basically said that no family planning organizations that do abortions and promote abortions can get Federal funds. There were claims made at that time that all of these family planning organizations would have to close up shop and all these women

would be denied contraceptive services. In truth, all but two of them stayed in business. They made the commitment. They took the money and they stopped promoting abortion.

Now we have a substitute that has been put forward, the Pelosi language, that says that no money would go to an organization that promotes abortion as a method of family planning. The person who will certify whether or not that is the case is Bill Clinton, the man who rescinded the Mexico City policy in 1993, the first act he ever performed. He does not like Mexico City. But we are going to trust him now, the man who vetoed the partial-birth abortion bill. "Trust Bill" is what we are being told today.

Another thing that this language does is, they can be performing abortions and, yes, they can be using their U.S. dollars to buy fax machines and dollars from somewhere else to perform the abortions, but as long as they are not promoting it, they can still get all these U.S. dollars. I believe that if you are really pro-life and you are really committed to the principles that are in the Declaration of Independence, which is we are all endowed by the Creator with certain inalienable rights, including the right to life, then you need to support the Smith amendment.

This was Ronald Reagan's policy. The Members who are proposing this alternative are the people who never supported Ronald Reagan's policy.

I believe, if we are committed to the principles that this Nation was founded on, we will support the Smith language. I encourage all of my colleagues to vote with SMITH.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, as you will recall, we debated this issue of the Mexico City policy back in February when we talked about whether the family planning funds should be released. We debated it again in June when we talked about the State Department authorization. And we will continue to be debating it next year and every year thereafter until we come up with a constructive solution. This is a constructive compromise.

This addresses what the opponents have said that they objected to. This says that we will not fund family planning programs where abortion is used as a method of birth control. This says that we will not. So why not agree, shake hands? We have resolved a very difficult issue and now we can work constructively in other countries where women and children and men are forced to live lives of abject poverty, because that is what we condemn them to if we do not make family planning information available to women so that they can control the size of their families.

We have a responsibility, we who live in a country so prosperous and so free, to do something for those people who

do not. Please support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would inform the Members that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has 7½ minutes remaining, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] has 6 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD] has 4½ minutes remaining.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California, [Ms. WOOLSEY].

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, each year in the developing world 600,000 women die from pregnancy-related complications. Maternal mortality is the largest single cause of death among women during their reproductive years. That is why support for family planning services is becoming more important every year.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is 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.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Pelosi-Gilman substitute.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], my good friend.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. I have come to this floor on a number of issues, particularly as they relate to the budget. I think of what we have tried so hard to do, of getting our country's financial house in order and balancing the Federal budget and saving our trust funds for not just future generations but for present generations, and moving from a caretaking society to a caring society. I think of how important those things are.

Yet they pale in comparison to the fact that many of the people around the world live in abject poverty. We have a population in this world of about 5.2 billion and it is climbing. I think of some societies, whose economies grow, but their population growth outstrips their economic growth and they become poorer and poorer and poorer.

For the life of me, I do not know why this great country, the United States of America, would not want to help those countries become more prosperous, and I would like to understand why we would not want them to help control their population growth. This amendment does this.

I just urge, with all that I could urge my colleagues to recognize that this is

not the United States of America. I lived as a Peace Corps volunteer overseas. I have seen how people live. They want to live a better life. They want their children to have better lives. But they have got to have a way of knowing how to control their populations and to be able to grow in a logical way.

I urge my colleagues to recognize, this is not about abortion. This is about whether we are going to allow for logical family planning so we do not need abortions and we do not have so many people living in abject poverty.

I urge Members to support the Pelosi and Greenwood amendment. I urge them to allow and help other countries have logical family planning.

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

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

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Smith amendment and in opposition to the substitute.

The Supreme Court has opined in *Roe* versus *Wade* and its erroneous progeny that we have to allow the killing of preborn children. Clearly this was a misread of the Constitution by the Court.

In any event, the Court has not opined that our Government has an obligation to provide this service here in America or in any other land. We should not take to this course by our own will.

The sanctity of life transcends international boundaries. It is time to say no to a careless export, the notion that abortion is acceptable as a means of family planning.

I would prefer to block all international family planning funding. It is fiscally irresponsible to do otherwise. But if we are to fund this type of program, and the Smith amendment does not end international family planning, we must do all we can to see that we do not fund those which promote abortion.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Smith amendment and in support of the bipartisan amendment.

I would like very much to be associated with the comments of my colleague on the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] that pointed out the compromises in this amendment, particularly with the China language.

Federal funds cannot be used to perform abortions overseas. That is the law. But it appears that some of my colleagues are so jittery over a woman's right to choose that they confuse it with a person's right to medical education and a family's right to plan their lives.

The U.N. Fund for population activities is not an organization which encourages abortion. What it does encourage is the prevention of unwanted pregnancies in 140 different countries. Not only does the U.N. fund work to prevent abortions, it provides programs which promote better nutrition, health and longer life expectancy. Vote for the bipartisan Pelosi-Gilman amendment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let me say that I rise in opposition to the Smith amendment, clearly, to say that this is not a vote on abortion and we should recognize that. This is about saving lives, because family planning funds are used to provide effective means of birth control, health care for pregnant mothers and newborns, and education on family planning options.

Let us look at the role and responsibility of this country, sharing its expertise with those nations who need our help in family planning. I support the Gilman-Pelosi amendment, a viable approach to making sure that we save lives, that we do not support abortion in this instance, but we support saving lives through fair and adequate family planning.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Smith amendment to H.R. 2159, the foreign Operations appropriations bill. My colleagues, it is disheartening to see this legislation once again before us on the floor of the House and I urge you to join me in opposing this amendment.

Despite attempts of this amendment's proponents to characterize it as such, this vote is not about abortion. Proponents of the Smith amendment wrongly claim that release of family planning funds without restrictions will allow U.S. aid to support abortion services abroad. These funds, however, can not by law be used to provide or promote abortions. They argue that funding is fungible, but the Agency for International Development has a rigorous process to ensure that the current ban on the use of U.S. funds for abortions is adhered to and that no U.S. funds are spent on abortion services.

Funds to support family planning are not funds for abortions. Family planning funds are used to provide contraceptives to persons who would otherwise not have access to them. Family planning funds support education and outreach on family planning options, family counseling, health care, and technical training for personnel.

These funds help to improve the health and increase the survival rate of women and children during pregnancy, in childbirth, and in the years after. Family planning allows parents to control the number of children that they have and the timing of those births. And in so doing it allows women the opportunity to reach beyond the walls of their homes, to get an education and to work outside of the family. A recent report of the Rockefeller Foundation argued that devoting less time to bearing children, reducing family size, and improving the

health and survival of women and children results in better economic prospects in developing countries.

Withholding these funds will reduce access to contraception and in so doing increase unintended and unwanted pregnancies. Experience demonstrates that as unintended pregnancies increase, so does the abortion rate. In fact, United States funding to Hungary has coincided with a 60-percent reduction in abortions in that country. In Russia, increased use of contraceptives has led to a 30-percent reduction in abortions.

My colleagues, this is not a vote on abortion. This is a vote to provide more options and opportunities for the people of developing nations around the world.

For these reasons, I call upon each Member to signal their support for the health and welfare of women, children and families and vote against the Smith amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer my support for my colleague's amendment. I do not believe America should offer financial assistance to any foreign organization that supports abortion. Under today's policies, several agencies that are supported by U.S. funds can do just that.

Groups like the U.N. Population Fund and Family Planning International Assistance freely take U.S. monetary support and use those funds to perform and promote brutal abortion policies. Some of them, like the U.N. Population Fund, help fund China's coercive population control policies which result in thousands of abortions and forced sterilizations.

