

□ 1843

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 310, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 310, I was not able to be here due to a delayed airline flight. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

AMERICAN EMBASSY SECURITY ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 247 and rule XVIII, 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. 2415.

□ 1843

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. 2415) to enhance security of United States missions and personnel overseas, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes, with Mr. MILLER of Florida (Chairman pro tempore) in the Chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment number 1 printed in part A of House Report 106-235 offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) had been disposed of.

□ 1845

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR. GILMAN

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to the authority granted in H. Res. 247, I offer amendments en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

The text of the amendments en bloc is as follows:

Part B amendments en bloc offered by Mr. GILMAN, consisting of the following:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. CAPUANO: Page 12, after line 4, insert the following:

(F) INTERNATIONAL RAPE COUNSELING PROGRAM—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated in paragraph (1), \$2,500,000 for the fiscal year 2000 are authorized to be appropriated only for a United States based rape counseling program for assistance to women who have been victimized by the systematic use of rape as a weapon in times of conflict and war.

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. SANDERS: Page 15, after line 20, insert the following:

(6) ISRAEL-ARAB PEACE PARTNERS PROGRAM.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under clause (i), \$1,500,000 for the fiscal year 2000 is authorized to be available only for people-to-people activities (with a focus on young people) to support the Middle

East peace process involving participants from Israel, the Palestinian Authority, Arab countries, and the United States, to be known as the "Israel-Arab Peace Partners Program". Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit a plan to the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives for implementation of such program. The Secretary shall not implement the plan until 45 days after its submission to the Committee.

Amendment No. 14 offered by Mr. SANDERS: Page 35, after line 9, insert the following:

SEC. 211. GENDER RELATED PERSECUTION TASK FORCE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF TASK FORCE.—The Secretary of State, in consultation with other Federal agencies, shall establish a task force with the goal of determining eligibility guidelines for women seeking refugee status overseas due to gender-related persecution (including but not limited to domestic and workplace violence and female genital mutilation).

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall prepare and submit to the Congress a report outlining the guidelines determined by the task force under subsection (a).

Amendment No. 17 offered by Mr. ANDREWS:

Page 46, after line 22, insert the following:

SEC. 257. DENIAL OF PASSPORTS TO NONCUSTODIAL PARENTS SUBJECT TO STATE ARREST WARRANTS IN CASES OF NONPAYMENT OF CHILD SUPPORT.

The Secretary of State is authorized to refuse a passport or revoke, restrict, or limit a passport in any case in which the Secretary of State determines, or is informed by competent authority, that the applicant or passport holder is a noncustodial parent who is the subject of an outstanding State warrant of arrest for nonpayment of child support, where the amount in controversy is not less than \$2,500.

Amendment No. 19 offered by Mr. EHLERS: Page 57, after line 18, insert the following:

SEC. 303. SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ADVISER TO SECRETARY OF STATE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF POSITION.—Section 1 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ADVISER.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—There shall be within the Department of State a Science and Technology Adviser (in this paragraph referred to as the 'Adviser'). The Adviser shall have substantial experience in the area of science and technology. The Adviser shall report to the Secretary of State through the Under Secretary of State for Global Affairs.

“(2) DUTIES.—The Adviser shall—

“(A) advise the Secretary of State, through the Under Secretary of State for Global Affairs, on international science and technology matters affecting the foreign policy of the United States; and

“(B) perform such duties, exercise such powers, and have such rank and status as the Secretary of State shall prescribe.”

(b) REPORT.—Not later than six months after receipt by the Secretary of State of the report by the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences with respect to the contributions that science, technology, and health matters can make to the foreign policy of the United States, the Secretary of State, acting through the Under Secretary of State for Global Affairs, shall

submit a report to Congress setting forth the Secretary of State's plans for implementation, as appropriate, of the recommendations of the report.

Amendment No. 20 offered by Mrs. CAPPS: Page 68, after line 20, insert the following:

(c) SCHOLARSHIPS FOR PRESERVATION OF TIBET'S CULTURE, LANGUAGE, AND RELIGION.—Section 103(b)(1) of the Human Rights, Refugee, and Other Foreign Relations Provisions Act of 1986 (Public Law 104-319, 22 U.S.C. 2151 note) is further amended by striking "Tibet," and inserting "Tibet (whenever practical giving consideration to individuals who are active in the preservation of Tibet's culture, language, and religion)."

Amendment No. 21 offered by Mr. ENGEL:

Page 75, line 7, strike "The Secretary of State" and insert "(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Secretary of State".

"Page 75, line 8, strike "that members" and insert "the following:

(1) Members".

Page 75, beginning on line 13, strike "unless" and insert a period.

Page 75, after line 13, insert the following:

(2) Items designated as crime control and detection instruments and equipment for purposes of section 6(n) of the Export Administration Act (50 U.S.C. app. 2405(n)) are not approved for export by use of the RUC.

Page 75, line 14, strike "the President" and insert the following:

"(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply if the President".

Page 75, beginning on line 20, strike "in which case" and all that follows through line 21 and insert a period.

Amendment No. 38 offered by Mr. ENGEL:

Page 84, after line 16, add the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 703. RECOGNITION OF THE MAGEN DAVID ADOM SOCIETY IN ISRAEL AS A FULL MEMBER OF THE INTERNATIONAL RED CROSS AND RED CRESCENT MOVEMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) It is the mission of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement to prevent and alleviate human suffering, wherever it may be found, without discrimination

(2) The International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement is a worldwide institution in which all National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies have equal status and share equal responsibilities.

(3) The state of Israel has ratified the Geneva Conventions which govern the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement.

(4) The Magen David Adom Society is the national humanitarian society in the state of Israel.

(5) The Magen David Adom Society follows all the principles of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement.

(6) Since the founding of the Magen David Adom Society in 1930, the American Red Cross has regarded it as a sister national society and close working ties have been established between the two societies.

(7) The Magen David Adom Society is excluded from full membership in the International Conference of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement solely because the Society is not an official protective symbol recognized by either the Geneva Conventions governing the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement or the Statutes of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement.

(8) During the past 25 years the American Red Cross has consistently advocated recognition and membership of the Magen

David Adom Society in the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement.

(9) The state of Israel has unsuccessfully tried in the past to amend the Geneva Conventions to allow for the emblematic recognition of the Magen David Adom Society.

(10) Recognition of the Magen David Adom Society in Israel as a member of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement would help fortify the spirit of goodwill in the Middle East peace process.

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

(1) the President should, at the earliest possible date, enlist the cooperation of all nations that are signatory to the Geneva Conventions to ensure that the recognition of the Magen David Adom Society in Israel as a full member of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement is resolved at the forthcoming 27th International Conference of the Red Cross and Red Crescent; and

(2) the President should support a resolution by that Conference requesting the International Committee of the Red Cross to waive on an exceptional basis the 5th condition of recognition in article 4 of its Statutes of the Movement, thus enabling the full participation of the Magen David Adom Society as a member of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement.

Amendment No. 39 offered by Mr. DELAHUNT:

Page 84, after line 16, add the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 703. ANNUAL REPORTING ON WAR CRIMES, CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY, AND GENOCIDE.

(a) SECTION 116 OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961.—Section 116(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151n(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking the period at the end and inserting “and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) wherever applicable, consolidated information regarding the commission of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and evidence of acts that may constitute genocide.”

(b) SECTION 502B OF THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961.—Section 502B(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2304(b)) is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following: “Wherever applicable, such report shall include consolidated information regarding the commission of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and evidence of acts that may constitute genocide.”

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendments, as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 9, as modified, offered by Mr. ROHRABACHER:

Page 34, strike line 18, and all that follows through line 9 on page 35, and insert the following:

SEC. 210. EFFECTIVE REGULATION OF SATELLITE EXPORT ACTIVITIES.

(a) LICENSING REGIME.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of State shall establish a regulatory regime for the licensing for export of commercial satellites, satellite technologies, their components, and systems which shall include expedited approval, as appropriate, of the licensing for export by United States companies of commercial satellites, satellite technologies, their components, and systems, to NATO allies, major non-NATO allies, and other

friendly countries, but not to the Peoples Republic of China.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—For proposed exports to those nations which meet the requirements of paragraph (1) above, the regime should include expedited processing of requests for export authorizations that—

(A) are time-critical, including a transfer or exchange of information relating to a satellite failure or anomaly in-flight or on-orbit;

(B) are required to submit bids to procurements offered by foreign persons;

(C) relate to the re-export of unimproved materials, products, or data; or

(D) are required to obtain launch and on-orbit insurance.

(b) FINANCIAL AND PERSONNEL RESOURCES.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated in section 101(I)(A), \$11,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for the Office of Defense Trade Controls for fiscal year 2000, to enable that office to carry out its responsibilities.

(c) IMPROVEMENT AND ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary shall, not later than six months after the date of enactment of this Act, submit to the Congress a plan for—

(1) continuously gathering industry and public suggestions for potential improvements in the State Department's export control regime for commercial satellites; and

(2) arranging for the conduct and submission to Congress, not later than 15 months after the date of enactment of this Act, an independent review of the export control regime for commercial satellites as to its effectiveness at promoting national security and economic competitiveness.

Amendment No. 12, as modified, offered by Mr. ROHRABACHER:

Page 35, after line 9, insert the following:

SEC. 211. REPORT CONCERNING ATTACK IN CAMBODIA.

Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 6 months thereafter until the investigation referred to in this section is completed, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees, in classified and unclassified form, containing the most current information on the investigation into the March 30, 1997, grenade attack in Cambodia, including a discussion of communication between the United States Embassy in Phnom Penh and Washington.

Amendment No. 16, as modified, offered by Mr. SALMON:

Page 46, after line 22, insert the following new section:

SEC. 257. REPORT ON TERRORIST ACTIVITY IN WHICH UNITED STATES CITIZENS WERE KILLED AND RELATED MATTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than six months after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 6 months thereafter, the Secretary of State shall prepare and submit a report, with a classified annex as necessary, to the appropriate congressional committees regarding terrorist attacks in Israel, in territory administered by Israel, and in territory administered by the Palestinian Authority.

(b) CONTENTS.—Each report under subsection (a) shall contain the following information:

(1) A list of formal commitments the Palestinian Authority has made to combat terrorism.

(2) A list of terrorist attacks, occurring between September 13, 1993 and the date of the report, against United States citizens in Israel, in territory administered by Israel, or in territory administered by the Palestinian Authority, including—

(A) a list of all citizens of the United States killed or injured in such attacks;

(B) the date of each attack and the total number of people killed or injured in each attack;

(C) the person or group claiming responsibility for the attack and where such person or group has found refuge or support;

(D) a list of suspects implicated in each attack and the nationality of each suspect, including information on—

(i) which suspects are in the custody of the Palestinian Authority and which suspects are in the custody of Israel;

(ii) which suspects are still at large in areas controlled by the Palestinian Authority or Israel; and

(iii) the whereabouts (or suspected whereabouts) of suspects implicated in each attack.

(3) Of the suspects implicated in the attacks described in paragraph (2) and detained by Palestinian or Israeli authorities, information on—

(A) the date each suspect was incarcerated;

(B) whether any suspects have been released, the date of such release, and whether any released suspect was implicated in subsequent acts of terrorism; and

(C) the status of each case pending against a suspect, including information on whether the suspect has been indicted, prosecuted, or convicted by the Palestinian Authority or Israel.

(4) The policy of the Department of State with respect to offering rewards for information on terrorist suspects, including any information on whether a reward has been posted for suspects involved in terrorist attacks listed in the report.

(5) A list of each request by the United States for assistance in investigating terrorist attacks listed in the report, a list of each request by the United States for the transfer of terrorist suspects from the Palestinian Authority and Israel since September 13, 1993, and the response to each request from the Palestinian Authority and Israel.

(6) A description of efforts made by United States officials since September 13, 1993, to bring to justice perpetrators of terrorist acts against United States citizens as listed in the report.

(7) A list of any terrorist suspects in each such case who are members of Palestinian police or security forces, the Palestine Liberation Organization, or any Palestinian governing body.

(c) CONSULTATION WITH OTHER DEPARTMENTS.—In preparing each report required by this section, the Secretary of State shall consult and coordinate with all other Government officials who have information necessary to complete the report. Nothing contained in this section shall require the disclosure, on a classified or unclassified basis, of information that would jeopardize sensitive sources and methods or other vital national security interests or jeopardize ongoing criminal investigations or proceedings.

(d) INITIAL REPORT.—The initial report filed under this section shall cover the period between September 13, 1993, and the date of the report.

(e) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—For purposes of this section, the term “appropriate congressional committee” means the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives.

Amendment No. 40, as modified, offered by Mr. HALL of Ohio:

Page 84, after line 16, insert the following:

SEC. 703. SENSE OF CONGRESS SUPPORTING HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE TO THE PEOPLE OF BURMA.

It is the sense of the Congress that the United States Government should support

humanitarian assistance that is targeted to the people of Burma and does not support the State Peace and Development Council (SPDC) and is only implemented and monitored by international or private voluntary organizations that are independent of the SPDC.

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

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 247, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank our colleagues who have agreed to place their amendments in this en bloc amendment. This is the product of a bipartisan effort to incorporate amendments and to expedite consideration of H.R. 2415, the American Embassy Security Act.

As the Clerk read, we have included 13 amendments in this en bloc. These amendments make improvements such as adding the reporting of genocide to the Human Rights Reports, the establishment of a qualified science advisor to the State Department, requiring a report on the grenade attack in Cambodia, requiring a report outlining terrorists attacks in Israel, and establishing an Israel-Arab Peace Partners program.

The report on terrorist attacks is important because it allows killers of American citizens to be brought to justice. It is important to the conduct of our foreign policy and to the oversight of our foreign aid that Congress know whether an entity receiving assistance is cooperating in the apprehension of those who kill and maim our U.S. citizens in terrorist incidents.

We welcome the contributions these Members are making to this bill, and I urge support to the en bloc amendment.

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, in 1976 Congress passed legislation mandating the State Department to produce reports on human rights practices in countries around the world. To the credit of the State Department, these reports have become the most accepted and widely used resource for highlighting human rights abuses and have become invaluable to the work of any individual or any organization serious about protecting human rights.

Additionally, they have become a critical component in fashioning our

own bilateral relationships with foreign governments. They also help us to determine how we should exercise our influence in multilateral organizations such as the IMF and the World Bank.

However, the reports are not presently required to provide information on crimes against humanity, war crimes, or evidence of acts that may constitute genocide in a manner that most clearly profiles these most serious, I would submit, of human rights abuses.

This amendment would address that omission and would mandate inclusion of such information in a separate section of the annual country reports. I would submit that evidence of acts of genocide should be particularly noted, as I would submit that genocide represents the ultimate violation of human rights.

In fact, many of us in this Chamber were convinced to support the administration's policy in Kosovo based upon our concern that Milosevic's targeting of Albanians for ethnic cleansing would lead to another Holocaust.

I urge support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in 1976 Congress passed legislation mandating the State Department to produce reports on human rights practices in countries around the world. To the State Department's credit, these reports have become the most accepted and widely-used resource for highlighting human rights abuses and have become invaluable to the work of any individual or organization serious about protecting human rights. Additionally, they have become a critical component in fashioning our own bilateral relationships with foreign governments. They also help us to determine how we should use our influence in multilateral organizations such as the IMF and the World Bank.

However, the reports are not presently required to provide information on crimes against humanity, war crimes, or evidence of acts that may constitute genocide in a manner that most clearly profiles these most serious of human rights abuses. This amendment would address that omission and would mandate inclusion of such information in a separate section in the annual country reports. Evidence of acts of genocide should be especially noted, as I would submit that genocide represents the ultimate violation of human rights.

Many of us in this chamber were convinced to support the Administration's policy in Kosovo based upon our concern that Milosevic's targeting of Albanians for ethnic cleansing would lead to another genocide. Unfortunately, in 1994 there were some in the State Department who debated whether what was happening in Rwanda constituted "genocide"—even as 800,000 people were slaughtered because of their ethnic origin. This House passed a Concurrent Resolution on June 15, condemning the genocidal acts and crimes against humanity committed by the Government of Sudan. And yet this year's country report on Sudan does not call those crimes what they are. If it is a war crime, call it a war crime. If it is genocide, call it genocide.

Adoption of this amendment would focus the attention of the State Department on the issues of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide in a timely manner and make

that information available in a clear and unequivocal form to the family of nations. It should strengthen the genocide early warning initiative the Administration announced last year. It could save thousands—if not millions—of lives throughout the world by directing world attention to these atrocities, hopefully provoking early diplomatic intervention.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL USA,

600 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, SE,

Washington, DC, July 15, 1999.

Hon. WILLIAM DELAHUNT,

1317 Longworth House Office Building,

Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DELAHUNT: I understand that you have offered an amendment that would ask the Department of State to include information on the commission of war crimes and genocide, where applicable, in its annual volume of Country Reports on Human Rights Practices. We welcome your initiative and feel that it can only serve to support the Administration's announcement last December 10th of the creation of a genocide early warning initiative.

The Department of State's annual report has become an important and very comprehensive treatment of human rights conditions which already includes reports of individual killings. However, a single murder may also amount to a war crime or represent part of a pattern of genocide which should be noted when applicable as well. Your proposal that the Department look for and report patterns of behavior amounting to genocide and war crimes is a useful one which we are confident the drafters of the annual report sections will support.

Your interest in this issue and your continued strong support for human rights are deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN RICKARD,
Legislative Director.

CENTERS FOR RELIGIOUS FREEDOM,
Washington, DC, June 15, 1999.

Hon. WILLIAM DELAHUNT,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DELAHUNT: Freedom House applauds your efforts to direct the State Department to report on genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes on a timely basis.