These organizations are also attempting to change abortion laws in many different countries. They are actively lobbying for abortion with the assistance of U.S. tax dollars.

This amendment will prevent these atrocities. It guarantees that no U.S. funds will be used in any way to promote abortion or sterilization by any group.

If these agencies want to promote abortion as a form of birth control, let them do it without the support of American funds. I encourage all my colleagues to support this amendment and prevent U.S. funds from being used to support coercive family planning.

□ 1600

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, we in Congress have a responsibility to look at not just the intent of our actions but the consequences. In my opinion, the reality is that to restrict funding for family planning is to increase abortions, thousands of abortions. In addition, I think the impact of the Smith language, intended or not, will be to stop tens of thousands of women from getting the kind of prenatal care that I am grateful that my wife was just able

to have in having a healthy, happy baby.

Let us be clear. The law does not allow any U.S. dollars to be used to fund abortions abroad. If we used the stretch logic of some of the supporters of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], we would also cut off all military aid to our allies, because the defense money we send to those allies which helps them and us could then be channeled to funding abortions in those countries. Let us support the right of families in other countries to do what we cherish for our families here in America, to plan for our families' futures. Support Gilman-Pelosi. Oppose the Smith amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BARCIA], one of the sponsors of the amendment.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I offer my gratitude for the tremendous job that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is doing on the debate on this very important amendment which he has offered.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to clarify the exact ramifications of our amendment and the alternative amendment offered by my esteemed colleagues the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD], the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL], the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY], and the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Quite simply, our amendment will ensure that U.S. tax dollars are not allocated to foreign nongovernmental organizations for international family planning programs unless they agree to, No. 1, not violate the laws of other countries with respect to abortion, No. 2, not wage campaigns to alter a country's laws on abortion except to oppose coercive abortion practices and, thirdly and finally, not perform abortions except to save the mother's life or in cases of rape or incest.

Our amendment is necessary to close a loophole that allows U.S. tax dollars to subsidize organizations which work to increase the availability of abortions around the world. The Gilman - Pelosi - Campbell - Lowey - Greenwood substitute will certainly result in a deadly version of the pea in the shell game when we try to identify those responsible for these abortions. It may not be our dollars, but our dollars freed up those that did not pay for the abortion.

I urge my colleagues to support the Smith-Barcia-Hyde-Oberstar amendment and oppose the alternative. The lives of the unborn are too important to leave to the whimsical nature of a loophole.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, we have heard the rhetoric once again. Members of Congress sitting here, standing here in the Capitol of the United States talking about this issue. On the other side of this amendment, mostly men, but this is not the real world. What really happens in the real world, whether it is in Kazakhstan, whether it is in Bolivia, anywhere around the world, a real woman, somebody's mother, somebody's sister, somebody's daughter, somebody's wife is pregnant and she has five children or six children, she may have lost one or two to hunger or disease already and she is pregnant again because she has no access to family planning and she is terrified and she is determined to get an abortion. She sees that as her only option, rather than starve the children that remain at home. She is going to get that abortion. She is going to get it in some dingy little concrete, damp, dank clinic somewhere out in the middle of nowhere if she is lucky, or she is going to get it in a back alley of some faraway place, terrified, unhygienic, threatening to her health.

That is the world. That is happening as we speak all over the planet every day. There are two things we can do about that. We can turn away. That is what the Smith language does. "Go away. Don't be there. Let that happen. As long as we're not part of it, nothing we can do about it. It's not our problem. It's not our mother. It's not our sister. It's not our daughter."

Or we can be there. We can be there with a few scant American dollars to turn on a light bulb in that clinic, to set up a desk, to put some pamphlets on the table, to have a human being with care to say to that woman, "You do not want to come back here again under these circumstances. We want to give you the birth control pill. We want to teach you how to use a condom. We want to empower you not to have to put yourself or be put in this position again." That is what the Gilman amendment does. Please support the compromise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAPPAS].

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

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Smith amendment.

I have only been here in Congress for 8 months yet this is my third debate on this floor on the issue of whether we ensure that American tax dollars are not used to change the pro-life laws of other countries, whether we truly guarantee that our tax dollars will not be used to pay for abortions, or whether we will allow our tax money to go to organizations that violate the laws of the country to which the aid is sent. Maybe the third time is a charm. The vast majority of Americans agree

with the goals and purpose of this amendment and I urge its passage today.

This amendment is a commonsense effort to make sure that America's foreign aid policy is both morally and fiscally responsible and I gladly support both aspects of the Smith amendment.

My time is short so let me get to the point on the U.N. fund. My parents were able to decide to have more than one child. Because of this freedom, my older sister, Olga, has a younger sibling—a brother—me. However, parents in China do not have this basic right. Until, the UNFPA condemns this brutal coerced abortion policy in China or any other country, no United States tax dollars should go to this misguided program. The bipartisan Smith-Barcia-Hyde-Oberstar amendment is the only way to clearly define what U.S. tax money can be used for in this program.

I would like to concentrate on another aspect of this amendment, specifically the "Mexico City" language.

This language is clearly the safeguard that the taxpaying public wants to see on the large expenditure in population control activities that this country pays for. We are talking about \$385 million of U.S. tax money. The Smith amendment specifically addresses the ever increasing scourge of U.S. tax dollars being used to change the laws in other countries. Just as this Congress and Nation are seriously concerned about possible efforts by foreign nations to influence our elections and laws, we must not be hypocritical and allow U.S. tax dollar recipients to do the same things to laws in other countries. Clean up this practice and vote for the Smith amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise this Congress' attention to one of the greatest ironies of this entire overseas abortion debate. Many of my colleagues who will stand here on this floor and oppose this amendment to restore the pro-family, pro-cultural, pro-child, and successful Mexico City policy are many of the same members who regularly lambaste this body for not moving on campaign finance reform.

Well, if you truly believe in campaign finance reform, this is your vehicle. This is a campaign finance reform vote. This is international campaign finance reform. Vote for the Smith amendment and you will walk the walk of campaign finance reform. Otherwise you are saying that it is OK for U.S. foreign aid money, our hard-earned tax dollars, to be used as soft money to lobby and change laws throughout the world. Planned Parenthood and their kind do not like the pro-life laws in many countries around the world. They will not rest until they bring down these safeguards for the most vulnerable. 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, especially lobbyists for the abortion industry. So are the American people. The Smith-Barcia-Hyde-Oberstar amendment will prevent this and I urge my colleagues to clean up this travesty and to support the Smith amendment.

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

Let me just speak for a moment to my friends who may feel they can somehow rationalize voting "yes" on

Gilman-Pelosi and "yes" on the underlying pro-life amendment. Please do not. It is not honest law making. If you are against pouring hundreds of millions of dollars into the abortion industry overseas, the only honest vote is "no" on Gilman-Pelosi and "yes" on Smith-Barcia-Hyde-Oberstar.

Today, Mr. Chairman, 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. Our amendment permits the flow of funds only to those organizations that provide only family planning and not abortion. The innocent children are not put at risk. Who we subsidize, not just what, but who we subsidize does matter and who we give millions of dollars to does matter.

Mr. Chairman, the simple fact of the matter is the long-standing law that no U.S. funds can be directly used for abortion was found to be incomplete. It was like Swiss cheese. The organizations were doing abortions on demand and yet seemingly adhering to the letter of the law with regards to the Helms amendment. That is why we have the Mexico City policy. We do not want to put these unborn children at risk.

Let me be very clear on this. The effect of the Gilman-Pelosi amendment is that even if a foreign nongovernmental organization performs abortion on demand, even if they perform abortions on demand at any stage of the unborn child's development, even if they perform abortions on demand on teenagers without parental knowledge or consent, they still could get huge Federal grants so long as they say they are not promoting abortion as a method of family planning, whatever that is.

To add insult to injury, the phrase "promote" is not defined. I asked some questions earlier, define it very clearly like our amendment does, and the answers were not very enlightening. To adopt Gilman-Pelosi is to sacrifice clarity for vagueness, and the consequence will be that the administration will have breathtaking latitude to find that even the most aggressive abortionists in the world are eligible for funding.

The Smith-Barcia language is straightforward. It is absolutely transparent. It establishes a wall of separation between abortion and birth control. By contrast, the Gilman-Pelosi language intentionally blurs the line of demarcation between abortion and contraception and keeps the abortionists overseas on the Federal dole.

Let me make this very clear, Mr. Chairman. The pro-life vote is no on Gilman-Pelosi. This is no compromise. The Gilman-Pelosi amendment is clearly a killer amendment. I urge a "no" vote on it.

Let me just remind Members, the 7 sponsors of this amendment, with all due respect, are like a who's who of the

abortion rights in this Congress. They all voted against the partial-birth abortion. To suggest that somehow this is a pro-life compromise simply does not have any currency to it. Please vote "no" on the first amendment, "yes" on the second.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank our colleagues for this very, very informed and serious debate this afternoon. I think those of us who worked hard and long, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD] in the leadership of this issue, to put together an appropriate response to the concerns that have been expressed by my colleague in the House, found expression in the supporters of the Gilman-Pelosi-Greenwood-Campbell, the list goes on and on, amendment to the Smith amendment.

I say I am proud of those who spoke on our behalf because they spoke with conviction and consistency. Our colleague in his closing remarks talked about some other issues that have been voted on by those of us who are sponsoring this amendment and since he brought up the subject of votes, I want to bring up the subject of votes as well.

Of the 15 people who spoke in support of the Smith amendment, in opposition to the Gilman-Pelosi-Greenwood amendment, 13 of them voted against international family planning, votes just moments ago, moments before this debate began, for the Paul amendment to eliminate the family planning, international family planning money from this bill. One, the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN] voted against the Paul amendment. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the maker of this amendment, was silent on the Paul amendment. He did not vote on that issue. So we do not know where he would stand on that particular amendment.

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

Ms. PELOSI. I will yield if the gentleman would like to say where he would have voted on the Paul amendment, how he voted on the Paul amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I would like to make it very clear that without, and this is why Members voted for the Paul amendment, without pro-life safeguards we are giving money to the abortion industry overseas. That is why Members voted that way.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I take back my time. Clearly the gentleman does not want to state where he would have been on the motion to cut all family planning funds from this legislation. It should be clear to our colleagues what the intention is of the Smith amendment and of those who spoke in the well to support it. Indeed, the leadership of the Republican Party in this House, the gentleman from

Texas [Mr. ARMEY] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], who spoke on the issue, they all voted for the Paul amendment to cut the family planning funds from here.

So to my colleagues who have a discomfort level with this, I hope they take some comfort in the fact that we came together in a bipartisan fashion, we listened over the years to your concerns and addressed them. Some of my colleagues even today, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES], mentioned the force abortion program in China. That is not in the bill any longer. That is not in the bill any longer. And we have widened the separation wall between family planning and abortion.

This is an issue about family planning. Those who oppose our amendment oppose international family planning. If you support international family planning, support the alternative amendment to the Smith amendment.

Mr. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Smith amendment. This amendment is nothing more than a global gag rule, denying U.S. funding to overseas family planning agencies.

Agencies which provide women's reproductive health services, improve children's health and reduce the number of abortions around the world.

This amendment will result in the closure of family planning clinics in some of the poorest countries in the world and will surely increase the number of abortions, worldwide.

The Pelosi/Gilman amendment is a fair compromise; it denies funds to any organization which promotes abortion as a method of family planning; and diverts any UNFPA funding that would have gone to operations in China to USAID family planning programs.

People of faith carry the responsibility of stewardship, particularly in the area of human reproduction. Striving to ensure that each child is a blessing for its family and for the world.

The gentleman from New Jersey is clearly a man of conviction. As colleagues on the International Relations Committee he and I have been able to work out compromises in the past. And I hope that we can continue to do so on this important issue.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Gilman-Pelosi-Campbell-Lowey-Greenwood-DeLauro-Slaughter substitute to the Smith amendment to H.R. 2159, the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill. This bipartisan substitute amendment is important to protecting the lives and health of women and children around the globe.

Opponents of this amendment have attempted to paint this vote as one about abortion. That is simply inaccurate. This is not a vote about abortion, but about women having the ability to plan their own families. It is a vote about preventing unintended pregnancies. It is a vote about improving the quality of life for people around the world, fighting overpopulation, and preventing hunger.

The Gilman-Pelosi-Campbell-Lowey-Greenwood-DeLauro-Slaughter amendment will preserve current law prohibitions on the use of U.S. funds for abortion. It will continue the ban on the use of U.S. funds to lobby for or against abortion funds. This amendment will

disqualify from U.S. family planning assistance any foreign nongovernmental and multilateral organizations that with their own funds "promote abortion as a method of family planning." The amendment will, in fact, prohibit U.S. family planning assistance from going to these organizations unless they use U.S. funds to "prevent abortion as a method of family planning."

Despite the claims of its authors, the Smith amendment will not reduce abortion funding in the foreign operations bill by a penny because there is currently absolutely no abortion funding. The only effect of the Smith amendment will be to defund organizations providing voluntary, preventative family planning services which are the most effective way to reduce abortions.

Around the world, a staggering 585,000 women die each year from pregnancy-related causes, including 70,000 from unsafe abortions. The best way to save lives and reduce the number of abortions is to reduce the number of unwanted pregnancies. The most effective way to do this is through voluntary family planning. Voluntary family planning safeguards the lives and health of mothers and enhances the prospects of their young children.

Abortion is not and should not be a substitute for contraception. Family planning is the primary means of reducing unintended pregnancies and unwanted births. The Gilman-Pelosi amendment addresses and supports this priority and ensures that organizations which promote abortion as a family planning method will be ineligible for funding.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for the Gilman-Pelosi-Campbell-Lowey-Greenwood-DeLauro-Slaughter amendment and in so doing vote for family planning and the lives of women and their families. Thank you.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Gilman-Pelosi amendment, which will ensure America's continued support for international family planning programs. Global family planning is essential for protecting the health of women, ensuring the health of children, and reducing the demand for abortions. We must not sacrifice the well-being of families around the world on the altar of abortion politics.

Each year, approximately 4 million women will have an unwanted or dangerous pregnancy, resulting in nearly 2 million more abortions or miscarriages. These women do not have access to modern contraception, medical advice or prenatal care.

In the absence of family planning, over half a million women die each year from pregnancy-related causes, including 70,000 from unsafe abortions. Funding restrictions will only add to these numbers.

U.S. support for international family planning has helped families space the birth of their children and has increased the odds that there will be enough food and other essentials to be shared among all family members. We've enabled women to bear children when they are physically strong and can breast-feed normally—increasing child survival by as much as 20 percent.

The Gilman-Pelosi amendment will continue our support for family planning programs while preserving current prohibitions on the use of U.S. funds for abortion. It continues the ban on the use of U.S. funds to lobby for or against abortion rights. It prohibits any organization that promotes abortion as a method of

family planning with their own funds from receiving U.S. family planning assistance. And it ensures that organizations that provide voluntary, preventative family planning services will receive the necessary funds to continue their work to reduce the number of abortions and the number of pregnancy-related deaths.

Mr. Chairman, anyone who is serious about promoting the health of women and children must support family planning. And anyone who truly wants to reduce abortions must support these programs as well. I urge my colleagues to support the Gilman-Pelosi amendment.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I strongly support international family planning because it will improve women's health, reduce poverty, and protect our global environment. Our family planning programs save lives, and they should be continued without unnecessary restrictions.