Too many times the world has ignored serious evidence of genocide while it was occurring. For example, the fact that genocidal acts and crimes against humanity are being conducted by the government of Sudan, as noted in House Resolution 75 of June 15, has gone uncommented on in the most recent State Department Human Rights Reports on country practices. Improved reporting could lead to thousands, even millions of lives, being saved. We enthusiastically support your important initiative.

Sincerely,

NINA SHEA,
Director.

THE INTERNATIONAL CAMPAIGN
TO END GENOCIDE
Washington, DC, July 15, 1999.

Congressman WILLIAM D. DELAHUNT,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DELAHUNT: I am writing on behalf of the Campaign to End Genocide, an international coalition of over a dozen human rights groups dedicated to ending genocide in the coming century.

We strongly support the Delahunt Amendment to H.R. 2415, which will require the State Department in its annual Human Rights Report to include annual reporting on war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide.

Genocides and other mass murders have killed more people in this century than all the war combined. "Never again" has turned into "Again and again." Again and again, the response to genocide has been too little and too late.

During the Armenian genocide and the Holocaust, the world's response was denial. In 1994, while 800,000 Tutsis died in Rwanda, State Department lawyers debated whether it was "genocide", and the U.N. Security Council withdrew U.N. peacekeeping troops who could have saved hundreds of thousands of lives. By focusing State Department attention on war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide, we hope that such moral callousness in U.S. policy-making will never again be repeated.

We are encouraged that this amendment has received the bipartisan support it deserves. Opposition to such heinous crimes dates back to the beginning of our republic when President Jefferson sent American warships to end the depredations of the Barbary pirates. President Bush mobilized the U.N. forces that defeated the genocidal war criminal, Saddam Hussein. And now President Clinton has led the NATO defeat of the indicted war criminal Slobodan Milosovic.

Please let us know how we can be of further help.

Sincerely,

DR. GREGORY H. STANTON,
Director.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW).

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, the plane of the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) has been delayed because of weather. She chairs the Subcommittee on Human Resources of the Committee on Ways and Means.

When I chaired that committee, we did a great deal of work as part of the welfare reform bill, the child support provision. In that, we put a provision into the law regarding passports. This goes directly towards what the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) has suggested in amendment number 17.

I would ask that the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) work with the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) and Members of the Committee on Ways and Means in order that we not have an inconsistency in the law with regard to the issuance of passports on past-due child support payments.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) that I appreciate the concern with regard to the work of the Committee on Ways and Means and will work with the gentleman on any concerns pertaining to the amendment he has referred to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY) seek to control the time of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON)?

Ms. MCKINNEY. I absolutely do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Georgia will control the remaining 8½ minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPES).

Mrs. CAPPES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the en bloc amendment, and I thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) for their hard work on this bill.

I am pleased that the amendment includes a provision that I have authored to encourage the study and preservation of Tibetan culture. For many years, the Tibetan people have suffered tremendously under a succession of oppressive regimes in China.

The United States Information Agency currently offers 30 scholarships to Tibetan students who wish to study in the United States. My amendment directs the USIA to consider, whenever practical, individuals who are active in the preservation of Tibet's culture, language, and religion when granting these scholarships.

My amendment is the result of conversations that I have held with U.S. experts on Tibet, some of whom reside in my district at the University of California at Santa Barbara. It is clear that these subtle changes to the program will be very helpful in our efforts to preserve this ancient culture.

I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), a member of our committee.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the en bloc amendment to H.R. 2415. I have two provisions included in the en bloc regarding export of U.S. satellite technology, and I am the original cosponsor of a third provision that calls for the United States to support and defend the democratic Republic of China on Taiwan.

I congratulate the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) for his timely provision in support of the Taiwanese allies.

My first amendment will strongly improve the State Department's process of approving export licenses for American satellites and related technologies.

Last year, the Congress made a bipartisan decision to transfer the licensing of satellite exports from Commerce back to the State Department. Our intention was obvious. We wanted someone to scrutinize proposed exports to potentially threatening countries like Communist China. Instead, the bureaucracy clamped down on everyone, stopping even normal business transactions with friendly nations like Canada and Sweden.

The en bloc amendment before us today includes my amendment forcing

the State Department to create and properly fund a streamlined export regime which would apply to allies and friendly countries, but which would not be available for Communist China and other hostile powers.

I appreciate both the chairman's and the ranking member's acceptance of this amendment as well as the strong support shown by the U.S. aerospace industry. With all of their continued support in conference, I believe we can enact this mandate and funding into law that will serve America's security as well as our economic and commercial interest.

My other amendment calls for the State Department to provide the appropriate congressional committee a report in classified and unclassified form on the March 30, 1997 grenade attack on Democrats in Cambodian. In this attack, where 17 Cambodian men, women and children were killed, among the 120 persons wounded was an American citizen named Ron Abney who is a member of the International Republican Institute. Thus, we need to see that report.

I thank the chairman and the ranking member for including my provisions in the en bloc amendment.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), the ranking member, for their cooperation in including in this en bloc amendment two amendments in which I have an interest.

The first is a matter which I worked on with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) which requires systematic and thorough reporting on the efforts of the United States Government to extradite those accused of committing crimes under the jurisdiction of U.S. law against U.S. citizens. These are important provisions that I believe will help us crack down on terrorism.

I also thank the chairman and the ranking member for including my legislation which will deny passports to custodial parents who have accrued a child support obligation of more than \$2,500. I think it is very important that, before Americans enjoy the privilege of traveling abroad, that they make meet their obligations to their own children here at home.

This is an important tool in our effort to step up child support enforcement. I again thank the chairman and the ranking member for their cooperation by adding this to the en bloc. I urge the adoption of the en bloc amendment.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that the amendment that I have proposed with Representatives ANDREWS and SAXTON, which

would require the State Department to issue periodic reports on the investigations of Palestinian terrorists who have murdered Americans, will be included in the American Embassy Security Act. I thank Chairman BEN GILMAN for his personal involvement in this matter. The Senate unanimously accepted this anti-terrorism amendment to the Senate State Department Authorization bill.

At least twelve American citizens have been killed by Palestinian terrorists in Israel since the signing of the Oslo Accords in September 1993. Over 20 suspects in the attacks currently reside in territory controlled by the Palestinian Authority. Several of these suspects are walking about free. Some have reportedly been given positions in Palestinian police forces.

The United States has the right and the responsibility under U.S. law to prosecute the terrorist killers of Americans. The House of Representatives strongly endorsed this principle last year when it voted 406 to 0 in favor of a resolution declaring that the “[Palestinian] suspects should be tried in the United States unless it is determined that such action is contrary to effective prosecution.” While the administration should be commended for sending investigative teams to Israel to investigate these attacks, the effort has been incomplete. For example, no rewards have yet been offered by the U.S. government for information leading to the capture of the Palestinian killers of the murdered Americans, even though multimillion dollar rewards have been offered in other cases of Americans killed by terrorists abroad. And despite reams of evidence implicating certain individuals in the murders of Americans—including in one case an outright confession—no indictments have been secured by U.S. authorities. The reports will help to respond to concerns that political considerations may be stalling these investigations.

The bipartisan amendment responds to the lack of progress in the investigations. Specifically, the amendment would require the administration to provide Congress with regular, detailed reports on the status of the investigations into the killers of Americans. The report would also contain information on the policy of the State Department with respect to offering rewards for information leading to the capture of the terrorist suspects and a list of suspected terrorists serving in Palestinian security forces.

Smartly, the language protects against the disclosure of information that would impede ongoing investigations. Obviously, the American families that have lost loved ones in terrorist attacks do not want these investigations compromised in any way.

The families of the victims support our effort. I quote from a letter signed by three of the families: “Your legislation addresses a serious and immediate problem. We have constantly been frustrated and disappointed at the difficulty of finding out the most basic information about the status of U.S. investigators into the attacks in which our children were killed. This legislation will help rectify the problem. Reports to Congress on these investigations will help to make it possible for Congress to play a crucial supportive role in facilitating efforts to apprehend, prosecute, and punish terrorists who have murdered American citizens in Israel or the administered territories.” The letter continues: “Keeping a spotlight on these issues is a crucial component in the process

of achieving Middle East Peace. . . . The peace process can only be strengthened by a move toward justice.”

The amendment is about achieving justice, and achieving peace for the families who have lost loved ones in terrorist attacks. It’s about recognizing that American life isn’t cheap, and that if you’re an American citizen killed abroad, the United States will never forget you.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, Mr. ENGEL’s amendment (amendment #47, part of the en bloc) builds on Section 408 of the bill, a section which was added as a result of an amendment I successfully offered with Mr. PETER KING of New York during consideration of this legislation in the International Relations Committee. Section 408—and, by extension, the language offered today—seeks to end the intimidation of defense attorneys in Northern Ireland, and to secure just and impartial investigations of the murders of two heroic defense attorneys, Rosemary Nelson and Patrick Finucane.

As adopted by the full committee, Section 408 cuts off funding authority for U.S.-sponsored training and exchange programs offered to Northern Ireland’s police force, the Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC), unless the President certifies that the United Kingdom has initiated independent investigations into the murders of two Catholic defense attorneys. It also conditions the funds on the President certifying that the UK is appropriately protecting other defense attorneys who have been harassed by the Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC).

On September 29, 1998, Rosemary Nelson, a defense attorney from Northern Ireland, testified before the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights and told us that, as a defense attorney working on high-profile, political cases, she feared the RUC. She reported that she had been “physically assaulted by a number of RUC officers,” and that the harassment included, “at the most serious, making threats against my personal safety including death threats.”

Six months later, on March 15, 1999, Rosemary Nelson was murdered, the victim of a car bomb. Because of Rosemary’s own stated fears, and because of subsequent reports issued by Northern Ireland’s Independent Commission on Police Complaints, several questions have been raised about RUC complicity in her murder.

Amazingly, however, the British government insists that the RUC be the agency most involved in investigating Rosemary’s murder.

In addition to the Nelson family, numerous international human rights organizations, the European Union, the Northern Ireland Law Society, elected officials from both sides of the divide in Northern Ireland, and the U.S. Congress have all called for independent inquiries—RUC-free inquiries—into Rosemary Nelson’s murder. Similarly, leading human rights activists are calling for an independent judicial inquiry into the allegations of government collusion in the murder of slain defense attorney Patrick Finucane.

In an extraordinary show of bipartisan support, this past April, the U.S. House of Representatives passed my bill, H. Res. 128, condemning the Finucane and Nelson killings and calling on the British government to adequately protect defense lawyers. The resolution unequivocally linked Ms. Nelson’s murder

with that of Patrick Finucane, recognizing the hostile environment within which Northern Ireland’s defense lawyers function, particularly aggravated by threats coming directly or indirectly from the police.

Section 408 of this bill renews our previous calls for the independent inquiries as but one step toward accountability for human rights violations against defense lawyers in Northern Ireland. It blocks U.S. funds to RUC programs and requires the President and the State Department to do more to persuade the Blair government to mitigate the harassment of defense attorneys in Northern Ireland. Mr. ENGEL’s amendment extends our efforts in Section 408 by restricting the export of law enforcement equipment to the RUC until the Section 408 goals are met. While the RUC does not currently receive the equipment banned by the Engel amendment, the added language precludes them from doing so, or even qualifying for such equipment, until the standards are met.

It is important to note that even while negotiations have been stalled and the future of the new Northern Ireland Assembly is in jeopardy, the British government can take some unilateral steps to restore confidence in the peace process. As recommended in this bill, the Blair government should pull the RUC off the Rosemary Nelson murder case, take decisive action to protect defense attorneys, and initiate an objective, public inquiry into the murder of Patrick Finucane.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to speak in support of my amendment to HR 2415, which would allow the Secretary of State to deny, revoke, or limit passports to non-custodial parents who owe \$2,500 or more in child support. Current law sets the threshold at \$5,000—an amount that does not go far enough to protect America’s children.

Only half of all custodial parents who are awarded child support actually receive the full amount ordered by a court. Over \$5 billion is owed in delinquent child support payments each year. In a time when millions of American children live below the poverty level, the government must make a strong statement that significant delinquency in child support payments will not be tolerated. I believe we must stand up for personal responsibility and the well being of children around the nation and I thank the Chairman for offering this en bloc amendment and including this important provision.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment, and I want to make clear why I do. One of the most depraved and beastly actions toward defenseless civilians by armed men in recent conflicts has been the commission of rape as a tool of war. It’s been done in Kosovo and in Rwanda. This isn’t “date rape”; it isn’t even rape by someone who knows the person he’s doing it to. It is rape as a kind of ultimate demonstration of power and control and of contempt for the women being raped and the groups they belong to.

As a result, the number of women who have been raped in this way and for these reasons has continued to grow. Like any other form of torture or degradation in wartime, rape as war crime leaves behind devastating physical and especially psychological effects that can last a

lifetime. People become unable to sleep, unable to work, unable to trust other people, unable to escape from the constant feeling of the events themselves.

The Human Rights subcommittee of which I am the ranking member just held a hearing on the U.S. response to victims of torture. It is obvious that one of the consistent characteristics of the 160 centers worldwide for torture victims—not enough to have live-in facilities for people in the greatest need, not enough to provide even outpatient counseling.

We need to do more to help. I commend my colleague MIKE CAPUANO for recognizing that fact and finding a way to start doing so. I strongly support this amendment and I encourage the House to adopt it.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the en bloc amendment and my two amendments contained therein.

In the United States, people know that in the event of an emergency they can always count on the American Red Cross to come to the rescue. Other countries' Red Cross or Red Crescent societies perform similar functions.

The Israeli counterpart to the American Red Cross is the Magen David Adom (MDA) society. MDA carries out all of the traditional roles of a voluntary medical aid society, such as emergency medical services, maintenance of blood supplies, first aid, and disaster relief. Unfortunately, unlike the American Red Cross and every other nation's ICRC component organization, MDA is not accepted as a member of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement.

The Magen David Adom Society is excluded from full membership in the International Conference of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement solely because the Red Shield of David, the organization's emblem, is not officially recognized by either the Geneva Conventions or the Statutes of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement. I have the fullest respect for the religious traditions represented by the red cross and red crescent, but I also respect the decision of Israel, as a Jewish state, to choose a sign more in line with its religious tradition. With peace slowly but surely coming to the Middle East and Israel developing progressively more relations with its neighbors, it is time that the ICRC accepts the Magen David Adom as a full member.

The amendment, which I offer with my friend, the gentleman from New York, Mr. WEINER, seeks to shine light on this problem and presses our government to seek a solution. Specifically, it urges the President to work with other nations to achieve recognition of MDA as a full member of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement at the forthcoming 27th International Conference of the Red Cross and Red Crescent.

My second amendment, Mr. Chairman, conditions exports of crime control equipment—such as batons, hand cutts, or tear gas—to the Royal Ulster Constabulary on independent investigations into the murders of defense attorneys Patrick Finucane and Rosemary Nelson. Section 408 of the underlying bill already conditions FBI and police training of the RUC on independent investigations of these suspicious murders. My amendment adds to that section by restricting exports of police items.

I share the fear of many members of Congress and human rights groups that the RUC will white wash these investigations. My

amendment and the bill, itself, are designed to send the signal that we will no longer stand for bungled investigations and cover-ups of politically-motivated killings. It is time that peace and justice came to northern Ireland.

I would like to thank Chairman GILMAN, Ranking member GEJDENSON, and Subcommittee Chairman CHRIS SMITH for their exceptional cooperation and support during this process.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Salmon-Andrews-Saxton amendment to H.R. 2415, which requires the Administration to provide Congress with regular, detailed reports on the status of the investigations into the killers of Americans. Over 20 suspects in the deaths of twelve American citizens currently reside in the territory controlled by the Palestinian Authority, and several of these suspects are walking free.

While the United States has a right and responsibility to prosecute the terrorist killers of Americans, the Administration's effort has been incomplete. This amendment would hold the Administration responsible for following through with the pursuit of justice. We must be active in our fight against terrorism, and this bill will aid in the maintenance of U.S. vigilance against terrorism.

I would like to express my sincere thanks to my colleagues, Mr. SALMON, who are tireless foes of terrorism, and I would also like to thank Mr. GILMAN for offering the en bloc amendment and for including this important provision in his amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, during this past week the Communist People's Republic of China started a series of events to threaten Taiwan:

Starting just this last weekend and going into this week, China has been conducting the first military exercise in the Taiwan Strait since 1996, with soldiers chanting "We will liberate Taiwan";

Meanwhile the Communist Party newspapers ran the headline, "Those who play with fire will get burnt";

In addition, last Thursday, China declared that it has mastered the design technology for the neutron bomb.

In light of these imminent threats from mainland China, the U.S. Congress must send a clear message that we support our democratic ally Taiwan and that the U.S. will defend Taiwan from military attacks. Without that clear message, Communist China may be tempted to attack Taiwan and destabilize the world, hoping that the U.S. will stand aside, particularly when the Clinton Administration advocates for "one China." If there were one democratic China, the U.S. Congress and the people of the United States would support it. For now, there is only one democratic State in China—The Republic of China on Taiwan—so we will support Taiwan.

The people of Taiwan have spoken with their votes to stay separate from the Communist mainland until there is democracy for all. We respect their votes and their voice. We commend them for building this flourishing democracy regardless of threats from the Beijing. I support the amendment from my colleagues Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. Wu, and Mr. BILIRAKIS, to declare that we stand with our democratic allies, and we will defend democratic Taiwan.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of our time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

The amendments en bloc were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 106-235.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part A amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Page 19, strike line 1 and all that follows through line 17, on page 21, and insert the following:

(d) CONTRIBUTION TO UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND.—

(1) LIMITATION.—Of the amounts made available under subsection (a) for United States voluntary contributions no funds may be made available to the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) unless the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees the certification described in paragraph (2).