The only reason why we are even considering the Smith amendment again this year, even though it is already included in the State Department authorization bill, is because the proponents of this amendment are scared their unpopular provision may never be enacted. Apparently, they are confident that, despite support in the House, their view is in fact an extreme position which is not supported by the Senate, by the President, or by the American people.

Why? Because the American people understand that family planning is necessary, successful, and addresses a critical need. According to the World Health Organization, nearly 600,000 women die each year of causes related to pregnancy and childbirth. When couples cannot control the number and timing of births, maternal and infant mortality increases. It is estimated that one in five infant deaths could be averted by birth spacing alone. Our family planning efforts directly address these problems, and as David Broder commented in the Washington Post "the success of the program is undeniable." For example, studies show that our efforts, as part of an international strategy, have prevented more than 500 million unintended pregnancies. I am shocked that proponents of the Smith amendment claim that our family planning program actually increase the number of abortions, when, in fact, the exact opposite is true.

The Smith amendment would severely limit our efforts and lead to a dramatic increase in the number of abortions worldwide. When the so-called Mexico City restrictions were in place during the Reagan and Bush administrations, U.S. funding for the International Planned Parenthood Federation was suspended. This organization currently supports family planning in over 150 countries and helps serve at least 10 million couples annually in developing countries. The Smith amendment may prevent the U.S. Government from funding this organization and helping so many people. That would be a terrible mistake.

This amendment is pernicious, unnecessary, and harmful. If enacted, it would severely limit family planning efforts and simply result in more unwanted pregnancies, more fatalities among women, and more abortions. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Smith amendment.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Smith amendment reinstating restrictions on American assistance to international family planning.



The Smith amendment, if adopted, would have three effects: First, it would deny U.S. funds to overseas family planning agencies that perform legal abortions with their own funds; second, it would deny funding to the United Nations Population Fund [UNFPA] which is active in more than 140 countries should it spend any funds in China, and third, it would kill all chances for this legislation to be signed into law.

We all deplore policies of forced abortion or coercive population control. There is no doubt that where these policies exist, such as in China, we should make every effort to reverse them.

Mr. SMITH and his cosponsor should support the Gilman-Pelosi amendment which has been carefully crafted to achieve a middle ground in this long-running congressional debate.

This amendment prohibits the use of U.S. funds to lobby for or against abortion.

It prohibits the use of American aid to perform abortions in any foreign country unless the life of the mother is endangered if the fetus were carried to term or in cases of rape or incest.

It prohibits American aid from being distributed to UNFPA if it operates population planning programs in China.

Many would argue that the Gilman-Pelosi alternative concedes too much ground in its effort to find a compromise. With a world population approaching 6 billion people of which 1.2 billion reside in China, many would argue that the best way to convince Chinese authorities to change their policies of coercive abortion and forced family planning is to support legitimate family planning programs by international agencies and nongovernment organizations in China. However, Mr. GILMAN and Ms. PELOSI offer their compromise in a sincere, bi-partisan effort to reach the political middle ground in order to move forward with this important legislation.

I support the Gilman-Pelosi alternative and urge my colleagues to do so.

H.R. 2150

OFFERED BY: MR. GILMAN

AMENDMENT No. 9: Strike all after the title heading 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 appropriated or otherwise made available 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) LIMITATION ON LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available 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 Population 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 in 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.

ZERO POPULATION GROWTH,  
Washington, DC, August 21, 1997.

Hon. HOWARD BERMAN,  
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BERMAN: On behalf of the nearly 60,000 members of ZPG across the country, I am writing to ask you to support the Gilman-Pelosi amendment when the House resumes consideration of the Foreign Operations appropriation bill.

The Gilman-Pelosi amendment will come up when Rep. Chris Smith once again offers his amendment to impose a "global gag rule" on international family planning providers. As you know, the Smith amendment would deny U.S. funding to overseas family planning agencies that either perform legal abortions (with non-U.S. funds) or which publicly support any changes in the abortion laws or regulations in foreign countries. This far-reaching amendment would have the result of closing family planning clinics in some of the poorest countries in the world, thereby dramatically increasing the number of abortions. The Smith amendment would also deny funding to the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), which runs effective family planning programs in more than 140 countries, if they spend so much as one penny in China. While no one denies that the Chinese population program is often brutal, and always coercive, there is not one sliver of evidence that UNFPA has ever been involved with any involuntary practices.

The Gilman-Pelosi amendment is a new effort at compromise that offers real hope for solving this seemingly unending debate. It responds directly to the claim that the U.S. subsidizes the promotion of abortion by de-

nying funds to any organization that promotes abortion as a method of family planning. Rep. Smith and his allies will oppose this amendment because he knows that it will be impossible to find any organization that receives U.S. family planning aid that does truly promote abortion. The Gilman-Pelosi amendment also concedes the UNFPA argument, but says that if UNFPA does operate in China the money appropriated for that agency would instead be given to U.S. Agency for International Development for family planning programs.

While we believe the Gilman-Pelosi amendment is unnecessary, and that strong enough protections already exist to keep U.S. funds from being used to perform abortion, we believe this represents the best opportunity to move beyond this divisive debate and get on with the business of providing important family planning services to women around the world.

I hope you will vote yes for the Gilman-Pelosi amendment.

Sincerely,

PETER H. KOSTMAYER,  
Executive Director.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose the Smith, Barcia, Hyde, and Oberstar amendment. This amendment would reinstate the Mexico City restrictions and prohibit U.S. funding to any private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organization that directly or indirectly performs abortions in a foreign country. But the 1973 Helms amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act already prohibits U.S. funds from being used to pay for abortions. This amendment would prevent U.S. assistance to agencies that—with their own funds, to U.S. funds—provide abortion counseling or services. The effect of this amendment would be to deny reproductive choice to women in other countries, not matter what their own beliefs, laws, and cultures have to say about this intensely personal and important issue.

The amendment would also prohibit all United States funding for the U.N. Fund for Population Activities [UNFPA] unless it ceases activities in China. But UNFPA has no China program right now, and the authorization bill language already reduces United States contributions to UNFPA, dollar-for-dollar, for any amount UNFPA spends in the future on a China program—meaning that the United States will not be supporting the reprehensively forced-abortion policy.

The Smith amendment cuts family planning—but it won't reduce abortions. Cutting family planning assistance will mean millions more unintended pregnancies—and more, not fewer abortions. Just the reverse happened after contraceptives and family planning were introduced in Russia after the fall of the Soviet Union—Russia's reliance on abortion was reduced by one-third. The United Nations estimates that 40 percent of pregnancies worldwide are unintended, and of these, 60 percent end in abortion. Family planning can dramatically reduce these tragic statistics.

International family planning efforts also help protect the health of women and children by reducing the number of high-risk births from pregnancies spaced too closely together. Everyday more than 31,000 children under the age of 5 die in developing countries from low birthweight and other complications of high-risk pregnancies. The U.S. Agency for International Development [AID] estimates that, by spacing births at least 2 years apart, family planning can prevent an average of one in four infant deaths; and family planning can

prevent 25 percent of all maternal deaths by allowing women to delay motherhood and avoid unintended pregnancies.

Family planning programs can have a dramatic influence on our ability to do something about uncontrolled population growth in many parts of the world. According to AID, more than 50 million couples in the developing world use family planning as direct result of U.S. population program. In the 28 countries with the largest AID-sponsored family planning programs, the average of children per family has declined by one-third, from six to four.