(2) CERTIFICATION.—The certification referred to in paragraph (1) is a certification by the President that—

(A) the 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

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

(3) DEFINITION.—As used in this subsection, the term "coercion" includes physical duress or abuse, destruction or confiscation of property, loss of means of livelihood, and severe psychological pressure.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 247, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk which was made in order by the Committee on Rules.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California wish to offer his amendment at this time?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer it at this time, but if I might ask a parliamentary inquiry, it might be most efficient simply to allocate all time and divide it fairly between the two sides on the issue, whether it be on my second-degree amendment or the first-degree amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH). I would be willing to do so if that is possible.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding, and actually this is an inquiry to the Chair, that the

time on the Smith amendment will be divided. I would take that time in opposition. Then my understanding is that the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) would have some time on his secondary amendment, and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), I imagine, would be in opposition, and that would give us all an opportunity to divide the time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, that is perfectly acceptable with me. I simply wish to offer my second-degree amendment at such a time as to protect the opportunity to present that. If I have now done so, then I will wait until the time that has been allocated to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is expired. Is that acceptable?

□ 1900

Is that acceptable?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The gentleman may offer the substitute amendment at this point and the debate time will be allocated accordingly, and debate on the two amendments will be consumed simultaneously.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment.

The text of the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment is as follows:

Part A amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. CAMPBELL as a substitute for Part A amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Page 19, strike line 1, and all that follows through line 17 on page 21, and insert the following:

(d) CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND.—

(1) LIMITATIONS ON AMOUNT OF CONTRIBUTION.—Of the amounts made available under subsection (a), not more than \$25,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 shall be available for the United Nations Population Fund (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as the "UNFPA").

(2) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS IN CHINA.—None of the funds made available under subsection (a) may be made available for the UNFPA for a country program in the People's Republic of China.

(3) CONDITIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts made available under subsection (a) for fiscal year 2000 for the UNFPA may not be made available to UNFPA unless—

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

(B) the UNFPA does not commingle amounts made available to the UNFPA under this section with other sums; and

(C) the UNFPA does not fund abortions.

(4) REPORT TO CONGRESS AND WITHHOLDING OF FUNDS.—

(A) Not later than February 15, 2000, 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.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to that, and I understand that under regular order the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) would proceed first?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) will control 15 minutes; the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) will control 15 minutes on the Campbell amendment; the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) will control 15 minutes on his amendment; and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) will control 15 minutes in opposition.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, one further inquiry, I think it would be efficient, but would it be possible simply to proceed with both together; the 30 minutes times two? In other words, the 1 hour of debate all at the same time, with alternating between various spokespersons?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize for debate to be shared in the appropriate amount of time with each Member controlling 15 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. So, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) would have 15, I would have 15 minutes to control, I would have 15 minutes to control, and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) would have 30?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is agreeable.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will entertain all debate before putting the question of the vote on the subtitle amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Campbell-Gilman-Gejdenson-Porter-Johnson amendment and in opposition to the Smith amendment.

I remain as dedicated as anyone in this chamber to the cause of human rights in China. From the freedom fighters of Tianamen to the Dalai Lama's loyal supporters in Tibet we have, in the Congress, have supported the cause of human rights in China. But that is not what is under debate at

this moment. Under current law, no U.S. funds can be spent on abortions. The U.N. Population Fund does not support China's one-child policy and has condemned the abuses of that program. UNFPA operates in only 32 of China's counties to support maternal and child health, and that is all.

This debate should not be about China, it should be about the programs in over 100 other countries where UNFPA operates. And, Mr. Chairman, I would like to highlight one Nation for which U.S. support would be cut off by the Smith amendment, and that happens to be Mexico.

I believe that we can all agree that helping Mexican mothers space the births of their children is good for Mexico and good for our own Nation. Birth spacing is the best way to improve child survival and to limit Mexico's rapidly expanding population. We have no USAID mission in Mexico. UNFPA is the largest external donor to the Mexican family program. UNFPA is the only channel we have to support Mexican family planning. The Smith amendment, regrettably, would have the effect of cutting off all support to Mexico.

We must support that program and other vital UNFPA programs such as their anti-AIDS campaign in Haiti, not just to benefit Mexicans and Haitians but to also benefit our own Nation. If the countries south of our border develop into strong stable societies, it will help our exports and relieve some of the immigration pressure on our own Nation. Population growth in Latin America and the Caribbean drive the environmental pressures on Florida, on Texas, on New Mexico, Arizona, California, and some of our other States. This pressure will be relieved if UNFPA's voluntary family planning programs move forward in these regions with our own support.

The Smith amendment would have the effect of cutting off all U.S. support for those programs, like UNFPA's support to the victims of storms like Hurricane Mitch. It would also block U.S. support for UNFPA's program to stop the horrific practice of female genitalia mutilation.

Mr. Chairman, the Campbell amendment has been endorsed by 47 organizations, including the YWCA, the American Association of University Women, the American Public Health Association, the National Wildlife Federation, and the League of Conservation Voters.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I urge our colleagues to support the Campbell amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK).

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA), and I have great concerns about the policies and practices used by the United Nations Population Fund.

The United States cannot give taxpayer money to an organization that is intricately involved with human rights abuses that are taking place in China and other places around the world. I wish to read the words of a woman who worked to enforce China's population program. Mrs. Gao was the administrator at the Fujian Province Planned Birth Office from 1984 to 1988. These are her own words before the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights of the Committee on International Relations.

My work at the planned birth office included establishing a computer data bank of all the women of childbearing age in the town. I also issued birth-allowed certificates to women who meet the policy and regulations of the Central and Provincial Planned Birth Committees and are, therefore, allowed to give birth to children. Should a woman be found pregnant without a certificate, an abortion is performed immediately, regardless of how many months pregnant she is.

This case about a Miss Chen Li-Ren who was a female resident of a village outside of Yonghe Town. In 1996, she became pregnant in spite of the fact she was not married and did not have a certificate. It's a violation of the planned birth policy to become pregnant without a birth-allowed certificate.

To avoid heavy monetary penalties and abortion, she in order to save the child's life, when she was 3 months pregnant, left the town. But when she was 9 months pregnant, somebody informed on her. The planned birth enforcement team of Yonghe Town began searching for her. They were unable to find her, so they tore down her husband's family's house and also threatened to also tear down the house of her parents.

One day, when she was at her parents house, the enforcement officials forced their way into the house. They found her and immediately stuffed her into a car and escorted her to the Municipality Planned Birth Induced Delivery Center where the abortion was performed.

This is the document that we issue to people who have already given birth to a son. It's the birth-not-allowed notices. Such notices are sent to the couple when the data concludes they do not meet the requirement of the policy and are not allowed to have any further children. Any couple who has already given birth to a son will receive this notice and such notices are made public. The purpose of this is to make it known to everyone that the couple, if they are having a second child, is in violation of the policy, therefore facilitating supervision of the couple. We also issue control device inspection and pregnancy test notices.

According to the specific data on each woman, every woman of childbearing age is notified that she has to have a contraceptive device, reliability, and pregnancy examinations when necessary. Should she fail to present herself in a timely manner for these examinations, she will not only be forced to pay a fine, but our supervision team will apprehend her and force her to have such an examination. This is the document that we issue to women who must undergo sterilization or other birth control methods.

We also imposed monetary penalties on those who violated central and provincial regulations. If they refused to pay the penalties, our supervision team members would apprehend and detain them until they paid such fines.

We also analyze informant materials submitted in accordance with the informing system and then put these cases on file for investigation.

Most planned birth offices in Fujian Province's rural areas have their own detention

facilities. In our town, the facility is right next door to my office. It has one room for males and one room for females, each with the capacity of about 25 to 30 people. To catch violators, our planned birth office does not need consent by the courts or judicial departments, or the public security departments. Our actions are completely independent of them. There are no paperwork formalities and there are no time limits associated with the detention. Detainees pay 8 RMB per day for food. They are not allowed to make phone calls or mail letters.

The majority of the detainees are, of course, either women who are pregnant without birth-allowed certificates or women who are to be sterilized or women who have been fined. As I explained previously, if we do not apprehend the women themselves, we detain their family members, such as a father, a mother, a sister, brothers, or their husband. And we detain them until the women themselves come forward to be sterilized or to have an abortion.

I led my subordinates to Yinglin Town Hospital to check on births. I found two women in Zhoukeng Town had extra-plan births. I led a planned birth supervision team composed of a dozen cadres and public security agents. With sledge hammers and heavy crowbars in hand, we went to dismantle their houses.

We were unable to apprehend the women in the case so we took their mothers in lieu of them and detained them in the planned birth office's detention facility. It wasn't until about half a month later that the women surrendered themselves to the planned birth office. They were sterilized, fined heavily, and their mothers were finally released. I myself did so many brutal things, but I thought that I was conscientiously implementing the policy of our party and that I was an exemplary citizen and a good cadre.

Once I found a woman who was 9 months pregnant, but did not have a birth-allowed certificate. According to the policy, she was forced to undergo an induced abortion. In the operating room, I saw the child's lips were moving and how its arms and legs were also moving. The doctor injected poison into its skull and the child died and it was thrown into the trash can. Afterwards the husband was holding his wife and crying loudly and saying, what kind of man am I? What kind of husband am I? I can't even protect my wife and child. Do you have any sort of humanity?

All of those 14 years, I was a monster in the daytime, injuring others by the Chinese Communist authorities' barbaric planned birth policy. But in the evening I was like all other women and mothers, enjoying my life with my children. I couldn't go on living with such a dual life any more.

It is also my sincere hope that what I describe here today can lead you to give your attention to this issue so that you can extend your arms to save China's women and children.

Mrs. MYRICK. So, if Members of the House agree with the UNFPA that what Mrs. Gao described is voluntary and suits China's current conditions, then by all means support the Campbell-Gilman substitute to give them at least \$20 million. I, for one, will never give my vote to an organization that could look the other way when such atrocities are being committed against women and children.

I will vote for the Smith amendment and no on the Campbell-Gilman amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

If the gentlewoman wants to achieve a reduction in the kinds of incidents

she just referenced, then she should vote for the Campbell amendment, because what is clear in every country where family planning activities have increased, abortions have been decreased.

We only need to look at our experience. In Tunisia, as contraceptive use increased by 94 percent, abortion rates plummeted. In South Korea, abortion rates were halved as contraceptive use went up by 80 percent.

What is absolutely clear is that if the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Smith) gets his way, if the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) gets her way, there will be more forced abortions in China. It is as simple as that.

If we cut back on the voluntary family planning funds, what will happen? More forced abortions.

□ 1915

Now, if my colleagues talk to some folks, they will say they have got problems with family planning, they are against some of the methods used for birth control. Get up and make that debate. It is a slight of hand to talk about the forced abortions in China and to try to use that as an assault on family planning.

Every dollar that is cut from family planning, every time the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) succeeds, he increases forced abortion in China. It is absolutely clear. What happens is, if women do not have access to family planning, voluntary family planning, if they cannot get contraception, there will be more forced abortion.

In every country's experience, as family planning dollars increase, abortions decrease. It is not the gentleman from New Jersey that will decrease abortions and forced abortions in China. It is the gentleman from California. And those of us who support family planning funds that will reduce the number of abortions in China and all other countries, support family planning and we will reduce abortion. Limit family planning funds, and we increase the number of abortions.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to give my colleagues a few statistics to think about as we debate whether to restore funding for UNFPA.

If each woman averages two children, world population would rise to 11 billion in the next century and level off.

If women average 2.5 children each, our globe would face a world with 27 billion people by 2150.

But if the fertility rate fell to 1.6 children per woman, population would reach a peak of 7.7 billion in 2050 and drop to 3.6 billion by 2150.

It's clear that rampant population growth affects governments' ability to provide waste treatment and sanitation, schools, food, transportation, health care and environmental protection.

World population is increasing by 78 million people a year—97 percent of this increase is in developing countries, where access to family planning and reproductive health services is limited and where pregnancy and childbirth are still a risk to the lives and health of women.

We know that in high-fertility countries in sub-Saharan Africa, between 36 and 55 percent of women report that their most recent birth was mistimed or unwanted.

We have the tools to give these women access to needed services and combat this global problem—it's called the UNFPA (UN Fund for Population Assistance)—but last year we slashed UNFPA's budget to zero.

In this one year alone, the impact of the U.S.'s decision to withdraw funding to UNFPA deprived 870,000 women of access to contraception. This resulted in 500,000 unwanted pregnancies, 234,000 unwanted births and 200,000 abortions.

We also hurt UNFPA's ability to encourage safe delivery practices, resulting in the deaths of an additional 1,200 maternal deaths and the loss of 22,500 infants who couldn't access UNFPA services.

I am here today to urge my colleagues not to make the same mistake again. The Smith Amendment will leave millions of women and men without a choice.

In the 30 years since the U.S. Government began helping other countries provide their citizens with family planning services, the number of couples using contraception in developing countries has multiplied tenfold and the average number of children per woman declined from nearly six to fewer than four.

As we all know, there are many countries around the world that have a population rate that is higher than their GDP. Their impressive economic advances become outweighed by their population growth, which means that they are effectively just treading water. By failing to fund UNFPA, we are leaving them to drown.

Why oppose the Smith Amendment?

First, the Smith Amendment requires UNFPA to leave China entirely or lose U.S. support. This puts UNFPA in an impossible Catch-22.

China, as a member of the United Nations, can ask for—and UNFPA must give—family planning assistance. UNFPA cannot choose its clientele. So asking UNFPA to leave China is a provision that they can never satisfy.

Second, conditioning UNFPA's funding on certification that there have been no forcible abortions in China by anyone—including the Chinese government's family planning program—is also an impossible task.

UNFPA's funding is for UNFPA programs which operate under stringent human rights standards and with a firm opposition to coercion in all of its forms. UNFPA does not support abortion—in no case is abortion allowed as a method of family planning. UNFPA also opposes quotas or targets in family planning programs and only works in those counties in China that have abolished such measures.

Contrary to what some people may think, UNFPA did not leave its conscience at the door when it agreed to provide family planning assistance to China.

We must remember that we are funding programs of UNFPA, not the Chinese government. UNFPA conducts a voluntary family planning program with a rigorous commitment to human rights. The Smith Amendment won't change China's policies but it will continue to cause suffering around the world.

Don't hold women and men in the nearly 150 other nations who need and use UNFPA's services hostage because you don't agree with the policies of one nation. Support UNFPA's lifesaving work in AIDS prevention, family planning assistance, and safe pregnancy and childbirth. Reject the Smith Amendment. Support the Campbell Amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, for 20 years the U.N. Population Fund has poured millions of dollars, about \$157 million to be exact, provided technical assistance, and given effusive praise to China's program that relies on forced abortion and forced sterilization to achieve its goals.

For 20 years, the UNFPA has whitewashed these crimes, the kind the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) just talked about, and has heaped lavish praise on China's one-child-per-couple program. It has provided cover and covered up for the Beijing hardliners who oppress and victimize women and murder their children.

In fact, Nafis Sadik, the executive director of the UNFPA, has had this to say about the Chinese program: "The implementation of the policy in China and the acceptance of the policy is purely voluntary. There is no such thing as a license to have a birth." That is an unmitigated lie, I say to my colleagues.

She has also said, "The UNFPA firmly believes, and so does the Government of the People's Republic of China, that their program is a totally voluntary program." That, too, is a lie.

For 20 years, the UNFPA has participated with the perpetrators of the most egregious systematic abuse of women in history. My colleagues heard the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) talk about Mrs. Gao. She was one of those who ran the program in Fujian Province for 14 years. That is what the UNFPA has covered up for all of these years.

Let me just remind my colleagues that both Presidents Reagan and Bush, with the support of Democratic Congresses, barred all funding to the UNFPA because of its complicity and support of China's barbaric program.

Last year Congress passed and President Clinton signed the Omnibus Appropriations Act that included a total cut-off of UNFPA funding. Why? Because it includes heavily forced abortion and forced sterilization.

The amendment that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) and I are offering would prohibit U.S. funding to the UNFPA unless the President certified that UNFPA has terminated all activities in the PRC; or, during the 12 months preceding such certification there have been no abortions as a result of coercion.

This is all about forced abortion. The UNFPA has been complicit. They have supported it. And they have said it with their statements and have been part of a cover-up.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself ½ minute.

Mr. Chairman, this does not provide for money for abortion in China. The Campbell amendment takes away money for family planning in China for every dollar that the U.N. spends there. So this debate is very, very serious, but it is not on China's abortion policy.

The Campbell amendment authorizes no money for abortion, no money for China. And for every dime that the U.N. chooses to spend in China, we take back one dime from the U.N.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, who is the introducer of the substitute that I support very strongly, for yielding the time to me.

So I rise in support of the Campbell substitute and in opposition to the Smith amendment.

The U.N. Population Fund is one of the world's leading international agencies providing for women's sexual and reproductive health. It collaborates with government agencies and NGOs to develop and implement effective policies and programs dealing with female genital mutilation, HIV/AIDS, comprehensive care for refugees, as we saw in Kosovo, child and maternal nutrition, and family planning methods and services.

Contrary to what we have heard this evening, UNFPA does not fund or provide abortion services or related equipment. The UNFPA does not support China's despicable population programs.

The Campbell amendment prohibits U.S. funds from being used in UNFPA's China program. It addresses the concern of some Members about the fungibility of funding by reducing our UNFPA contribution dollar for dollar for the agency spending in China. It re-states U.S. law forbidding funding for any abortion services.