Assistance to other nations that seek voluntarily to limit their population is in our profound national interest. There is no greater threat to our national security than an exploding world population. The world's population now stands at 5.8 billion, and adds another 80 million people every year—the equivalent of adding another New York City every month. If we don't constrain population growth, our work to improve living standards, control pollution, and battle disease is hopeless. More than 95 percent of population growth is occurring in developing countries, where burgeoning population growth contributes to deforestation, water scarcity, global warming, wildlife extinction and other environmental problems that effect us all.

American leadership is crucial to making family planning assistance available to couples in the developing world. Partly because of our leadership, a growing number of countries now provide family planning services of their own. If we retreat, accelerated population growth will pose a direct threat to our national interest.

Support family planning. Oppose the Smith amendment.

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

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

#### RECORDED VOTE

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 2(c) of rule XXIII, the Chair announces he may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the period of time within which a recorded vote, if ordered, may be taken on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 210, noes 218, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 362]

#### AYES—210

Abercrombie	Boehlert	Condit
Ackerman	Bonior	Conyers
Allen	Boswell	Coyne
Andrews	Boyd	Cramer
Baesler	Brown (CA)	Cummings
Baldacci	Brown (FL)	Danner
Barrett (WI)	Brown (OH)	Davis (FL)
Bass	Campbell	Davis (IL)
Becerra	Capps	Davis (VA)
Bentsen	Cardin	DeFazio
Berman	Carson	DeGette
Berry	Castle	Delahunt
Bilbray	Clay	DeLauro
Bishop	Clayton	Dellums
Blagojevich	Clement	Deutsch
Blumenauer	Clyburn	Dicks

Dingell	Kennedy (MA)	Ramstad
Dixon	Kennedy (RI)	Rangel
Doggett	Kennelly	Regula
Dooley	Kilpatrick	Reyes
Dunn	Kind (WI)	Rivers
Edwards	Klecza	Rodriguez
Ehrlich	Klug	Rothman
Engel	Kolbe	Roukema
Eshoo	Lampson	Roybal-Allard
Fazio	Lantos	Rush
Evans	Lazio	Sabo
Farr	Leach	Sanchez
Fattah	Levin	Sanders
Fawell	Lewis (CA)	Sandlin
Fazio	Lewis (GA)	Sawyer
Filner	Lofgren	Schumer
Flake	Lowey	Scott
Foglietta	Luther	Serrano
Foley	Maloney (CT)	Shaw
Ford	Maloney (NY)	Shays
Fowler	Markey	Sherman
Frank (MA)	Matinez	Sisisky
Franks (NJ)	Matsui	Skaggs
Frelinghuysen	McCarthy (MO)	Skeen
Frost	McCarthy (NY)	Slaughter
Furse	McDermott	Smith, Adam
Gedjenson	McGovern	Snyder
Gephardt	McHale	Spratt
Gibbons	McKinney	Stabenow
Gilchrest	McNulty	Stark
Gilman	Meehan	Stokes
Gordon	Meek	Strickland
Green	Menendez	Tanner
Greenwood	Millender-	Tauscher
Gutierrez	McDonald	Thomas
Hamilton	Miller (CA)	Thompson
Harman	Minge	Thurman
Hastings (FL)	Mink	Tierney
Hefner	Moakley	Torres
Hilliard	Moran (VA)	Towns
Hinchey	Morella	Turner
Hinojosa	Nadler	Upton
Hobson	Neal	Velazquez
Hooley	Obey	Vento
Horn	Olver	Visclosky
Houghton	Owens	Waters
Hoyer	Pallone	Watt (NC)
Jackson (IL)	Pascrell	Waxman
Jackson-Lee	Pastor	Wexler
(TX)	Payne	White
Jefferson	Pelosi	Wise
Johnson (CT)	Pickett	Woolsey
Johnson (WI)	Pomeroy	Wynn
Johnson, E. B.	Porter	Yates
Kelly	Price (NC)	

#### NOES—218

Aderholt	Cox	Hoekstra
Archer	Crane	Holden
Armey	Crapo	Hostettler
Bachus	Cubin	Hulshof
Baker	Cunningham	Hunter
Ballenger	Deal	Hutchinson
Barcia	DeLay	Hyde
Barr	Diaz-Balart	Inglis
Barrett (NE)	Dickey	Istook
Bartlett	Doolittle	Jenkins
Barton	Doyle	John
Bateman	Dreier	Johnson, Sam
Bereuter	Duncan	Jones
Bilirakis	Ehlers	Kanjorski
Bliley	Emerson	Kaptur
Boehner	English	Kasich
Bonilla	Ensign	Kildee
Bono	Everett	Kim
Ewing	King (NY)	King (NY)
Borski	Forbes	Kingston
Brady	Fox	Klink
Bryant	Gallegly	Knollenberg
Bunning	Ganske	Kucinich
Burr	Gekas	LaFalce
Burton	Gillmor	LaHood
Buyer	Goode	Largent
Callahan	Goodlatte	Latham
Calvert	Goodling	LaTourette
Camp	Goss	Lewis (KY)
Canady	Graham	Linder
Cannon	Granger	Lipinski
Chabot	Gutknecht	Livingston
Chambliss	Hall (OH)	LoBiondo
Chenoweth	Hall (TX)	Lucas
Christensen	Hansen	Manton
Coble	Hastert	Manzullo
Coburn	Hastings (WA)	Mascara
Collins	Hayworth	McCollum
Combust	Hefley	McCrery
Cook	Herger	McDade
Cooksey	Hill	McHugh
Costello	Hilleary	McInnis

McIntosh	Poshard	Snowbarger
McIntyre	Quinn	Solomon
McKeon	Radanovich	Souder
Metcalf	Rahall	Spence
Mica	Redmond	Stearns
Miller (FL)	Riggs	Stenholm
Mollohan	Riley	Stump
Moran (KS)	Roemer	Stupak
Murtha	Rogan	Sununu
Myrick	Rogers	Talent
Nethercutt	Rohrabacher	Tauzin
Ney	Ros-Lehtinen	Taylor (MS)
Northup	Royce	Taylor (NC)
Norwood	Ryun	Thornberry
Nussle	Salmon	Thune
Oberstar	Sanford	Tiahrt
Ortiz	Saxton	Trafficant
Oxley	Scarborough	Walsh
Packard	Schaefer, Dan	Wamp
Pappas	Schaffer, Bob	Watkins
Parker	Sensenbrenner	Watts (OK)
Paul	Sessions	Weldon (FL)
Paxon	Shadegg	Weldon (PA)
Pease	Shimkus	Weller
Peterson (MN)	Shuster	Weygand
Peterson (PA)	Skelton	Whitfield
Petri	Smith (MI)	Wicker
Pickering	Smith (NJ)	Wolf
Pitts	Smith (OR)	Young (AK)
Pombo	Smith (TX)	Young (FL)
Portman	Smith, Linda	

#### NOT VOTING—5

Boucher	Neumann	Schiff
Gonzalez	Pryce (OH)	

□ 1632

Messrs. SENSENBRENNER, METCALF, WELLER, and SESSIONS changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. BENTSEN and Mr. SHAW changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

#### RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 234, noes 191, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 363]

#### AYES—234

Aderholt	Buyer	Diaz-Balart
Archer	Callahan	Dickey
Armey	Calvert	Doolittle
Bachus	Camp	Doyle
Baker	Canady	Dreier
Ballenger	Cannon	Duncan
Barcia	Chabot	Dunn
Barr	Chambliss	Ehlers
Barrett (NE)	Chenoweth	Emerson
Bartlett	Christensen	English
Barton	Coble	Ensign
Bateman	Coburn	Everett
Bereuter	Collins	Ewing
Berry	Combust	Foley
Bilirakis	Condit	Forbes
Bliley	Cook	Fowler
Blunt	Cooksey	Fox
Boehner	Costello	Gallegly
Bonilla	Cox	Ganske
Bonior	Cramer	Gekas
Bono	Crane	Gibbons
Borski	Crapo	Gillmor
Brady	Cubin	Goode
Bryant	Cunningham	Goodlatte
Bunning	Danner	Goodling
Burr	Deal	Goss
Burton	DeLay	Graham