The goal of the Smith amendment is to force UNFPA to leave China, even though its current program gives it exclusive control of the family planning programs in 32 countries. Passage of the Smith amendment will cut off the U.S. contribution to UNFPA's work worldwide unless China stops its policies of coercive abortion.

Mr. Chairman, more than 500 million women and girls live in China. That is one in every five women on this planet. The irony of the efforts of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is that if UNFPA were to pull out of China, the only source which Chinese women will have for family planning and reproductive health services is the Chinese Government. Again, if the Smith amendment passes, the Chinese Government will be women's only option for reproductive health care.

It is important that we support the Campbell substitute.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1¼ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentlewoman a question if she would return to the microphone.

She mentioned a moment ago that this program will be run exclusively by the UNFPA. Is that her statement?

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

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

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I said China is in charge of the reproductive health and services for the 32 countries.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, but who is running the family planning/population program?

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, UNFPA.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, just so the record is very clear on this, the question was asked by our former U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, what will be the role of the Chinese Government? And the answer back from the executive director of the UNFPA was as follows:

The Chinese Government, at the central and provincial levels, will be in charge of coordination, internal monitoring, guidance, and evaluation, all of which will be conducted in accordance with ICPD principles. The local government will be in charge of the actual implementation of project activities at the county level program.

Mr. Chairman, that is exactly the problem. The Chinese Government, as they have been doing for the last 20 years, will run this program; and again, the UNFPA will give it more cover, which it certainly does not deserve.

Women, it even says in the document, will be assessed a social compensation fee if they do not conform to the guidelines, the one-child-per-couple program.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I say to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) but no money for UNFPA goes for Chinese abortion policies or abortion.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the Smith amendment, with great respect for the maker of this amendment but in complete disagreement, because it would eliminate funding for international family planning under the United Nations Population Fund, UNFPA, and to support the Campbell-Malone amendment.

The Smith amendment, if enacted, would punish women and families around the world in a misguided effort to affect China's family planning program.

I do not understand why the poorest women on this planet, year in and year out, must be held hostage to the conservative politics of the Republican party. And I say that, as I say, with respect for the individuals involved here.

We should ask, who suffers from the Smith amendment? The World Health Organization estimates that nearly 600,000 women die each year of pregnancy and child-birth related causes. Nearly all of these women are in developing countries.

The UNFPA funds program to reduce this mortality and related health problems. Women around the world, par-

ticularly impoverished women, will be harmed by this amendment.

I understand my colleagues' concern about some of the horrible practices in China. That is why this amendment says that any funds used in China by UNFPA will be deducted from the UNFPA. None of us, none of us, support forced abortions or forced sterilizations.

The Campbell-Gilman-Malone-Crowley amendment addresses these concerns by specifically banning U.S. funds from being spent in China. Furthermore, it requires that for every dollar that UNFPA spends in China, America's contribution will be reduced, as I have mentioned.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that I follow closely the human rights violations in China. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is a leader on that subject, and I support what he wants to do about China. And that is what we do in the Campbell-Gilman-Malone-Crowley amendment.

While current law already bans U.S. funding for abortions or abortion services, to once and for all overcome any misunderstanding, this amendment once again reiterates that prohibition of U.S. funding for abortions.

We should note that UNFPA is already on record in opposing coercion and UNFPA conforms to universal human rights standards. The UNFPA does not fund abortions nor abortion-related activities anywhere in the world. UNFPA opposes China's one-child-per-family policy.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Smith amendment and to support the Campbell-Gilman-Malone-Crowley amendment.

With these legal protections and the tremendous need for family planning efforts around the world, Congress should not block important programs that promote women's safety and health.

UNFPA programs work and these programs should be given the opportunity to go forward.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire as to how much time remains on both sides.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) has 19½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) has 9 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of the Smith-Barcia amendment to the American Embassy Security Act.

The Smith-Barcia amendment would prohibit U.S. contributions to the UNFPA until UNFPA terminates its involvement with the Chinese coercive population control program or until China ends its brutal and abusive one-child-per-family policy.

For 20 years, the UNFPA has been a supporter and defender of China's population control program, giving the Chinese Government over \$150 million.

It is a tragedy that some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would even suggest that we should vote to send taxpayer money to support this brutal Chinese program. This is a tragic and wasteful expenditure of U.S. taxpayer money.

Why would we contribute taxpayer money to a program that has been a partner to some of the most heinous population control programs in the world, including incarcerating pregnant women in barracks until they consent to abortions or sterilizations, forcing pregnant women to attend "study sessions" away from their families until they agree to have abortions, and carrying about sterilizations without the consent or knowledge of the women while rendering other medical services?

The worst part of this is that UNFPA is turning a blind eye to these atrocities against the women of China. In fact, UNFPA has publicly praised their forced abortion program in China. UNFPA even provides cover for China's program by calling it voluntary.

This program is anything but voluntary. Here are some horrifying examples. It is reported that Australia has deported at least three pregnant women to China, and one of them was very close to her delivery date. So what happened? Just days before this woman was to give birth, she was forced to have an abortion.

This abuse is beyond tragic. I do not understand how anyone, in good conscience, could support UNFPA while they are funding and actively promoting China's oppressive population control program.

Now, my colleagues will hear our colleagues on the other side of the aisle push for a compromise with the Gilman-Campbell amendment. Do not be fooled.

□ 1930

The Gilman-Campbell amendment is merely an attempt to block an up-or-down vote on this issue, an attempt to block an up-or-down vote on Smith-Barcia. It is window dressing for those who are afraid to admit they are supporting China's policy.

In fact, this amendment proposal was defeated by the House when it was last offered in 1997 and it should be rejected again today. Why do we need to keep going over this again and again?

This is plain and simple. The U.S. already contributes to activities to promote women's health and well-being by contributing to other international organizations and NGOs that work in this field. It is not necessary to finance organizations such as UNFPA which collaborate with programs that violate the fundamental human rights of women and children.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, in a show of our bipartisan strength the Republican side wishes to yield a 2-

minute slot to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY).

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, there is something about the debate on UNFPA up to this point that has been really interesting. The people against UNFPA do not really want to talk about UNFPA. Instead, they want to talk about China and how bad China's policies are. You could never figure from these folks that UNFPA spends less than 2 percent of its worldwide budget in China and is active in only 32 of China's 2,700 counties.

Now, I do not like China's policies on controlling family size, forced abortion or forced sterilization and UNFPA's program in China moves China away from these practices.

I would rather talk about the 98 percent rather than the 2 percent. In Uganda, UNFPA runs programs to eliminate female genital mutilation and reduce the number of mothers who die giving birth. In the Philippines, UNFPA helps women achieve economic empowerment. In Kosovo, UNFPA gave pregnant refugee women thousands of clean delivery kits. They did the same thing in Central America after Hurricane Mitch and in Papua-New Guinea after a tidal wave. In Africa, UNFPA is cooperating with UNICEF and WHO on a pilot initiative in seven countries to prevent mother-to-child transmission of HIV.

This is what UNFPA does. What UNFPA does not do is support or fund abortions. UNFPA does not condone coercion in family planning nor do they support China's one-child policy and they do not support forced sterilization.

If we vote against UNFPA, we will ensure that more mothers will die giving birth, that more children will contract HIV disease and that female genital mutilation will not go away. That cannot be what we want and that is why we have to support UNFPA.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Smith amendment to H.R. 2415, the American Embassy Security Act of 1999, and in support of the Gilman-Campbell substitute amendment. While the Smith amendment claims to protect women from coerced abortions in China, its real effect is to deny poor women around the world access to voluntary family planning. Further, the Smith amendment fails to acknowledge that the United Nations Population Fund does not support abortion as a family planning method, opposes quotas in family planning programs, and works only in counties in China that have abolished such practices.

The Gilman-Campbell substitute amendment, on the other hand, provides the needed funds for millions of women and men around the world who depend on international support for family planning, AIDS prevention, and

approved infant and maternal mortality. Simply put, the lives of poor women around the world are at stake if we should pass the Smith amendment. Poor resources make these women highly vulnerable to death-related delivery practices, sexually-transmitted diseases, and other horrible conditions.

Please support the Campbell-Gilman amendment and let us defeat the Smith amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Smith-Barcia amendment and to oppose the Campbell amendment. This amendment prevents U.S. funding for China's deplorable population control program which includes coercion, forced abortion and forced sterilization for both Chinese men and women.

Women all over China are victimized daily due to their desire to bear children. Let me share with Members a few of the methods used in China's so-called family planning policy that are a matter of record:

Arresting pregnant women and taking them to abortion clinics tied up or in handcuffs; incarcerating pregnant women in barracks until they acquiesce to abortions and/or sterilizations; forcing pregnant women to attend "study sessions" away from their families until they agree to have abortions; carrying out sterilization or abortion without the consent or knowledge of the women while rendering other medical services; crushing the skulls of babies with forceps during delivery or injecting iodine, alcohol or formaldehyde into the soft spots of their tiny heads as they are crowning so that they are born dead; imprisoning husbands until their wives submit to child-killing procedures; cutting off food, electricity, water and wages for couples who refuse to comply with the Chinese government's barbaric policies; confiscating the furniture, livestock and even homes of families who refuse to comply; finally, demolishing the homes of those who refuse to comply, as reportedly occurred in two Catholic villages in the Hepel province.

When Steven Mosher wrote from his research in China, he said this:

From Sandhead Brigade there were 18 women, all 5 to 9 months pregnant, and many red-eyed from lack of sleep and crying. They sat listlessly on short plank benches arranged in a semicircle about the front of the room, where He Kaifeng, a commune cadre and Communist Party member, explained the purpose of the meeting. He said slowly and deliberately, "None of you has any choice in this matter. The two of you who are 8 or 9 months pregnant will have a caesarean; the rest of you will have a shot which will cause you to abort."

In order to return home to their families, the women had to agree to abort their babies no matter how far along their pregnancies were.

This is not family planning. These are outright human rights abuses. I do not believe that this is a pro-life or a

pro-choice issue. It is a human issue. It is a woman's issue. It is a family issue. This is an issue of blatant government abuse and the United States taxpayers should not in any way be a part of it.

Whether you are pro-life or pro-choice, we should agree that China's so-called family planning techniques are inhumane. Their slogan is, this is what China uses to market their campaigns, "Better to have more graves than more than one child."

Mr. Chairman, we cannot stand by claiming that we see no evil, hear no evil as the UNFPA assists the China program, holding it up as an excellent example for other countries. Until the UNFPA stops aiding in the abuse of women in China, we should not fund it.

I urge my colleagues to support the Smith-Barcia amendment.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) control my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN).

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) have done here has been truly on a bipartisan basis.

I was sorry to hear the comments of the gentlewoman from San Francisco (Ms. PELOSI) that seemed to put a partisan tinge on this. This is the Campbell-Frelinghuysen-Gilman-Greenwood-Horn-Houghton-Nancy Johnson-Kelly-Morella-Shays amendment and we tried to match every one of those with a Democratic Member of the House and that has been done. This amendment is truly bipartisan.

When the Chinese Nationalists moved from the mainland to Taiwan in 1949, they established one of the world's most dynamic economies. In the 1960s and the 1970s, there were billboards throughout Taiwan. On those billboards were happy faces and smiles in the family of four of which two were little kids. Then there was the family and maybe six little kids and they had unhappy faces. The government educated the population. They did that with contraception, not abortion.

This is what we are talking about in the Campbell amendment. It is not funds for abortion. It is funds for contraception, not abortion. A wise population policy is sorely needed in this world. Over population is the most serious problem in the world today. There has been a population explosion in Africa, Asia, and the developing nations of Latin America. Without educating their people, those countries will not have a prosperous economy as is the Republic of China on Taiwan. The Taiwanese will have opportunities.

I happen to be particularly interested in the country of Cambodia. There are 50,000 to 60,000 Cambodians in Long Beach, California, where I live. These refugees chose freedom and have opportunity. When I look at what is going on in the homeland which was devastated by the murderous Pol Pot. He killed more than a million of his fellow countrymen. People who live in Cambodia need a population program. Those in this chamber who want to stop an effective United Nations Population Program are just plain wrong. We need these funds for contraception. Women not only in the United States but in developing nations, in Africa, Latin America and South Asia, need those funds. The House should not be shortsighted as we have been too often in this Chamber. If you want to reduce abortions, then encourage contraception and family planning.

How can you not have contraception and let impoverished women be forced to have abortions. Provide family planning and contraception? Then you will not need abortions. Think of the success on Taiwan. That is what other nations must do. Taiwan's success showed that a nation does not need to chew up its economic human resources. Taiwan has provided a good life for most of its people. The people Mr. Campbell's amendment would help do not have a good life. Vote for the Campbell amendment and help thousands of people out of poverty.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

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

The debate is very simple. If you support the work that the United Nations Population Fund is doing around the world to reduce unintended pregnancies and abortions, encourage child spacing and proper nutrition for mothers and babies, and help women deliver healthy babies in high risk areas, then vote for the Campbell amendment. If you support cutting off this critical assistance and leaving women around the world without the resources they need to keep themselves and their babies healthy and strong, then vote for the Smith amendment. It is just that simple.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Campbell-Maloney-Gilman Amendment and in opposition to the Smith Amendment.

This debate is very simple. If you support the work that the United Nations Population Fund is doing around the world to reduce unintended pregnancies and abortions, encourage child spacing and proper nutrition for mothers and babies, and help women deliver healthy babies in high risk areas, then vote for the Campbell Amendment. If you support cutting off this critical assistance and leaving women around the world without the resources they need to keep themselves and their babies healthy and strong, then vote for the Smith Amendment. It's that simple.

The fact is: UNFPA does not support coercive abortion policies in China or anywhere

else. UNFPA only operates in counties in China that have eliminated the use of any coercive family planning measures, and encourages voluntary family planning and the elimination of coercive policies throughout China.

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.

My colleagues, in forty years our planet's population will more than double. As a responsible world leader, the United States must do more to deter the environmental, political, and health consequences of this explosive growth.

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

Mr. Chairman, this vote comes down to one question: Do you support family planning? If you support voluntary family planning to reduce unintended pregnancies and abortions around the world, you *must* vote yes on the Campbell Amendment and no on the Smith Amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Just let me remind the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) regarding his statement earlier, we provide about \$385 million to nongovernmental organizations and governments. Hopefully it will have the Mexico City conditions attached to it. But that money goes for contraception and for family planning. We also provide AIDS money and child survival money. There is an enormous amount of humanitarian aid and I support much of that aid.

Let me also point out, Mr. Chairman, that Amnesty International recently did a report on coercion in China. They pointed out with an absolute, declarative sentence, this is something that many of the human rights groups have pointed out, including the State Department in its Country Reports on Human Rights Practices. Here is Amnesty's statement: "Birth control has been compulsory in China since 1979." There is no right to choice on birth control. That includes, by the Chinese government's definition, abortion. It is estimated that in excess of 10 million abortions are performed in China every year, 90 percent of which are coerced in some way. Brothers and sisters, I say to my colleagues, are illegal in China. It is a one-child-per-couple policy. That is not family planning. That is Big Brother control.

I would hope my colleagues would realize that the means to implementing that just happen to be IUDs, abortion, things that many people in this Chamber, particularly on the other side of this issue, have no problem with. But when it is coerced, when that line of demarcation is crossed and forced abortion, which was properly construed to be a crime against humanity at the Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal, is looked at by the UNFPA year in and year out as being a voluntary program,

that is where we have to draw the line and say, "Wait a minute. The judgment of this organization is suspect." It is a very coercive program. Read the State Department's report. It is replete with examples and statements about how coercive it truly is. And read Amnesty's report. These are human rights organizations that have come out and said it is coercive.

I hope that we can draw the line and withhold this \$20 million because an organization that does this kind of thing does not deserve it.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute and 10 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman very much for yielding me this time. I rise in opposition to the Smith amendment and in support of the Campbell-Gilman-Maloney bipartisan amendment. Frankly I think it is important to emphasize what the United Nations Population Fund really does. The Smith amendment simply prevents it from doing the good work that it does all over the world. That is the important statement that we make today. The UNFPA is the largest internationally funded source of population assistance to developing countries. It is funded through voluntary contributions by 88 member nations.

This is not an isolated group. This is not a group that participates in coercing forced abortions in China. In fact, they stand up against it. Most of their work deals with family planning. Their donors are the United States, Japan, Netherlands, Germany, Norway, Denmark, Sweden, among others. They provide support to 150 countries in Africa, Latin America, the Caribbean, Asia, the Pacific, the Arab states and in Europe. Since 1969, UNFPA has provided almost \$4 billion for voluntary family planning.

□ 1945

Mr. Chairman, I think it is unreasonable to suggest that someone who provides a safe delivery kit is involved in forced and coercive abortions. This is a kit that saves lives, and I would argue very vigorously, Mr. Chairman, that the work of the UNFPA should be supported and this amendment, the Smith amendment, voids what we are trying to do, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to support wholeheartedly the amendment of the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and all others in a bipartisan way to promote family planning.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment offered by Representative CAMPBELL, GILMAN, and MALONEY. This amendment restores funding to the United Nations Population Fund ("UNFPA") but ensures that no U.S. funds will be spent in China. It allows the U.S. to maintain control over the funds it provides to the UNFPA and requires that any funds used for a program in China shall be deducted from the funds made available to the UNFPA.

The UNFPA is the largest internationally funded source of population assistance to developing countries. It is funded through voluntary contributions by 88 member nations. The major donors are the United States, Japan, the Netherlands, Germany, Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Great Britain, Canada, Finland, Switzerland, France, Belgium, Australia and Italy. However, U.S. funding for UNFPA was eliminated for FY 1999.