Granger	McCollum	Royce
Gutknecht	McCrery	Ryun
Hall (OH)	McDade	Salmon
Hall (TX)	McHugh	Sanford
Hamilton	McInnis	Saxton
Hansen	McIntosh	Scarborough
Hastert	McIntyre	Schaefer, Dan
Hastings (WA)	McKeon	Schaffer, Bob
Hayworth	Metcalf	Sensenbrenner
Hefley	Mica	Shadegg
Herger	Miller (FL)	Shaw
Hill	Moakley	Shimkus
Hilleary	Mollohan	Shuster
Hoekstra	Moran (KS)	Skeen
Holden	Murtha	Skelton
Hostettler	Myrick	Smith (MI)
Hulshof	Neal	Smith (NJ)
Hunter	Nethercutt	Smith (OR)
Hutchinson	Ney	Smith (TX)
Hyde	Northup	Smith, Linda
Inglis	Norwood	Snowbarger
Istook	Nussle	Solomon
Jenkins	Oberstar	Souder
John	Ortiz	Spence
Johnson, Sam	Oxley	Stearns
Kanjorski	Packard	Stenholm
Kaptur	Pappas	Stump
Kasich	Parker	Stupak
Kildee	Paul	Sununu
Kim	Paxon	Talent
King (NY)	Pease	Tauzin
Kingston	Peterson (MN)	Taylor (MS)
Klecza	Peterson (PA)	Taylor (NC)
Klink	Pickering	Thomas
Knollenberg	Pitts	Thornberry
Kucinich	Pombo	Thune
LaFalce	Portman	Tiahrt
LaHood	Poshard	Trafficant
Largent	Quinn	Walsh
Latham	Radanovich	Wamp
LaTourette	Rahall	Watkins
Lewis (CA)	Redmond	Watts (OK)
Lewis (KY)	Regula	Weldon (FL)
Linder	Riggs	Weldon (PA)
Lipinski	Riley	Weller
Livingston	Roemer	Weygand
LoBiondo	Rogan	Whitfield
Lucas	Rogers	Wicker
Manton	Rohrabacher	Wolf
Manzullo	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (AK)
Mascara		Young (FL)

## NOES—191

Abercrombie	Dooley	Kelly
Ackerman	Edwards	Kennedy (MA)
Allen	Ehrlich	Kennedy (RI)
Andrews	Engel	Kennelly
Baesler	Eshoo	Killpatrick
Baldacci	Etheridge	Kind (WI)
Barrett (WI)	Evans	Klug
Bass	Farr	Kolbe
Becerra	Fattah	Lampson
Bentsen	Fawell	Lantos
Berman	Fazio	Lazio
Bilbray	Filner	Leach
Bishop	Foglietta	Levin
Blagojevich	Ford	Lewis (GA)
Blumenauer	Frank (MA)	Lofgren
Boehlert	Franks (NJ)	Lowe
Boswell	Frelinghuysen	Luther
Boyd	Frost	Maloney (CT)
Brown (CA)	Furse	Maloney (NY)
Brown (FL)	Gejdenson	Markley
Brown (OH)	Gephardt	Martinez
Campbell	Gilchrest	Matsui
Capps	Gilman	McCarthy (MO)
Cardin	Gordon	McCarthy (NY)
Carson	Green	McDermott
Castle	Greenwood	McGovern
Clay	Gutierrez	McHale
Clayton	Harman	McKinney
Clement	Hastings (FL)	McNulty
Clyburn	Hefner	Meehan
Conyers	Hilliard	Meek
Coyne	Hinchey	Menendez
Cummings	Hinojosa	Millender-
Davis (FL)	Hobson	McDonald
Davis (IL)	Hooley	Miller (CA)
Davis (VA)	Horn	Minge
DeFazio	Houghton	Mink
DeGette	Hoyer	Moran (VA)
Delahunt	Jackson (IL)	Morella
DeLauro	Jackson-Lee	Obey
Dellums	(TX)	Olver
Deutsch	Jefferson	Owens
Dicks	Johnson (CT)	Pallone
Dingell	Johnson (WI)	Pascrell
Dixon	Johnson, E. B.	Pastor
Doggett		Payne

Pelosi	Schumer	Tierney
Pickett	Scott	Torres
Pomeroy	Serrano	Towns
Porter	Shays	Turner
Price (NC)	Sherman	Upton
Ramstad	Sisisky	Velazquez
Rangel	Skaggs	Vento
Reyes	Slaughter	Visclosky
Rivers	Smith, Adam	Waters
Rodriguez	Snyder	Watt (NC)
Rothman	Spratt	Waxman
Roukema	Stabenow	Wexler
Roybal-Allard	Stark	White
Rush	Stokes	Wise
Sabo	Strickland	Woolsey
Sanchez	Tanner	Wynn
Sanders	Tauscher	Yates
Sandlin	Thompson	
Sawyer	Thurman	

## NOT VOTING—8

Boucher	Nadler	Schiff
Gonzalez	Neumann	Sessions
Jones	Pryce (OH)	

## □ 1641

Mr. WATT of North Carolina and Mr. DINGELL changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## □ 1645

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into a brief colloquy with my chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today because it had been my intention, and I appreciate the patience of the chairman for entertaining my consideration of an amendment which ultimately we withdrew, which talked about the total elimination of any and all funding from the U.S. taxpayers to the Palestinian Authority.

That amendment was under consideration going back to early July, before we had some of the most recent and horrendous tragedies: the one on July 30, in which 150 people were injured, the tragedy of July 30, which we all are now only too familiar with, in which 13 people were killed, 150 were injured. Five Americans, Mr. Chairman, five Americans were killed in Israel at the hands of the Islamic terrorists and those who would bring Israel down.

Just this morning, as our day was beginning here, we got the news of the tragedy at the Ben-Yehuda Pedestrian Mall in West Jerusalem. We know of at least one American from New Jersey that was killed in that horrendous attack, and this all is with the backdrop of the chairman of the PLO hugging and embracing what I would best describe as an international outlaw, the head of the Hamas terrorist group that is wreaking havoc in Israel.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the patience of the chairman of the subcommittee in entertaining my concern for continued U.S. dollars being sent to the Palestinians. I think it is only fair to understand that by anybody's definition the peace process is dead. How

many Americans, much less how many Israelis, must be murdered before we understand as a nation that we cannot continue to try to prop up a man who has blood on his hands, who has failed to live by the Oslo accords, who has violated those accords repeatedly?

While we could not get this amendment considered to cut off all aid to the Palestinians, I would just suggest that our State Department seriously consider, as they approach the coming days and discussions with the PLO, that they seriously consider whether it is appropriate to further try to prop up this peace process in the wake of the tragedies and the murders and the wanton disregard for Israeli as well as American lives.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest, in closing, that they know the characters that have killed half-a-dozen Americans. We know that the PLO has refused to step forward and prosecute them or turn them over to the Americans. That is egregious enough. I think all Americans would join us in what I think can only be an act of conscience, and beginning to focus reality on this entire process.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman and the ranking minority member's indulgence in considering earlier my bid to try to offer this amendment. It is obviously now not appropriate, but I do appreciate the chairman's allowing me to talk about this. It is a tremendous tragedy in the world community, and I think we need to rethink where we are in this whole process.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today—during consideration of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1998, that provides aid for the Palestinians—to condemn today's bombing of the Ben-Yehuda Pedestrian Mall in west Jerusalem, that has left at least five dead and well over 100 injured.

This atrocious act comes days before Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright's visit to Israel; and right on the heels of the July 30, 1997 suicide-bombing of western Jerusalem's open air, Mahane Yehuda market—another act of cowardice by militant Islamic terrorists that injured over 150 people, and claimed the lives of 13 others, including 5 Americans.

One of those killed was Leah Stern of New Jersey. Described by friends as a woman with no political interest, Ms. Stern's move to Israel had nothing to do with the peace process—that is, until two homemade explosives containing nails and screws tore apart her body. Ms. Stern came to the United States, via Israel, after World War II. According to her daughter, Yocheved Kushner, Ms. Stern had moved to Israel to, live out the rest of her life in peace. Instead, Ms. Stern has become a victim of what is, ironically, called the Middle East peace process.

Mr. Chairman, between September 13, 1993 and the July 31, 1997 bombing, there were six Americans murdered by Arab terrorists in Israel. At this moment we cannot tell how high this tally will climb. One thing we can be certain of is that there will be more to come. Imad Falouji, a former Hamas leader now serving in Arafat's Cabinet—when asked whether more suicide bombings are likely—said, "Another explosion will happen, of course, Palestinians

have patience, but if this starvation continues, watch for the revolution."

As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, I am in a unique position to follow the progress of the Middle East peace process in great detail; and have done so since coming to Congress 3 years ago. It is with great disappointment that I report to you—there hasn't been any progress. Since the signing of the Oslo accords in 1993, have we had peace? Have the Palestinian Authority and the PLO lived up to their commitments in the Oslo accords? No, we have not, and no, they have not. This is why I coauthored the Forbes-Saxton amendment that suspends U.S. assistance to the Palestinian Authority and PLO until the President can report and certify that they are complying with various elements of the Oslo accords and other human rights laws.

Personally, I would like to eliminate all assistance for the Palestinians, however, I offered this amendment because it is the right amendment at the right time. The State Department has failed the peace process by allowing Arafat's reign of terror to continue, and by not demanding better compliance. There are too many violations and instances of misconduct on the part of the Palestinians for us as a nation to ignore. We need to step back and reexamine what we're getting for our money. Are we getting an honest peace partner who respects its commitments to the Oslo accords? Is the U.S. assistance furthering the peaceful coexistence of Israelis and Palestinians? Currently, this is not the case.

Now the President has nominated Martin Indyk to be Assistant Secretary of State for Near East Affairs. Hopefully Mr. Indyk will be made to answer for his compliance in this conspiracy of silence during his confirmation hearings before the U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations this fall. I strongly oppose Mr. Indyk's nomination.

Year after year, the violations and gross misconduct of the Palestinian Authority and PLO continue to grow. History is sometimes a cruel, but honest teacher. We can never allow the politics of the moment to obscure the essential facts: the Palestinian Authority and the PLO openly violated the Oslo accords and continue to disregard the human rights of Israelis and Americans in Israel.

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

Mr. FORBES. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his efforts, and for agreeing to allow us to do something that I feel is in the best interests of this country. I do not think it is any secret to anybody in this body that I am a big believer in giving the administrative branch of this Government the authority to handle foreign policy. Nothing in this bill is earmarked for any country, including Israel.

I happen to agree with the gentleman about the PLO, and agree that I am not satisfied with the direction that seemingly they are taking there, and that the administration should ensure that they do everything to put a stop to this.

But my belief, however, is that the administrative branch of Government

has the constitutional charge to handle this measure; that they, indeed, agree with the gentleman that different directions should be taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FORBES] has expired.

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

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

Mr. FORBES. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, that is to make certain that our leaders in our foreign policy, Madeleine Albright, the President, have an open book and an open mind going into these negotiations.

I think the gentleman's message has been heard loud and clear. I am sure that the people of Israel and the supporters of Israel agree with the gentleman, as I do, that we must look very seriously at the very serious occurrences that are taking place there and take some actions accordingly.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to compliment the members of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee for what they have done regarding aid to Turkey, Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Nagorno-Karabagh. For the first time in recent memory there will not be a floor debate on several amendments regarding Armenia. This is because they have fashioned a fair consensus position.

The provisions included in this bill preserve the House of Representative's longstanding support of the people of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabagh by maintaining the economic sanctions against the Government of Azerbaijan for its blockade of Armenia, while allowing funds to be made available in Azerbaijan for democracy building.

The bill also allows for the crucial delivery of humanitarian aid through nongovernmental organizations to meet the tremendous needs of those affected by the conflict in the Transcaucas region, including refugees, wounded and displaced persons.

Unfortunately, the Senate has not chosen the path of consensus. They have chosen to lift the sanctions against Azerbaijan to curry favor with an oil-rich nation. I therefore urge the chairman and ranking member in conference to remain strong and oppose any weakening of section 907.

In 1992, Congress passed the Freedom Support Act. This law included a prohibition of direct nonhumanitarian assistance to Azerbaijan. This action was taken in response to the blockades placed on Armenia and Nagorno-Karabagh by Azerbaijan. These blockades have remained in place for over 5 years, and the effect has been devastating. They have denied fuel, heat, shelter, and other basic necessities to the people of Armenia and Karabagh, increasing their exposure to disease, hypothermia, and other public health crises. This misery only amplifies the problems created by armed conflict and nearly 400,000 refugees and displaced persons. We should strengthen our resolve to change Azeri Government behavior. Now is not the time to weaken section 907.

Once again I commend all of those who worked to resolve this issue, and hope this a good omen for the future.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, it is with great concern that I express my opposition to the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year [FY] 1998. Nations around the world look to the United States to set the stage for the foreign affairs arena. U.S. citizens look to Congress to set the stage for domestic priorities. This measure sets a poor example for other nations to follow and demonstrates that we care very little for the people in our own country.

H.R. 2159 calls for a \$33 million decrease from fiscal year 1997 for the nonproliferation, anti-terrorism, demining and related programs account. China continues the proliferation of nuclear weapons by providing information and materials to rogue nations. The United States must continue to make a concerted global effort to assist foreign countries to combat this threat of nuclear destruction. It is clear that we are making progress toward nuclear nonproliferation but until weapons of mass destruction have been eradicated, we cannot accept cutbacks to these programs.

Meanwhile, we are giving a combined total of \$5.2 billion to Israel and Egypt. Of this amount, \$1.8 billion is allocated for Foreign Military Finance which can be used for advanced weapons systems. Another \$475 million is made available for procurement of defense-related goods and services, including research and development in Israel. Egypt is provided with \$1.3 billion with which to purchase a tactical command and control system for its army. It is incomprehensible how we propose to send billions of dollars overseas for foreign defense, yet we expect our elderly to prolong receipt of Medicare benefits until they are sixty-seven. Five billion dollars for defense does not help the people of Israel, Egypt, or the United States when they are sick and in need of health services.

H.R. 2159 fails to provide a separate account for population development assistance. Instead, this measure allows up to \$385 million to be provided for international family planning through various accounts, including the child survival account. The Child Survival and Disease Programs fund was established to reduce infant mortality and improve the health and nutrition of children, especially in the poorest nations. It is counterproductive to appropriate funds for one program so that it can support another. If children's health is a priority, then we should treat it as such and leave its funding alone. If women's health is a priority, then we should reinstate a separate account for international family planning activities.