UNFPA provides support to 150 countries in Africa, Latin America, the Caribbean, Asia and the Pacific, the Arab states in Europe. Since 1969, UNFPA has provided almost \$4 billion for voluntary family planning and reproductive health care. UNFPA does not provide support for abortions or abortion-related activities anywhere in the world.

The services provided by the UNFPA are crucial in developing countries. Each year an estimated 600,000 women die as a result of pregnancy and childbirth where pregnancy and childbirth are among the leading causes of death for women of childbearing age.

For example, this safe delivery kit is provided to women in developing countries. This kit contains a bar of soap, a disposable razor, a surgical blade, two rolls of umbilical tape, plastic sheeting and 12 rolls of gauze bandage. This kit saves the lives of the mother and the child.

Women in these countries must have access to information that will allow them to make informed reproductive health decisions. These decisions can mean the difference between life and death.

We all condemn the human rights abuses conducted by China. Therefore, this amendment requires that U.S. funds contributed to UNFPA be placed under specific restrictions. U.S. funds will be kept in a separate account and may not be commingled with other UNFPA funds. It also deducts dollar for dollar the funds that UNFPA spends in China.

I urge my Colleagues to support this amendment. It restores the U.S. funding to UNFPA on behalf of women around the world. It also places restrictions on UNFPA funding to China. This amendment renews our commitment to save the lives of women around the world.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT).

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, governments in many countries that have experienced rapid growth for nearly two generations are now bursting at the seams and are unable to meet the challenge of providing even the most basic services for their citizens. This is the arena in which the UNFPA works, an arena in which every action has a reaction. In the most extreme cases, population growth along with poverty, ethnic tensions, and the misgovernance has resulted in vile conflict. The UNFPA is one of the most effective means available to address the problems caused by rapid population growth around the world. Its 900 staffers work in more than 150 countries to provide voluntary family planning and reproductive health services. By doing

so, it allows women and men to freely choose to limit the size of their families, and it helps to reduce the number of unintended pregnancies and abortions.

I would like to ask my colleagues to ask themselves a few questions when voting on this, questions like:

Who would do this work if the UNFPA did not?

Where would some countries be without UNFPA?

I know the answers I think of are unsettling, and I am sure many here, when they stop and think about the bigger picture, will come up with their own stark conclusions.

I urge my colleagues to support the Campbell amendment and support funding for UNFPA. And finally let me say in response to my partner in this effort, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) I am disappointed. I would like to point out that both Democrats and Republicans are supportive of family planning; just as, sadly, some Democrats and some Republicans oppose it.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, at least 350 million couples worldwide do not have access to information about family planning and a full range of contraceptives. Each day, 55,000 unsafe abortions take place, 95 percent of them in developing countries.

Unsafe abortions result in nearly 600,000 maternal deaths. It is estimated that the impact of the \$20 million cut off will lead to half a million more unintended pregnancies, 200,000 more abortions, 1,200 maternal deaths, 22,500 infant deaths. And while we are worried about human rights in China, of course, we are, let us worry about what desperate women will do. They will try to induce abortions by inserting objects like sticks and wires and knitting needles into the uterus, drinking harmful or poisonous substances. They will take dangerous doses of over-the-counter medication, douche with poisonous and caustic substances, inflict physical abuse like falling down stairs and blows to the belly and jumping from heights.

This is the kind of violence against women we need to worry about, and we can prevent if we support the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT), my good friend.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Smith-Barcia amendment and in opposition to the Campbell-Gilman amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there have been many efforts to make the Campbell amendment look reasonable and rational and

easy for a cross-section of Members to support. However, this amendment merely masks support for the inhumane treatment of women in China and all around the world. We cannot overlook the horrendous treatment of women because the United Nations Population Fund provides some needed services.

Just recently, the world was confronted with the reality of China's forced abortion policy when a woman who was deported from Australia to China was forced to go to the People's hospital just 10 days before she was due to give birth, and she was forced to undergo a mandatory abortion. Fellow Members of the House, this is totally unacceptable and intolerable, yet the organization we are talking about funding today, the United Nations Population Fund, does not even acknowledge a problem with China's policies. We should not add \$20 million in funding to this organization.

Mr. Chairman, China is not the only place where the United Nations Population Fund is active in implementing questionable and sometimes outrageous policies. Peru's population program has violated the human rights of women by coercing them into sterilization. This may include offering poor women food in exchange for sterilization or pressuring health workers to reach sterilization quotas and women being sterilized without their consent.

The U.N. Population Fund is also active in Vietnam and North Korea which have been credibly accused of coercive practices. They have not only turned a blind eye to forced abortions and sterilizations, but have even given China an award in its population control program.

I believe we must stand up and say this is enough. We should not fund the United Nations Population Fund until the organization has reformed and renounced coercive and abusive policies. The United States of America should not give the United Nations Population Fund \$25 million in taxpayers' money until they stop these practices.

According to the Campbell amendment, we will give 25 million to the United Nations Population Fund, and we will take it away if we can prove that they are involved.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield since he referred to my amendment?

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Can the gentleman kindly point where in my amendment I give any money to the UNFPA?

Mr. DEMINT. As I understand it, the gentleman's amendment does fund.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If the gentleman would continue to yield, the underlying bill funds, and my amendment takes away from that funding dollar for dollar whatever UNFPA spends in China.

Mr. DEMINT. Okay, but it does not address, reclaiming my time, this does not address what this organization is doing around the world, and it does not

send a signal to the organization that we want accountability to this horrendous treatment of women.

We must strike at the heart of the issue, we must do whatever we can to send a message to the world that while we appreciate the good things that this organization does, we expect them to stop this inhumane treatment.

Please join me in sending a clear message to the Chinese, the United Nations, that we do not condone this behavior.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I would like to ask the gentleman from California, in a Dear Colleague dated July 15 signed by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) he points out as a truth UNFPA manages its own program in China.

Does he stand by that statement?

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

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I recognize that the UNFPA arrangement with China yields to China the management of the program within China, and for that reason I do not, in my amendment, give a dime to China.

In fact, if the United Nations spends one dime in China, my amendment takes that dime back from the U.N. so that the United States tax dollars are not going to China.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the point I am trying to make is that in a Dear Colleague that was sent to every Member on the Hill, every House Member, the statement has been made that the UNFPA manages its own program in China. That is demonstrably false.

As I pointed out earlier in this discussion, the United Nations Population Fund on January 7, 1998, assigned by Dr. Sadik what will be the role of the U.S. government or the Chinese government was the question. The answer: The Chinese government at the central and provincial levels would be in charge of coordination in terms of monitoring, guidance, and evaluation. It also points out that the local government; that is, the Chinese government, will be in charge of the actual implementation of project activities at the county level. The UNFPA will not be managing this program, so that it is false and misleading, and I hope Members will take that into consideration.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bipartisan Gilman-Campbell amendment, and I place into the RECORD a letter to the ambassador, the American ambassador at the U.N., outlining UNFPA's policy that states there will be no birth quotas, that all birth quotas are lifted,

and if there is any coercion it will be investigated and the program will be suspended. And also, a letter from the State Planning Commission of China, I would like to have that placed into the RECORD, and I repeat that this debate is not about China. It is about helping the 149 other countries where UNFPA is saving the lives of women giving birth to children and family planning.

The letters referred to are as follows:

UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND,
New York, NY, 7 January 1998.

His Excellency, Mr. BILL RICHARDSON,
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary,
Permanent Representative of the United
States of America to the United Nations,
United States Mission to the United Nations,
New York, NY.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: I am writing to provide you with information in response to the questions and concerns raised by your Government in your letter of 2 December regarding the UNFPA Programme of Assistance to China, which will be presented to the UNDP/UNFPA Executive Board at this month's session.

Your questions with our responses are attached. We hope that this information will answer the queries to your satisfaction. We shall stay in close contact with you and your staff in preparation for the Executive Board, and remain available to answering further questions you may have.

I remain, dear Mr. Ambassador,

Yours sincerely,

NAFIS SADIK,
Under-Secretary-General.

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS RAISED BY U.S. GOVERNMENT ON THE UNFPA PROGRAMME OF ASSISTANCE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA (1998-2000)

1. WHICH COUNTIES WILL BE INCLUDED IN THE PROGRAM? WHAT IS THEIR POPULATION AND HOW DO THEY COMPARE TO NATIONAL AVERAGES IN ICPD THRESHOLD INDICATORS? HOW DID UNFPA ASCERTAIN THE COMMITMENT OF LOCAL AUTHORITIES TO ICPD GOALS AND PRINCIPLES?

Below is a list of the counties to be included under the program. The UNFPA field office in Beijing is in the process of preparing a detailed profile of all 32 counties. The most important input into these profiles, however, will be a baseline study which will be carried out in February 1998 with the technical assistance of an expert from Tulane University, USA. Unfortunately, it was not possible to carry out this baseline survey ahead of time owing to the fact that no UNFPA funding was available to be spent in China in 1996 and 1997. This survey will provide a clear picture of the RH situation prevailing in selected counties.

ICPD indicators, while available nationally are not broken down to the county level. This is because the sources of data are sample surveys which may not be representative at the county level. The counties were selected based on criteria agreed to with the Government: the commitment of local authorities to the projects and to the principles of the ICPD and the availability and commitment to a minimum of counterpart funding toward project activities; the existence of a good working relationship between State Family Planning Commission and the Ministry of Health at the county level; counties were selected where we are optimistic that results can be obtained within the three year time frame. Hence counties that are too poor, too remote, or too lacking in counterpart funding and enlightened leadership were not chosen. For the same reason the selection process also tried to include a cross sec-

tion of counties from different regions of the country.

UNFPA worked with the national Government to ensure that local authorities possessed a commitment to the ICPD, political will and the availability of counterpart resources.

County and province

Fengnin—Hebei.
Luanxian—Hebei.
Wenshui—Shanxi.
Aohanqi—Inner Mongolia.
Guichi—Ahui.
Xuanzho—Ahui.
Jianou—Fujian.
Yushui—Jiangxi.
Dongmi—Shandong.
Xinyang—Henan.
Mengzh—Henan.
Yingsha—Hubei.
Qianjian—Hubei.
Linwu—Hunan.
Youxian—Hunan.
Sihui—Guangdong.
Lipu—Guangxi.
Longan—Guangxi.
Wencha—Hainan.
Bazhong—Sichuan.
Yilong—Sichuan.
Pingba—Guizhou.
Zhenfen—Guizhou.
Xinping—Yunnan.
Xiangyu—Yunnan.
Luonan—Shaanxi.
Xixiang—Shaanxi.
Yuzhong—Gansu.
Datong—Qinghai.
Pingluo—Ningxia.
Kuerle—Xinjiang.
Rongcha—Chongqing.

2. WILL BIRTH QUOTAS REMAIN IN EFFECT IN THESE COUNTIES, AND WILL WOMEN FACE SANCTIONS IF THEY BECOME PREGNANT OR BEAR A CHILD OUTSIDE THE QUOTA?

No birth quotas or targets will be applied in the counties participating in the project. Funds will be released only after the UNFPA field office has received official written commitment from the provincial authorities that quotas and targets have been removed in each of the participating counties.

In the project counties couples will be allowed to have as many children as they want, whenever they want, without requiring birth permits or being subject to quotas; however, they may still be subject to a "social compensation fee" if they decide to have more children than recommended by the policy. State Family Planning Commission has indicated that it is the Government's intention to gradually eliminate incentives and disincentives from the family planning programme.

3. WILL FOREIGN OBSERVERS, INCLUDING NGO'S AND DIPLOMATIC PERSONNEL, HAVE ACCESS TO PROJECT COUNTIES AND TO RELEVANT COUNTY OFFICIALS?

It has been agreed with the Chinese Government that the project will follow all UNFPA procedures for monitoring and evaluation. In addition, the government has agreed that the project counties will be open to monitoring and evaluation visits by foreigners and that county officials would be available to talk to foreign delegations.

As evidence to this openness it should be noted that recently (28 November-3 December 1997) a delegation of foreign diplomats representing 17 countries on the UNFPA Executive Board participated in a field visit to project counties to gain a better understanding of the prevailing situation in the field and of the proposed project activities. The delegation which included 6 ambassadors was composed of representatives from Argentina, Brazil, Canada, the Czech Republic,

France, Ghana, India, Ireland, the Republic of Korea, Libya, Malaysia, Norway, Romania, Tanzania, Thailand, Ukraine and the U.S.A.

4. WHAT PROCEDURES WILL BE IN PLACE TO SEE THAT THERE ARE NO COERCIVE PRACTICES IN THE COUNTIES ASSISTED BY UNFPA?

Frequent and rigorous monitoring visits and activities will be undertaken by UNFPA and independent consultants as part of the project work plan, which includes inter-alia surveying client satisfaction, surveying FP service provider skills, and qualitative and quantitative assessment of progress made under the project.

The first important crucial step is the written commitment of the local Government authorities to the principles of ICPD, and specifically to ensuring that no coercion takes place in the selected counties. As mentioned earlier, no funds will be released until written commitment has been received from each of the local authorities of all the participating Provinces.

5. WHAT WILL BE THE ROLE OF THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT? WHAT WILL BE THE ROLE OF UNFPA?

The Chinese Government at the central and provincial levels will be in charge of co-ordination, internal monitoring, guidance and evaluation, all of which will be conducted in accordance to ICPD principles. The local government will be in charge of the actual implementation of project activities at the county level.

UNFPA's role will include monitoring and evaluation at the county level (as discussed above).

The projects will be executed by UN agencies and international NGOs.

6. WHAT PROCEDURES WOULD UNFPA FOLLOW AND WHAT RECOURSE IS AVAILABLE IF PHYSICAL, PSYCHOLOGICAL OR ECONOMIC COERCION IS REPORTED IN PROJECT AREAS? UNDER WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES WOULD UNFPA CONSIDER TERMINATION OF ALL OR PART OF ITS PROGRAM?

If UNFPA finds that there have been violations of the project guidelines in any county UNFPA will suspend operations of the project activities until the situation has been corrected.

If the situation is not corrected it will be reported to the Executive Board.

THE STATE FAMILY PLANNING
COMMISSION OF CHINA,
Beijing, June 30, 1998.

Dr. NAFIS SADIK,
Executive Director, United Nations Population
Fund, New York, USA.

DEAR DR. SADIK. It has been a great pleasure to meet with you last March during the High Level Meeting in Bangkok convened by ICOMP in cooperation with UNFPA. As you have been informed the orientation meeting for the project on RH/FP was held in April of this year. The more than 160 participants to the meeting include government officials from the State Family Planning Commission (SFPC), the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Cooperation (MOFTEC), Ministry of Health (MOH), relevant provinces, prefectures and counties as well as project managers, consultants and representatives from NGOs. Mr. Sven Burmester, UNFPA representative in Beijing also addressed the meeting.

Agenda items of the meeting comprise the principles of ICPD-POA, project objectives and activities, strengths and challenges in achieving the project objectives as well as project implementation plan. An outcome of the meeting is the consensus on how to implement the project. Following the meeting, the project counties have made considerable preparatory work for the project: the setting

up of project leading groups headed by county governors or their deputies, drafting of tentative work plans and even county-level project orientation meetings in some cases.

Following the ICPD, in the light of ICPD-POA, and China's national reality and drawing on both China and other countries' experiences, the Chinese government has made some new decisions and initiatives in implementing its population and family planning program. In 1995, SFPC announced that the approach and practice of the family planning program will undergo two transformations. In the same year, China's State Council organized a national meeting to promote the integrated approach for the family planning program. With a view to meeting the need of the public on reproductive health and family planning, a pilot project on quality service was initiated by SFPC in 11 counties, and approaches of informed choice of contraceptive methods are widely promoted across the country. With still 50 million impoverished population in the country, SFPC, in cooperation with other ministries and departments, conducted activities which integrate family planning with poverty alleviation, aiming at helping rural women in income generation and thus improving their status. Welcomed by the local people, these efforts have also created favorable conditions and beneficial experiences for the implementation of the project.

After the orientation meeting, the project counties reaffirmed their commitment to implementing the project in the light of ICPD-POA, their local characteristics and with a view of drawing on both domestic and foreign experiences. The project counties promise to adopt an integrated approach: one that will combine the promotion of family planning with economic development, universal education, improvement of women's status and provision of quality FP/RH services, and ensure that implementation of the project is not in the form of imposing birth quotas and acceptor targets on FP providers. While the counties are fully aware that they will be facing various challenges in the implementation of the project, they have expressed their confidence in the project's success, believing that the project objectives are in conformity with that of China's reproductive health and family planning program. Besides, China's post-ICPD experiences in its reproductive health and family planning program have also laid the required foundation for the implementation of the project.

I am very pleased to learn that the project document has been finalized between the Government and UNFPA Beijing Office and sent to the headquarters for approval. In the meantime, we very much hope that the headquarters will speed up the process to review and approve the project document so as to ensure the achievement of the project objectives within the limited project period. It is my belief that a good implementation of the project will greatly facilitate the fulfillment of the objectives set in ICPD-POA in China—a country which is home to nearly a quarter of the world's population and step up China's reproductive health and family planning program. It is also the hope of both myself and my colleagues that you yourself could come and visit some of the project counties after the project starts.

With my best wishes,
Yours sincerely,

LI HONGGUI,
Vice Minister.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the bipartisan Campbell-Maloney-Gilman amendment to restore funding to the United Nations Population Fund and in opposition to the Smith amendment. And in response to the most recent speaker on the other side, I think it is important to underscore once again the Campbell amendment provides no family planning money to China, it provides no family planning money for abortions. International family planning assistance is essential though in addressing two of the greatest challenges that face the developing world, providing better health care to women and reducing the rate of child mortality.

That is what we ought to be focusing on here tonight. Over 585,000 women a year die from complications due to pregnancy and childbirth. UNFPA extends prenatal and postnatal care and counseling, increasing the chance for survival for Third World children and their mothers. By simply teaching women to space their children 2 years apart, the UNFPA helps increase the survival rate for these children by almost 30 percent.

U.S. contributions to UNFPA also help prevent abortions, and we seem in some danger of losing sight of that tonight. I presume we all share that goal. Continuing to withhold U.S. funding for UNFPA will contribute to an estimated 500,000 unplanned pregnancies. That means abortions, perhaps 200,000 more abortions it has been estimated, as well as 1,200 maternal deaths, and 22,500 infant deaths. Studies show a clear link between the introduction of family planning services in Mexico, Columbia, Hungary, Russia, central Asian republics and a decline in the number of abortions.

With this one vote, Mr. Chairman, we can help improve women's health, we can decrease child mortality, we can dramatically reduce the number of abortions worldwide. The United States cannot fail to meet these responsibilities. I urge a "yes" vote on the Gilman-Campbell-Maloney amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and allowing me to participate in this debate. And I continue to wonder, if my colleagues do not support abortions, why would they oppose family planning? And when they oppose family planning, what it says to me is they want more abortions, because that is the direct outcome.

And I also wonder why so many men stand up and do not want women to have knowledge about family planning, particularly in poor countries where they need it the most. I wonder what is humane about that? What is loving, what is kind about that? I am embarrassed by the opposition of so many to allow women to have family planning

information. I support the measly \$25 million that we would provide to the United Nations Population Fund, and I regretfully support the Campbell-Maloney-Gilman-Crowley amendment of which I am cosponsor, which says that any money for family planning that goes to China would be deducted, so the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) cannot continue to make these false charges. There is no U.S. money going to China because we deduct it, and that is the bottom line.

I support family planning because I am concerned about the projected growth of 800 million new people from 1990 to 2000, and projections of another 800 million new people from 2000 to 2010, and I wonder what this world is going to be like with so much poverty and death.

□ 2000

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Maloney-Campbell-Gilman amendment and in opposition to the Smith amendment. I think it is very important that we get back to the facts here.

As has been pointed out, the funding that we are talking about tonight goes into maternal and child health services and devices. This includes family planning; it includes birth control devices. These are exactly the types of tools that we need to put in the hands of men and women, particularly in our developing countries, who are seeking to improve the lives of themselves and their families and to better their own countries. There are many men and women in these countries who are struggling to support their families, and we should be encouraging them to engage in responsible family planning.

Now, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) has expressed a multitude of concerns about practices in China. I think it is fair to say here that every Member of Congress standing here tonight deplores those activities. But it is also very clear and should be beyond dispute that there is not a single dollar proposed to go to China and to endorse any of those practices and, instead, will go to other countries.

I urge adoption of the Campbell-Gilman-Maloney amendment.

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

I respect the previous speaker very much, and when he says every Member deplores what is going on in China, I believe that. The problem is the UNFPA does not deplore it. They have been fronting and whitewashing crimes against women for 20 years and they continue to do so. It speaks volumes of an organization when it says there is no coercion, when every human rights group and every Member of Congress says that there is.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes 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 very strong support of the bipartisan Gilman - Campbell - Greenwood - Porter - Horn - Johnson - Kelly - Morella - Shays - Boehlert amendment, and I thank the ranking member, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) for his leadership.

Our amendment has deep and strong bipartisan support. What it says is that we want to do something to help women and the 149 countries receive maternal health care and child health care. Over 500,000 women die in child-birth each year. That is equivalent to one or two jumbo jets crashing every day. When there is just one crash, it is headline news for weeks; but the slow toll on women around the world is hardly on our radar screen.

It is about giving out safe delivery kits as were handed out to the women refugees in Kosovo. These are handed out to poor women and children, and it saves lives. It is health care.

Mr. Chairman, 179 countries support UNFPA. Let me tell my colleagues what it is not about. It is not about China; no money goes to China. And it is not about abortions, because no family planning money can be spent for abortions. If we continue the UNFPA cutoff, it will not hurt China. What it will hurt are women and children and lead to more abortions in the other 149 countries in which UNFPA works. It is about saving lives; it is about health care.

There is a solution to the suffering, and that is family planning support. Support the Gilman-Campbell amendment, cosponsored by many, many others of our colleagues. I thank the deep, bipartisan coalition that has worked to correct the action of our country cutting off funds when 179 other countries have supported that effort.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD at this time documentation in support of my position.

[From the New York Times, July 15, 1999]
VOTE TODAY TO SUPPORT MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH—FAMILY PLANNING UNDER FIRE

SUPPORT THE GILMAN-CAMPBELL-MALONEY-CROWLEY AMENDMENT TO STATE DEPARTMENT REAUTHORIZATION

(Submitted by Carolyn B. Maloney, Member of Congress)

Last year Congress disgracefully cut off funding to the United Nations Population Fund, an agency that supports voluntary family planning services, maternal and child health initiatives, and AIDS and sexually transmitted disease prevention programs in 150 countries. In April the House International Relations Committee wisely voted to restore \$25 million for the program in 2000. A House vote on the State Department authorization bill containing that contribution is expected today.

Once again, however, this worthy program is under attack by anti-abortion forces. The Population Fund does not provide or pay for abortion services in any country, and can actually reduce the need for abortions. Yet Representative Christopher Smith, a fervent abortion opponent, is expected to offer an

amendment to block funds for the program. He and others have argued that the United States should contribute no money to the agency unless it ceases all family planning activities in China.

This is senseless, because the fund's pilot project in China is actually designed to end coercive population policies. Under the program, the Chinese authorities have agreed to abandon quotas like the one-child policy in 32 areas covered by the pilot project, and adopt instead new strategies to slow birth rates, such as better contraception, health care and expanded economic opportunities for women.

Even so, as a tactical move, the program's supporters have agreed to deduct any amount the Population Fund spends in China, which is expected to be \$5 million a year, from the \$25 million United States contributions. The House now has no excuse for not financing family planning efforts that can improve the lives of women all over the world.

[From the Des Moines Register, May 28, 1999]
DEFUSING THE POPULATION BOMB—BALANCE IS WITHIN GLOBAL REACH WITH ENOUGH UNSELFISH HELP

It took 1,900 years from the birth of Christ to the dawning of the 20th century for the world's human population to reach 2 billion. In a single century since, it will have tripled. The 6-billion mark will be reached this October. An additional billion should be on hand by about 2014.

The good news is that life expectancy at birth has increased by two-thirds in this century, as more infants survive their first year. Further, while the population boom continues, it has been slowed by family-planning efforts. Not one industrialized country has a fertility rate higher than the replacement level, according to the Population Reference Bureau. The bad news is that, in the underdeveloped areas, the slowing of population growth is due to a rising death rate. Over-taxing the environment increases scarcities of basic necessities, and could accelerate that increase.

The world is running out of water to drink or use to grow crops. Eight percent of the world's population faces chronic water shortages, according to the United States Agency for International Development, and by 2025, more than one-third will face that danger. Hunger now kills 6 million a year. Water shortages could reduce the grain harvest in India, where already more than half of all children are malnourished.

The developed world, meanwhile, is reproducing responsibly. Americans have achieved stability with a 2.0 fertility rate (two children per woman). Our swelling population results from immigration. Europe's fertility rate stands at 1.4. Asia and Latin America show remarkable declines in the past 50 years, from 5.9 to 2.8 in Asia, 5.9 to 3.0 in Latin America. But in Africa, the rate has fallen only from 6.6 to 5.6. And where efforts to control population fail, starvation and disease move in. World Watch Institute says the HIV virus is reversing gains made in life expectancy in Africa. Since 1990, life expectancy in Botswana has dropped from 62 years to 44.

It means we have a very long way to go to find a healthy population balance.

The most hopeful note in the population statistics is that 50 percent of the world's married women of childbearing age now practice family planning, compared to fewer than 10 percent just 30 years ago. The tragedy is that the percentage isn't far higher than 50 percent.

As the Population Reference Bureau notes, the decline in childbearing was "brought

about by investments in family planning and other health programs, in education, and in greater social and economic opportunities, especially for women." Control of their childbearing means greater health and opportunity for both them and their children.

The greatest accomplishment mankind could muster in the coming century would be a guarantee that all of its newborns, everywhere on the globe, enter the world with a decent chance at a decent life. With unselfish help from the industrialized nations, it is within our reach.

[From the Houston Chronicle, July 7, 1999]
POPULATION FUNDING WILL HELP TO PREVENT
ABORTIONS

As the century prepares to close, the world's population is shooting inexorably toward the 6 billion mark and will surpass it later this year. One billion will be teenagers moving into their reproductive years, and the population explosion can reasonably be expected to continue increasing exponentially.

This means a number of problems around the world, including simply meeting the needs of education and jobs and the need for family planning. World population has doubled since 1950. What effect will it have on the environment, waste disposal and immigration when it reaches 15 billion or more?

The United Nations Population Fund, which plays a critical role for millions of women and their families, has been made a scapegoat in this country in recent years, with U.S. funding for the UNPF caught up in a clash of ideologies that is more about political grandstanding than about dealing with the real issues and solutions to explosive population growth.

In 1994 a program of action was adopted at the International Conference on Population and Development, of which the United States was a major architect. Five years after its inception, significant progress can be cited in nations where the plan is in place. But the greatest obstacles, say supporters, have been a lack of financial resources and the unfulfilled commitment of donor nations such as the United States. Congress, under the false impression that tax money would be paying for abortions, defunded the U.S. commitment last September.

Earlier this year, the U.S. House International Relations Committee took the first step in reversing this mistake when it voted to restore funding. In the coming days, the full House is expected to vote on that measure contained in the State Department Authorization (HR 1211). Some in the House, however, are threatening to strip this provision from the funding legislation. That would be a very shortsighted and misguided move.

The sad irony is that the population program would actually do far more in the way of family planning and the prevention of unwanted pregnancies and abortions than its critics are willing to admit. If the motivation for opposition to this measure is truly to halt abortions, then those who would kill it are actually doing the legislative equivalent of throwing gasoline onto a fire.

Members of the Texas congressional delegation will shortly have an opportunity to do the right thing by leaving the funding intact. Or they may opt to take the low road and exacerbate the problem they claim they are trying to solve.

We hope they choose the former over the cynical political grandstanding and rhetorical sleight of hand.

[From the Star, June 16, 1999]
WORLD POPULATION

The House of Representatives soon should consider renewal of funding for the United

Nations Fund for Population Activities. That is always a difficult issue in Congress, where last fall the House voted against this program as part of the omnibus budget resolution.

Family-planning assistance through the United Nations fund is one of the most important foreign assistance programs Congress considers because it contributes to universal access to family planning, prenatal care and reproductive disease services around the globe.

Support for the \$17 billion per year commitment to population spending has been dwindling, particularly in this country that formerly was a leader in international family planning.

Partly because of questions over paying for abortions in China, Congress has capped spending for international family planning at 70 percent of its 1995 level. However, the legislation to be considered by the House would authorize \$25 million in each of the next two fiscal years to the United Nations fund as long as certain conditions are met. Among them: None of the U.S. money would go to China and U.S. funds would not be mixed with other United Nations funds.

Further, the United Nations would have to meet other restrictions in regards to its spending in China or the United States could reduce its contributions. These conditions should satisfy critics.

World population growth is slowing, but it is problematic in developing nations. This year the world reaches 6 billion people. In another 14 years, the number is expected to rise to 7 billion, a total that could be reached faster depending on regional birth rates, the effect of AIDS, longer life expectancies and family-planning programs.

The United States plays a pivotal role, particularly in leading other developed nations, in slowing population growth. Congress should reauthorize effective programs through the United Nations fund.

[From the Courier-Journal, July 5, 1999]
UN POPULATION EFFORTS NEED OUR HOUSE
MEMBERS' VOTES

Five years after the United Nations Population Fund's historic Cairo conference, there's still no consensus on issues such as abortion, family planning and sex education. As a result, final agreement on an action plan was still being blocked at the UN last week by a group of small nations mostly Catholic and Muslim and including the likes of Libya and Sudan.

The good news is that population growth has, in fact, slowed in many places, thanks in part to the UN's efforts. But one big obstacle to more progress has been money. In a week or so, the U.S. House of Representatives will be able to do something about that, by restoring funds for the UN population program to the Foreign Relations Authorization Act.

Supporters fear that, if past attitudes are indicative, GOP members from this area will say no. But they hope that two new Democrats—Ken Lucas of Kentucky and Baron Hill of Southern Indiana—will say yes. We hope so, too.

The Cairo conference produced surprising agreement among disparate people: the Pope, Vice President Al Gore, leaders of Christian and Islamic countries, feminists, greens, scientists, prophets of doom, and condom salesmen. The abortion issue stymied unanimity, but there was broad commitment to more family planning, more education, and more effort to improve women's and children's health.

Sometime this fall, the world's population will reach 6 billion, one-sixth of them teenagers entering their reproductive years. But,

thanks to efforts by governments, charities and the UN, there's still a chance to hold the total to something like 9.8 billion by 2050. Mexico is showing how it can be done.

Earlier this month, New York Times reporter Sam Dillon described the spectacular drop in Mexico's birth rate, from seven children per woman in 1965 to 2.5 today. That decline has produced what population experts call a demographic bonus—what Dillon described as "the opportunity to generate higher savings rates and domestic investments that can bring rapid development, if the bonus is managed shrewdly."

Such progress is crucial for a country that already can't supply jobs for the 1.3 million new workers who enter the job market each year. It's also important north of the border. Economic troubles have pushed the yearly total of workers leaving Mexico for the United States from 27,000 in the 1960s to more than 277,000 now.

Mexico's record is being duplicated, sometimes exceeded, around the world, especially in Latin America. But more could have been accomplished had it not been for the hundreds of millions in cuts imposed on overseas family planning by the GOP Congress, which defunded the U.N. effort last September.

Democratic Reps. Lucas and Hill may have conservatives in their districts pushing for a "no" vote, but they won't be under the same pressure as their GOP colleagues to oppose renewal of appropriations for the United Nations Population Fund.

They can do the right thing. And their GOP colleagues always have the option of surprising everyone by casting sensible, humane votes.

[From the San Francisco Examiner, July 9, 1999]

REPRODUCTION ERROR—CONGRESSIONAL CONSERVATIVES PERSIST IN THEIR MISTAKEN NOTION THAT GLOBAL FAMILY PLANNING EFFORTS DON'T DESERVE U.S. MONEY

Ample reasons exist to continue the worldwide fight to control population. Survival is the first, but quality of life is an important byproduct. Still, the battle expected this summer in the U.S. Congress will be over whether managing the Earth's population is a goal worthy to pursue.

Capitol Hill, unfortunately, is where domestic politics and notions of morality get mixed up with sound public policy and good science. The Hill also is where this country will soon decide whether to support the United Nations Population Fund. Congress' action will occur shortly before the world's population is predicted to top 6 billion (as soon as late July). Last year, Congress nixed \$25 million for the U.N. office.

The controversy is created by a misperception. Some congressional conservatives are confused about international family planning efforts. By law, the United States cannot provide funds for abortions overseas, but the religious right carries the debate further. It argues that the U.S. should not give funds for other family planning activities to an organization that also provides abortions or even just abortion counseling. Its bizarre reasoning is that U.S. support will allow those organizations to shift money into promoting abortion.

There's no evidence of that. But there's plenty of evidence that denying women birth control information creates more abortions, more unwanted babies and more misery. Where's the compassion in these Capitol Hill conservatives?

Experts say the world adds 78 million people a year, or the equivalent of San Francisco's population every three days.

The prospect of overpopulation ought to worry everyone. As the Earth's resources become more and more strained, the misery

won't be confined to Third World women denied facts or contraception. Hardship will intrude into middle class neighborhoods, country clubs and even onto the floor of the House of Representatives.

Full funding of U.N. population efforts constitutes common sense.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to announce the remaining time.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) has 6 minutes remaining; the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) has 2 minutes remaining; and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) will have the right to close.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is what the bill says. The bill gives \$25 million to the United Nations Family Planning Agency and it says, no money for abortions. This is what the bill does. It says money from the U.S. taxpayer cannot go for abortion. It also says money from the U.S. taxpayer cannot go to China. That is what the bill says, the underlying bill. No money for abortion; no money for China.

Our good friend from New Jersey says, but this is not enough, because the United Nations might give some money of its own, some other people's money to China. So what the gentleman from New Jersey does is punish every other country on earth that might receive help from the United Nations Family Planning Agency.

I have been to sub-Saharan Africa almost every break that I can over the last 5 years. Zimbabwe is facing 1 million orphans from AIDS. My colleagues heard about Uganda and its female genital mutilation. These are deep and important problems that are helped by U.N. family planning.

Why can we not help some other way? Because the Brook amendment bars the United States assisting a country if that country has defaulted on its debts, and the truth is sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America have largely defaulted on their debts, so there is no other way that we can assist people in need in Africa, in India, in Bangladesh, in South America. Why would we punish them to make a statement, just to make a statement?

We are not seeing any assistance to China under the bill. My amendment says if the U.N. gives one dollar to China, we take a dollar back from what the United States gives to the U.N. My amendment does not add a dime; it takes away money in order to be sure that the China issue does not control this debate.

Mr. Chairman, I have been at pains to explain this. If colleagues think it is the same vote as last year, it is not. The Mexico City issue is not in this. What is in this bill is compassion for the people of Africa, South America, and Asia. I ask for a "yes" vote on the Maloney-Campbell amendment.