Each year the majority party touts its platform of family values, yet cuts funds and puts restrictions on international family planning. Given that women are the primary caretakers and household managers throughout much of the developing world, their health and well-being undeniably determines how their children will fare in life. According to a 1996 report from the United Nations Children's Fund [UNICEF] almost 600,000 women die during pregnancy and childbirth each year. Of these tragedies, 75,000 die attempting to abort an unwanted pregnancy themselves or with the help of an untrained and unsafe provider. These deaths render at least 1 million children motherless every year. The United States is hypocritical in its message of promoting family values, but limiting assistance for women's health in developing nations.

I will not support a measure that cannot lead by example. I will not support a measure that seeks to limit efforts to end the threat of nuclear destruction yet builds military defenses in foreign lands. I will not support a measure that restricts medical resources from women worldwide. I will not support the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1998.

The CHAIRMAN. No further Members seeking recognition, the Clerk will read the final lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1998".

The CHAIRMAN. There are no further amendments permitted by the order of the House of July 24, 1997.

Under that order, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HASTER) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman 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. 2159) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, under the previous order of July 24, 1997, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 375, nays 49, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 364]

YEAS—375

Abercrombie	Blagojevich	Canady
Ackerman	Bliley	Cannon
Aderholt	Blumenauer	Capps
Allen	Blunt	Cardin
Andrews	Boehlert	Castle
Archer	Boehner	Chabot
Armey	Bonilla	Chambliss
Bachus	Bonior	Christensen
Baesler	Bono	Clay
Baker	Borski	Clayton
Baldacci	Boswell	Clement
Ballenger	Boyd	Clyburn
Barcia	Brady	Coble
Barrett (WI)	Brown (CA)	Collins
Bartlett	Brown (FL)	Cook
Bass	Brown (OH)	Cooksey
Bateman	Bryant	Costello
Becerra	Bunning	Cox
Bentsen	Burr	Coyne
Bereuter	Burton	Cramer
Berman	Buyer	Crane
Bilbray	Callahan	Crapo
Bilirakis	Calvert	Cubin
Bishop	Camp	Cummings

Cunningham	Johnson (WI)	Payne	Whitfield
Danner	Johnson, E.B.	Pease	Wicker
Davis (FL)	Johnson, Sam	Pelosi	Wise
Davis (IL)	Kanjorski	Peterson (MN)	
Davis (VA)	Kaptur	Pickering	
DeFazio	Kasich	Pickett	
DeGette	Kelly	Pitts	
Delahunt	Kennedy (MA)	Pomeroy	
DeLauro	Kennedy (RI)	Porter	
DeLay	Kennelly	Portman	
Dellums	Kildee	Poshard	
Deutsch	Kilpatrick	Price (NC)	
Diaz-Balart	Kim	Quinn	
Dickey	King (NY)	Radanovich	
Dingell	Kingston	Ramstad	
Dixon	Klecza	Rangel	
Doggett	Klink	Redmond	
Dooley	Klug	Regula	
Doyle	Knollenberg	Reyes	
Dreier	Kolbe	Riggs	
Dunn	Kucinich	Riley	
Edwards	LaFalce	Rivers	
Ehlers	LaHood	Rodriguez	
Ehrlich	Lampson	Rogan	
Emerson	Lantos	Ros-Lehtinen	
Engel	Largent	Rothman	
English	Latham	Roukema	
Ensign	LaTourette	Roybal-Allard	
Eshoo	Lazio	Rush	
Etheridge	Leach	Ryun	
Evans	Levin	Sabo	
Everett	Lewis (CA)	Sanchez	
Ewing	Lewis (GA)	Sandlin	
Farr	Lewis (KY)	Sanford	
Fattah	Linder	Sawyer	
Fawell	Lipinski	Saxton	
Fazio	Livingston	Scarborough	
Filner	LoBiondo	Schumer	
Flake	Lofgren	Scott	
Foglietta	Lowey	Serrano	
Foley	Luther	Sessions	
Forbes	Maloney (CT)	Shadeegg	
Fowler	Maloney (NY)	Shaw	
Fox	Manton	Shays	
Frank (MA)	Manzullo	Sherman	
Franks (NJ)	Markey	Shimkus	
Frelinghuysen	Martinez	Shuster	
Frost	Mascara	Sisisky	
Furse	Matsui	Skaggs	
Gallegly	McCarthy (MO)	Skeen	
Ganske	McCarthy (NY)	Skelton	
Gejdenson	McCollum	Slaughter	
Gekas	McCrery	Smith (MI)	
Gephardt	McDade	Smith (NJ)	
Gibbons	McDermott	Smith (OR)	
Gilchrest	McGovern	Smith, Adam	
Gillmor	McHale	Smith, Linda	
Gilman	McHugh	Snowbarger	
Goode	McInnis	Snyder	
Goodlatte	McIntosh	Souder	
Gordon	McIntyre	Spence	
Goss	McKeon	Spratt	
Graham	McKinney	Stabenow	
Granger	McNulty	Stark	
Green	Meehan	Stenholm	
Gutierrez	Meek	Stokes	
Gutknecht	Menendez	Strickland	
Hall (OH)	Metcalfe	Stupak	
Hamilton	Mica	Sununu	
Harman	Millender-	Talent	
Hastert	McDonald	Tauscher	
Hastings (FL)	Miller (CA)	Tauzin	
Hayworth	Miller (FL)	Taylor (NC)	
Hefner	Mink	Thomas	
Herger	Moakley	Thompson	
Hill	Mollohan	Thornberry	
Hilliard	Moran (VA)	Thune	
Hinchee	Morella	Thurman	
Hinojosa	Murtha	Tiahrt	
Hobson	Myrick	Tierney	
Hoekstra	Nadler	Torres	
Holden	Neal	Towns	
Hooley	Nethercutt	Turner	
Horn	Ney	Upton	
Houghton	Northup	Velazquez	
Hoyer	Nussle	Vento	
Hulshof	Oberstar	Visclosky	
Hunter	Obey	Walsh	
Hutchinson	Olver	Wamp	
Hyde	Ortiz	Waters	
Inglis	Owens	Watt (NC)	
Istook	Oxley	Watts (OK)	
Jackson (IL)	Packard	Waxman	
Jackson-Lee	Pallone	Weldon (FL)	
(TX)	Pappas	Weldon (PA)	
Jefferson	Parker	Weller	
Jenkins	Pascrell	Wexler	
Johnson (CT)	Pastor	Weygand	
	Paxon	White	

Wolf	Yates
Woolsey	Young (AK)
Wynn	

NAYS—49

Barr	Hansen	Rogers
Barrett (NE)	Hastings (WA)	Rohrabacher
Barton	Hefley	Royce
Berry	Hilleary	Sanders
Campbell	Hostettler	Schaefer, Dan
Carson	John	Schaffer, Bob
Chenoweth	Jones	Sensenbrenner
Coburn	Lucas	Solomon
Combest	Minge	Stearns
Condit	Moran (KS)	Stump
Conyers	Norwood	Tanner
Deal	Paul	Taylor (MS)
Doolittle	Peterson (PA)	Trafigant
Duncan	Petri	Watkins
Ford	Pombo	Young (FL)
Goodling	Rahall	
Hall (TX)	Roemer	

NOT VOTING—9

Boucher	Kind (WI)	Salmon
Gonzalez	Neumann	Schiff
Greenwood	Pryce (OH)	Smith (TX)

□ 1713

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

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 364, final passage of H.R. 2159, the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act for Fiscal 1998, I am recorded as having voted "aye." It was my intention to vote "no."

#### AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2159, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of H.R. 2159, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, cross-references, and to make other conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House today.

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

There was no objection.

#### THANKING COLLEAGUES AND STAFF

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to thank my colleagues on the subcommittee that helped so tremendously in the drafting of this bill and especially to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], the ranking member of the subcommittee and to the staff people: Mark Murray, as well as Carolyn Bartholomew; to the committee staff on our side, Charlie Flickner, John Shank, Bill