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

First of all, I believe and I hope the House will believe and vote that the Campbell amendment trivializes forced abortion and coercive population control. The Amnesty International report made it very clear that birth control, and I quote again, "has been compulsory since 1979." Get this, this is right out of the report: "Women must have official permission to bear children." The government has to tell them when and if, by issuing, as the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) pointed out earlier, these coupons, these certificates that say that you can have a child. Who is the Chinese government to say that? And then the UNFPA comes in and says it is a voluntary program. It is anything but a voluntary program.

Let me also point out, again from Amnesty International's reporting, that what happens in China constitutes cruel, inhumane, and degrading treatment of detainees and restricted persons by government officials. They hold women. They put them into cells until they have their abortions. This is outrageous, and the UNFPA has given its good housekeeping stamp of approval year in and year out to this egregious practice.

Mr. Chairman, the supporters of the Campbell amendment, which is really a killer amendment, have made some arguments tonight. I would respectfully submit they are wrong, and most of them are internally contradictory. First, they argue that the UNFPA program in China is a force for good, that it helps the women and children in China and not the brutal PRC program of population control.

But here is what Wei Jingsheng, the great Chinese democracy advocate, had to say about that argument, and I quote: "When the United Nations gave the Chinese government its population control award, the Chinese people were flabbergasted. UNFPA," he goes on to say, "extended extensive help to the Chinese Communist Government. By doing that, it has set itself on the opposite side of the Chinese people."

That is Wei Jingsheng talking, not CHRIS SMITH or the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) or the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE). That is the leading democracy activist who spent years in the laogai because of his beliefs. UNFPA's argument that they are not involved in the coercive aspects of the Chinese program, that just by being there they might make it more free and voluntary, is exactly what they argued in 1986 when the UNFPA supporters sued the Reagan administration for finding that the UNFPA, and I quote, "supports or participates in the management of a program of coercive abortion."

Here is what Judge Abner Mikva, who later became President Clinton's White House counsel, had to say. He and two other judges found that AID's, and I quote, "careful explanation of how the UNFPA's activities in China aid the aspects of China's program that

Congress condemned amply supports his conclusion that funding UNFPA is prohibited."

In other words, Judge Mikva, again he was the counsel for the White House and he was a judge, upheld the determination that UNFPA supports or participates in the management of a program of coercive abortion.

The second argument made by supporters is that UNFPA is not about forced abortion. It is about opposing female genital mutilation and other violations of rights of women and children.

Mr. Chairman, this is an argument born of desperation. UNFPA is trying to reinvent itself in order to deflect attention from the real issue of UNFPA's complicity in the Chinese forced abortion program.

Mr. Chairman, when this argument started to surface, I asked my staff to find out how much the UNFPA spends on female genital mutilation. But despite repeated inquiries by my staff and other congressional staff, they absolutely refuse to give us any statistics on what, if anything, it has spent on anti-FGM projects.

The only mention of FGM in UNFPA's 1998 annual report is a single sentence describing the efforts of a super model who serves as a volunteer public relations worker for the UNFPA. The budget document that accompanied the report contained not a single mention of FGM.

Dozens, I would point out to my colleagues, of international organizations and NGOs do work on female genital mutilation and other good works as well. We must help those organizations, but we do not need to fight this evil by giving millions of dollars to an organization that collaborates with an equally egregious evil.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, look at what the Campbell amendment would actually do. Contrary to the claims of some of its supporters, it is not really a cutting amendment. Let us dispense with that. It starts out by increasing UNFPA's funding from zero, which is what is in the fiscal year 1999 budget, to \$25 million; then it reduces the increase by \$5 million. So the net effect is that if their amendment passes, it would give the UNFPA \$20 million more next year. It cries crocodile tears over the victims of Chinese forced abortion, but its net effect is to give a \$20 million reward to the principal international collaborator with that program.

Mr. Chairman, if someone proposed that we give millions of dollars to an organization that actively assisted in the management of a prison program in which prisoners were routinely tortured, what would we do? Would we say fine, you can have \$25 million, but first we are going to subtract \$5 million because that is what you actually contributed to the torture program? No, Mr. Chairman.

I believe we would cut off that organization without a dime. We would

want to disassociate ourselves completely from the torturers and their accomplices. But even more important, we would want to impose a severe punishment, and more importantly, a deterrent against possible collaboration in a program that included torture, because we want to put an end to torture. And the way to stop a bad practice, I would submit, whether it be torture or genocide or, in this case, forced abortion, is not to give \$20 million to its collaborators. Vote "no" on the Campbell amendment and "yes" on Smith-Barcia.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

I rise in strong support of the United Nations Population Fund and in firm opposition to the Smith amendment.

The United Nations Population Fund provides basic information on family planning. It is just that simple. It targets families in developing countries who otherwise would have to go without basic services such as prenatal and postnatal care. This United Nations program is also leading the charge in confronting the AIDS epidemic in Africa by working to prevent mother-to-child transmission of the AIDS virus. These types of infections account for roughly a third of new HIV infections.

This program should be commended and not burdened with the irrelevant restrictions on China as found in the Smith amendment which will deprive women in dire economic and personal circumstances from receiving the essential family planning that this program provides. A vote for the Smith amendment is a vote against the thousands of refugees who are women in the Balkans who have received kits which help to prevent the infections and diseases associated with giving birth and in unsanitary conditions.

□ 2015

Furthermore, we should not accept the fact that an estimated 1,200 additional women and 22,500 infants are projected to die if this House refuses to support the Nation's Population Fund. That would be immoral. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Smith amendment and for the Campbell - Maloney - Gilman - Crowley - Greenwood amendment for responsible family planning.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, if we are serious about reducing the number of abortions and improving the health and welfare of women and children around the world, then the U.S. must continue to contribute to the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA).

UNFPA works in more than 150 countries in the poorest regions of the world providing family planning services, maternal and child health care, and the prevention and treatment of sexually transmitted diseases. Cutting off the U.S. contribution to UNFPA only penalizes the more than 870,000 women who depend on this program for quality, safe, preventive and voluntary family planning services. Instead of

preventing abortions, the loss of \$25 million in funds will actually cause 500,000 additional unplanned pregnancies, more than 200,000 abortions, 1,200 more maternal deaths, and 22,500 infant deaths. When women are unable to control the number and timing of births, they may have no choice but to seek an unsafe and illegal abortion. Each year, 75,000 women in developing countries die from such abortions, many of which are self-induced. By denying women birth control information, we only create more abortions and more unwanted babies.

Contrary to popular myth, UNFPA does not support or promote abortion as a method of family planning. It does not support or promote China's population. In fact, the UNFPA program in China explicitly prohibits coercive practices and forced abortions. What UNFPA does do is support the right of women and families everywhere to make free and responsible decisions about the number and spacing of their children. It does assist women and men to deliver healthy babies in safe and sterile conditions and to protect and promote their health.

This debate is not about China. This debate is about empowering people across the globe so that they can plan both their families and their lives instead of forcing them to accept illness and poverty as a way of life. If we are to be a compassionate nation, then the U.S. must work to improve the lives and health of women all over the world and contribute to UNFPA.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, we are all concerned about protecting the health of women and children, not only in the United States, but around the world. No one in this chamber wants to see more abortions performed or more women forced into sterilization. Unfortunately, there are cases around the world, including China, where these kinds of actions take place. And, unfortunately, the United Nations Population Fund is doing little to end these abuses. We need to send a strong message to the UNFPA that until they stop supporting China and its brutal one-child abortion policy, we will not support their efforts.

At first glance, the Campbell substitute appears to be very similar to ours and even appears to achieve the same goal. We all agree that China is still involved in forced abortion and involuntary sterilization and we all agree that the UNFPA is doing nothing to discontinue this policy. We all agree that their actions and treatment of their citizens are horrific. That is why the Campbell Amendment decreases funding for the UNFPA, but our amendment goes a step further and will prohibit funding unless the President certifies that the UNFPA has either ceased its activities in the People's Republic of China or China stops using coerced abortion in the enforcement of its population control program.

Mr. Chairman, the China policy is a violation of a most basic right, the right to life. The Campbell amendment is a simple slap on the wrist and does not address the underlying problem of a violation of basic human rights. I urge my colleagues to vote for the Smith-Barcia amendment and oppose the Campbell amendment.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Gilman/Maloney/Crowley amendment to HR 2415. We shouldn't jeopardize international family planning efforts because of legitimate concerns about China's family plan-

ning policies. We are all against forced abortion. It is wrong, and must be unequivocally condemned. But that is not the issue here today.

The issue here is: do we empower women and families across the globe with the ability to plan for the number of children they can have, or do we pull the rug out under these important efforts. For me, the choice is clear. We must continue to work to give every woman the right and educated choices necessary to plan the size of her own family, free of any coercion.

I believe that opponents of international family planning efforts are using the issue of forced abortion as a stalking horse for an attack on our support of the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA). UNFPA funding has nothing to do with Chinese government policy on abortion. First of all, none of the funds that we give to the UNFPA are used in China. Not one cent of US contributions can be used in China. Secondly, the UNFPA does not support abortion in any of its work in China or anywhere else. Its program is specifically based on the premise that abortion is not a method of family planning. And thirdly, the UNFPA program is fully voluntary. Women choose to participate in the program without coercion.

Family planning is the best tool to eliminate unplanned pregnancies across the world. Better family planning means fewer abortions—something that pro-choice and pro-life groups can all support. The UNFPA works in 149 countries. Cutting off US funds will lead to more abortions, not less.

Let's work together to reduce the number of abortions. Let's join to support this amendment to help ensure that all women across the globe can receive access to voluntary family planning and allow them to control their own destiny.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my support for the vital work of the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) and to urge my colleagues to oppose the Smith-Barcia amendment and support the Campbell/Malone/Gilman/Crowley amendment.

The UNFPA provides essential primary health services to women in 150 developing countries. It supports the right of couples and individuals to decide freely and responsibly the number and spacing of their children and to have the information and means to do so free of discrimination, coercion, or violence. UNFPA relies on voluntary contributions of member states to provide women and men with access to safe, effective, affordable, and voluntary contraceptive methods of their choice, as well as access to health care for safe pregnancy and childbirth. UNFPA does not support or fund abortion; rather it works to prevent abortion by providing effective family planning services.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of the Campbell/Gilman amendment to restore funding to the United Nations Population Fund.

H.R. 2415 provides \$25 million for UNFPA, the world's largest organization providing family planning services to 150 countries in the poorest regions of the world. Restoring U.S. funding will help hundreds of thousands of women around the world gain access to family planning services.

Five years ago, the U.N. set out a new approach to the complex problem of population

control. This new approach emphasized improving the lives of women, improving the economic well-being of communities and women, and safeguarding the environment. This effort is called the United Nations Funding Program of Action (UNFPA) and is coordinated through the United Nations Population Fund (UNFP). The United States and other western nations pledged to share the annual \$17 billion cost, but the Action Plan has struggled to secure those funds since the beginning.

UNFPA provides reproductive health services, education of women and girls, involvement of men in family planning, education on HIV and AIDS, help with community-based sustainable development, and environmental awareness programs. In Latin America, the program is credited with dramatically reducing fertility rates.

The provision in H.R. 2415 balances the critical public health need for U.S. support for UNFPA and the human rights need to address concerns about coercive reproductive health practices in China. Although there are legitimate concerns about China's family planning program, the UNFPA program in China explicitly prohibits coercion and works to promote voluntary family planning.

Withholding UNFPA funds has serious consequences: it increases the worldwide unmet need for family planning services; deprives approximately 870,000 women of access to effective modern contraception; results in 500,000 unintended pregnancies; results in 234,000 births; results in 200,000 abortions; and results in thousands of preventable maternal and child deaths. In brief, it endangers the health and welfare of women and children and their families.

I urge my colleagues to support the Campbell/Gilman amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment offered by Mr. SMITH. This amendment prohibits a contribution to the United Nations Population Fund ("UNFPA") unless it ceases all activity in China. This amendment unfairly prohibits funding for reproductive health care and family planning services in developing countries.

While we all condemn the human rights practices in the People's Republic of China, we should not penalize the rest of the world by withholding this funding.

The UNFPA provides essential family planning and reproductive health care services to women in developing countries. All women should have access to quality reproductive health care. Family planning services are an important part of reproductive health care.

Each year an estimated 600,000 women die as a result of pregnancy and childbirth in developing countries. In these countries, pregnancy and childbirth are among the leading causes of death for women of childbearing age.

Women in these countries must have access to information that will allow them to make informed reproductive health decisions. These decisions can mean the difference between life and death. UNFPA funding puts this information in those communities.

The choice between saving millions of women around the world and punishing the government of China is clear. No one condones the coercive practices of the Chinese government in terms of family planning. But, none of us can condone keeping women around the world in the dark about their reproductive health needs.

I urge my Colleagues to vote against this amendment. Women around the world must have access to information that will ensure that their children will be born into a loving and stable environment.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Smith amendment as written and in strong support of the Campbell, Maloney, Gilman, Crowley, Greenwood amendment. The Campbell, Maloney, Gilman, Crowley, Greenwood amendment clarifies once and for all, the purpose of the United Nations Population Fund which is not to provide abortion services for women in foreign lands, but rather to provide basic reproductive health care to women which reduces the number of abortions and provide pediatric health care for infants. It also clarifies that no U.S. funds will be used in China.

The UNFPA has been portrayed by its opponents as a vestige of American imperialism bearing down on countries that are struggling to keep their nations free of the evils of abortion and aiding countries like China with a proven record of coerced abortion. The Smith amendment supports this portrayal by cutting all funding in the bill for UNFPA unless it complies with impossible demands.

What this position fails so poorly to report is that international family planning programs supported and originally intimated by the United States have nothing to do with abortion except that they have the potential to reduce the number of abortions performed legally or illegally internationally. They do so by preventing unplanned pregnancy and educating women and men about the importance of planned and timed pregnancy. Sadly, what should be a common ground for debaters on both sides of the polar abortion issue has become a battleground for maternal and child health advocates on either side of the debate.

The fact is that productive health programs represent a continuum of care for mothers and children that provide prenatal and pediatric care for children. Equally importantly, these programs provide lessons in how to effectively space pregnancies to prevent maternal and infant mortality. Planning and timing pregnancy is not just a theory that makes it easier for parents to manage their children. Children who are born less than two years apart are twice as likely to die as an infant. This nation has the resources to provide those less fortunate with the ability to control their own lives. With proper education, those in developing countries can plan their families just as we in the United States do. It is unconscionable, as leaders of the most prosperous nation on Earth, that we would deny these vital resources to the least prosperous on Earth.

The Smith amendment claims to fund UNFPA after certifying the program's withdrawal from China, or certification that there are no forced abortions associated with China's population control program. This amendment shows a lack of understanding of the way UNFPA works. China has requested UNFPA assistance in 32 countries. When assistance is requested UNFPA goes to work. It cannot withdraw unless the country asks them to withdraw. Accordingly, the President cannot certify all of China's population control program because UNFPA does not operate in all China. They could, however, certify the countries in which they are engaged.

The clarifying amendment offered by Representatives CAMPBELL and MALONEY, and oth-

ers would simply prevent U.S. funds from being used in China by reducing our contribution to the fund by the amount UNFPA spends in China. In addition, the amendment would withhold the entire U.S. contribution if any UNFPA funds are being used for abortion services.

I would ask my colleagues, if we can affirmatively certify that this money is not being used for abortions, and that no U.S. funds are being used in China, why would we not support maternal and child health programs? I urge my colleagues to support Representative CAMPBELL's clarifying amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 247, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) will be postponed.

It is the understanding of the Chair that amendment No. 4 will not be offered.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 106-235.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. SANFORD:

Page 14, line 23, strike "\$17,500,000" and insert "\$12,000,000".

Page 15, strike lines 19 and 20, and insert "\$1,500,000 for the fiscal year 2000".

Page 21, line 25, strike "\$15,000,000" and insert "\$8,000,000".

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 247, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would simply set at 1998 funding, the funding for the Asia Foundation, the Center for Cultural Exchange East-West, and the Dante B. Fascell North-South Center. It would save \$13.5 million each year, which though not viewed as a large amount of money in Washington, with many folks back home it is still, I think, a great sum of money.

Finally, this is an amendment that is supported by Citizens for a Sound

Economy, Citizens Against Government Waste, the National Taxpayers Union and Americans for Tax Reform. I think they support this amendment for a number of reasons, and I think it has a number of great things standing behind it.

The first thing that I think stands out in terms of why this amendment would make sense would be, whether a Republican or whether a Democrat, whether a liberal or whether a conservative, I think all of us would agree on the simple idea that we would not want a foundation out there receiving in essence disproportionate care. In other words, we would not want the care for these foundations to be above or, frankly, below that of which a foundation in one's home district receives. In other words, we would want it to be on par.

Yet, that is not at all the case, because these three foundations, which are each in university settings, receive disproportionate care and feeding from the Federal Government, because, unlike a foundation in any one of the 435 congressional districts across this country that have to go out and compete for grants, these three foundations receive not only a Federal guaranteed flow of money but then they can also pick up private grants as well.

The Congress recognized that back in 1995, and as a result, cut funding for these three foundations by \$25 million.

Well, what has happened since then is that the funding has crept back up basically to the level prior to the cut. I do not think this is fair to foundations we might have in any of our respective congressional districts. I will give an example of just a few of the outside funding sources I saw here.

For instance, East-West Center received \$100,000 from the Taipei Economic and Cultural Office. The William H. Gates Foundation provided \$2.3 million for population and health research to East-West Center. The government of Japan contributed \$363,000 to the East-West Center, and I could go down a long list, again, of grants in the marketplace that have been received by these foundations when they are also receiving Federal Government money.

Second, I would say there is a lot of duplication in each of these foundations. We could look up these topics, whether it is with the U.N., whether it is the World Health Organization, the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, there are a long list of agencies that also handle these type studies.

Third, I would say maybe they deserved disproportionate funding during the Cold War, but the Cold War is over. As an instrument of national policy, that policy is now gone. I mean, Asia Foundation has been around for 44 years. East-West Center has been around for over 30 years, and I think it ought to be brought back to par, again, which is what we did as a Congress in 1995.

Finally, I would just mention the fact that a number of these grants are

just plain bogus. I mean, I looked here at a number of the grants, methods of multiple stakeholding management of community forest, management in community-based forestry. Given the free enterprise system that we know works so well, if one really wants to manage a forest, put one person in charge of it and give them reason to be in charge of it, as opposed to community-based forestry whatever that means.

I see a second grant here on young adult sexuality. This collaborative project involving institutions in the Philippines, Thailand, Hong Kong, Indonesia, Nepal, Taiwan, and the United States will assess the extent, nature, determinants and reproductive consequences of premarital sex.

Call me old fashioned on this, but determinants I think simply to be attraction. Reproductive consequences I think are fairly simple. Sperm meets egg; somebody is going to get pregnant. I do not know that we need another study to tell us this.

I see with the Asia Foundation, a study on nuclear weapons in North Korea. The study went on to argue that the media reports of the construction of an alleged underground nuclear facility in North Korea are the results of deliberate leaks by the U.S. intelligence community.

Now how in the world is that in the best interest of the American taxpayer? How is that a benefit to U.S. overall interest?

So I would just say that there are a number of these studies that are funded with American tax dollars that do not make a whole lot of sense. I would again remind folks of the fact that it is supported by Citizens for a Sound Economy, supported by Citizens Against Government Waste, the Americans for Tax Reform and the National Taxpayers Union. I would urge a "yes" vote.

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

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. Although this Member shares his colleague's interest in reducing wasteful spending, the institutions targeted by his amendment certainly do not fall in that category. On the contrary, on closer examination, the Asia Foundation, the East-West Center, the Dante B. Fascell North-South Center, and other successful programs will confirm their cost effective contributions to American interests around the world.

Indeed, our modest investment in these institutions is money well spent.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, this Member would like to focus briefly on just one of the affected institutions: the Asia Foundation. The foundation has a 45-year proven track record. Programs and investments in reform-minded individuals in

Korea, Taiwan, and the Philippines directly supported the incredible democratic and economic transformations there. The Asia Foundation remains on the front lines doing the same today in Asia's new, emerging democracies like Indonesia and Bangladesh and helping lay the foundation for positive change in authoritarian countries like China and Vietnam.

Fundamental changes are happening in Asia as a result of the recent economic crisis. Now is the time to take advantage of this climate of change and expand programs advancing democracy, the rule of law, human rights, economic reform and sustainable recovery. That is why the International Relations Committee restored full funding for the Asia Foundation. Over 1/2 of the world's population is within the Asia Foundation's operating area. The Sanford amendment would cut the foundation back to its FY1998 appropriated level—a level \$7 million or 46 percent below this authorization and also below last year's appropriation. The authorization in the pending bill merely returns the Asia Foundation to its FY1995 funding level.

Helping Asia develop into a stable, market-oriented and democratic region is an important American national security objective. The programs of the Asia Foundation and others like the East-West Center support this national security objective. The Sanford amendment would severely cut these NGOs' programs and further restrict our ability to influence positive change. The long term cost of this amendment to U.S. foreign policy objectives certainly outweighs any short-term savings it may have.

For example, the developing countries in Asia are in desperate need of legal reforms. American commerce and local human rights are early beneficiaries of such Rule of Law programming. By defeating the Sanford amendment, we are supporting new legal reform initiatives for Indonesia, Thailand, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Vietnam, and China.

All three institutions targeted by the Sanford amendment are small, very cost effective private institutions that play very important complementary roles in advancing U.S. foreign policy interests around the world. We need their effort. This Member urges his colleagues to support the authorization levels reported by the International Relations Committee and oppose the Sanford amendment.

OPPOSE THE SANFORD AMENDMENT

Asia Foundation, East-West Center and Dante Fascell North-South Center are small, but cost effective private organizations that play very important complementary roles in advancing US foreign policy interests around the world. We need this effort.

Asia Foundation: 45-year proven track record. Over 1/2 of the world's population is within its programming jurisdiction. Following on its previous successes in Korea, Taiwan and the Philippines, the Asia Foundation is now focusing on emerging democracies like Indonesia and Bangladesh and promoting reform in China and Vietnam.

International Relations Committee authorized \$15 million (the Administration-requested level of funding). This restores Asia Foundation funding to its FY'95 (and pre-FY'95) funding levels. The Sanford Amendment would "freeze" the Asia Foundation at the FY'98 appropriation level of \$8 million. This is a \$7 million or 46 percent cut and even a reduction from the FY'99 level (\$8.5 million).

Fundamental changes are happening in Asia as a result of the economic crisis. Now,

is the time to take advantage of this climate of change and expand programs advancing democracy, the rule of law, human rights, economic reform and sustainable recovery. The Sanford Amendment would severely hamper Asia Foundation efforts supporting these U.S. national security objectives.

Now programming supporting much-needed legal reform in Indonesia would be jeopardized by the Sanford Amendment cuts. With the ouster of Suharto and the recent elections, Indonesia is in a very precarious transition. Asia Foundation programs supporting democracy, human rights, rule of law and economic restructuring will help steer this transition in the right direction. This is new programming that would be lost if the Sanford Amendment is adopted.

The long term costs of the Sanford Amendment to U.S. foreign policy objectives certainly outweigh any purported short-term savings.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW).

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

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Sanford amendment that would reduce the funding for one portion of his bill, the Dante Fascell North-South Center. The Dante Fascell North-South Center is an independent policy research and educational center strategically located in Miami, which is the gateway to Latin America and the gateway to the Caribbean.

The center is dedicated to economic and integration efforts, economic stabilization and growth, and furthering democracy and managing immigration. The center is a key player in the anticipated free trade area of the Americas. United States exports to Latin America climbed from \$31 billion in 1986 to over \$130 billion in 1997, comprising 20 percent of United States global exports.

The Commerce Department estimates that exports to Latin America will surpass exports to Europe in 2000 and surpass exports to Europe and Japan combined by 2010. Clearly, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman perhaps has merit to his amendment. However, his net is far too wide and it should be defeated. I would urge defeat of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Sanford amendment, which would reduce funding to the Dante Fascell North-South Center.

The Dante Fascell North-South Center is an independent policy research and educational center, strategically located in Miami, the gateway to Latin America and the Caribbean. The center is dedicated to economic integration efforts, economic stabilization and growth, furthering democracy, and managing immigration.

The center is a key player in the anticipated Free Trade Area of the Americas. U.S. exports to Latin America climbed from \$31 billion in 1986 to over \$130 billion in 1997, comprising 20 percent of U.S. global exports. The Commerce Department estimates that exports to Latin America will surpass exports to Europe

in 2000, and surpass exports to Europe and Japan combined in 2010. Clearly, trade and investment relations with Latin American countries are a vital interest to the United States.

Global financial volatility has highlighted the fact that stability and growth abroad has a direct impact on the U.S. economy. An Asia-type meltdown in Latin America would result not just in further economic crises, but would also manifest itself by increased drug trafficking, illegal immigration, civil unrest, and challenges to democratic rule. The North-South Center plays a crucial role in finding solutions for stability and prosperity in the region.

The North-South Center is an extraordinarily active force in education and discussion of U.S.-Latin American issues such as effects of the Castro regime, drug trafficking from Colombia, social causes of migration, food safety, and the role of the military in democratic society. The North-South Center is fueled by an internationally recognized staff which is dedicated to engaging diverse groups in inter-American issues from the perspective of the public good.

At the beginning of this century, the focal point of United States foreign policy was in Europe. During the mid-1900's, the United States focus shifted toward Asia as a source of commerce and trade. In the 21st century, the United States may very well be looking to Latin America as the center of economic cooperation and growth. We must be prepared for this shift, and we need the North-South Center to continue paving our way.

The Dante Fascell North-South Center's proven track record in facilitating international dialog among governments, nongovernmental organizations, and business interests makes it a vital asset for the United States in this new era of inter-American relations.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to recognize the importance of the Dante Fascell North-South Center and oppose the Sanford amendment.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS).

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in unambiguous and unequivocal opposition to this amendment.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), the ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I think all of us here are concerned about government expenditures, but when we take a look at what these institutions do in helping develop Democratic institutions in countries throughout the world, resolve disputes, to have the kind of dialogue, think about what just happened in Kosovo. One helicopter, \$16 million. We lost two of them; \$32 million. One F-117 stealth fighter, in excess of \$100 million. One F-16, \$25 million. The money we spend here in these centers helps dialogue, helps democracy and helps defend and protect America's interests.

I urge we defeat this amendment.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA).

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Chairman, I do have the greatest respect and trust in the integrity of my good friend from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) for introducing this amendment but I have to respectfully object to the amendment and I urge my colleagues not to pass this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in 1960 the Congress established the East-West Center in America's Pacific to further the foreign policy interests of the United States by promoting better relations and understanding the peoples of the United States in the Asian Pacific region.

Mr. Chairman, because of the essence of time, given the dynamic changes and the enhanced importance of the Asian Pacific region, where two-thirds of the world's population and one-third of the current trade that we conduct in that region of the world, Mr. Chairman, the mission of the East-West Center is more relevant and vital to U.S. interests than ever before.

I urge my colleagues not to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise with my esteemed colleagues on both sides of the aisle in strong opposition to the Sandford Amendment to H.R. 2415, the American Embassy Security Bill of 1999.

Mr. Chairman, the Sanford Amendment seeks to reduce the funding level approved by the House International Relations Committee for the Asia Foundation, the East-West Center and the North-South Center. The amendment should be defeated, as each of these important institutions clearly pursues vital foreign policy objectives on behalf of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, in 1960 the Congress established the East-West Center (EWC) in America's Pacific to further the foreign policy interests of the United States by promoting better relations and understanding between the peoples of the United States and the Asia-Pacific region. The East-West Center accomplishes this vital mission by attracting present and future leaders throughout the region who participate, along with America's leaders and experts in the Center's programs of cooperative study, training, and research of the issues most crucial to the region and to our nation.

Since the East-West Center's inception, over 45,000 individuals have participated in the Center's collaborative programs, providing the United States with an invaluable network of highly-placed alumni—an important link between the U.S. and the nations of the Asia-Pacific.

Mr. Chairman, in recent years as the Asia-Pacific region has undergone profound changes, it has also grown in fundamental importance to the United States for many reasons. With China and Japan, the region contains more than half the world's population and provides almost a third of the world's trade markets. The Asia-Pacific region is now the largest market for US exports, an economic trend that will significantly grow in the new millennium, and the establishment of the

East-West Center by the Congress almost forty years ago could not be more critical now—and what could be a better place to house this internationally acclaimed institution and forum than our fiftieth state of the Union—the State of Hawaii.

Mr. Chairman, over 100,000 U.S. military personnel are located in the Asia-Pacific, primarily in South Korea and Japan, underscoring the U.S. stake in and commitment to regional peace and security. With the recent disturbing developments in the Taiwan Strait, Mr. Chairman, this is a peace that is threatened as we debate today.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, no global problem—from nuclear and ballistic missile proliferation, to the prevention of AIDS, to damage control of regional financial meltdowns, to the reduction in greenhouse gases—can be effectively addressed without the participation of the major nations of Asia and the Pacific.

Given the dynamic changes in and the enhanced importance of the Asia-Pacific region, Mr. Chairman, the mission of the East-West Center is more relevant and vital to U.S. interests than ever before.

Mr. Chairman, as a Pacific nation, America cannot afford not to take her rightful place of leadership in the affairs of the Asia-Pacific region. We must recognize the important work of the East-West Center in support of this vital mission.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot more strongly urge our colleagues to defeat the Sanford Amendment.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK).

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this is perhaps one of the most, I would say, harmful amendments I have heard in quite awhile on the floor. I respect the writer of the amendment but I am sure he does not understand the broad scope of the North-South Center named after Dante Fascell.

First of all, our intent is to spread democracy throughout the world. No one or no center has done any better job of this than the North-South Center. It is perhaps the only policy and research and social service kind of organization in this country. On the amount of money that it operates on, it is very, very good. It has a hemispheric agenda and it directly helps the American people in forms of jobs, prosperity, the drug program, the AIDS program.

Mr. Chairman, I think this particular amendment by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), though well designed, should be defeated.

I rise in strong opposition to the Sanford amendment which will cap funding in this bill for the North South Center at its FY 1998 level of \$1.5 million. The current bill authorizes "such sums as may be necessary." The Administration requested \$2.5 million for the North South Center for FY 2000 for a reason. Additional funding beyond this amendment's cap is sorely needed.

The Dante Fascell North South Center is the only research, public policy studies, and

information center of its type, exclusively dedicated to finding practical solutions to problems and policy issues facing the Americas.

This public policy and research center promotes better relations between the U.S. and nations of Latin America, the Caribbean and Canada, and is dedicated to developing practical responses to regional challenges.

In carrying out its congressional mandate to promote better relations among the United States and the nations of Canada, Latin America, and the Caribbean, the center combines programs of public policy, cooperative study, research, and training.

The center responds to the hemispheric agenda that directly impacts the American people in the form of jobs and prosperity, drugs, migration, export opportunities, environmental quality, and the promotion of shared democratic values. Programs foster national and international linkages and partnerships through fellowships and collaborative efforts in both research and training.

Every Member of Congress who was here before 1992 remembers Rep. Dante Fascell. Throughout his decades of service in this body, Rep. Fascell worked fearlessly for an American foreign policy based on cultural, educational, trade and person to person exchanges between nations, in addition to normal government-to-government contacts. His vision became reality via the North South Center.

The Dante Fascell North South Center has been the foremost institution in bringing together the private sector, NGO's, and government representatives to monitor and evaluate the implementation of democratic governance in the Americas.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote no on this misplaced amendment.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I urge strong opposition to the amendment. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE).

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The gentleman from Hawaii is recognized for 1 minute.

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

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I can fully understand why people would want to try and save money but this kind of approach is, I think, unpardonable. I wish the gentleman had discussed the issue perhaps with myself, with the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK), with some others who are familiar with these programs. They perform an invaluable service, and to simply take the position that we are going to hack them in half or chop dollars out and let them try to fend afterwards as best they may is such a cavalier approach to cost cutting that it undermines, I think, entirely the thrust of any attempt to try and save money genuinely.

These institutions are providing an intellectual foundation that gives us the opportunity, as Mr. GEJDENSON indicated, to formulate policy in an intelligent way that saves the taxpayer dollars and allows us to carry foreign policy, in particular, forward in a manner that befits the strategic interests of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is ill-timed. It is ill-founded and should be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak against this amendment to H.R. 2415, the State Department authorization for FY2000. The amendment makes an ill advised 31 percent reduction in the bill's funding for the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange between East and West, more commonly known as the East-West Center.

The East-West Center has already suffered severe budget cuts during this decade. Further cuts would seriously compromise the national interests of the United States by weakening our full and constructive engagement in the Asia-Pacific area, which is emerging as the most dynamic region of the globe.

The East-West Center was established by the Congress in 1960 to improve mutual understanding and cooperation among the governments and peoples of the Asia-Pacific region, including the United States. The Center helps prepare the United States for constructive involvement in Asia and the Pacific through education, dialogue, research and outreach. The Congress and Executive Branch agencies turn to the Center for advice and information.

During the Center's 39 years of existence, more than 50,000 Americans, Asians and Pacific Islanders from over 60 nations and territories have participated in the East-West Center's educational, research and conference programs. Presidents, prime ministers, diplomats and distinguished scholars and statesmen from all parts of the region have used the Center as a forum to advance international cooperation. The Center has become one of the most highly respected institutions in the region.

The friendly relations which exist today between the United States and countries of Asia and the Pacific are attributable in large measure to the work of the East-West Center.

The 21st century will be the Pacific Century. Our relations with the nations of the region will determine America's role in the Pacific Century. Will we retain our position of leadership, or will we be relegated to the margins of the Pacific Century? The answer depends to a large extent on our commitment to understanding the region, demonstrating our involvement with its future, and nurturing our ties to its leaders of today and tomorrow.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment and send a clear signal that U.S. interest in and commitment to the Asia-Pacific region remain undiminished.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote against the cuts called for in the Sanford Amendment and I urge my colleagues to join me in defeating this amendment.

Those of us on the International Relations Committee have been here before. These proposals were all offered to us at our markup, and they lost—badly. On both sides of the aisle, the conclusion then was that the East-West Center, the North-South Center, and the Asia Foundation deserved a substantial level of support. We were right then, and this amendment is wrong now.

These organizations do a lot of good for a small investment. The East-West Center is one of the best methods we have to build long-term relationships with the nations of the Pacific Ocean—places we neglect all too much. Part of the funding we proposed for the

East-West Center is intended to establish an Ocean Resources Institute to figure out the best way to use the great marine wealth in the Pacific in a way that is economically and environmentally sound. And the Asia Foundation, which has been in Indonesia for almost half a century, was one of the most important groups doing civic education before the Indonesian elections. They are also heavily involved in helping small to medium-sized businesses, especially those owned by women, get on their feet and keep going, even during Indonesia's economic crisis.

The money that would be provided here is well justified and will be well used. Join me in demonstrating your support for a responsible investment with a long-term payoff. Vote against these cuts.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my opposition to the Sanford amendment to HR 2415, which seeks to delete \$5.5 million in funding from the East-West Center, \$1 million from the North-South Center, and \$7 million from the Asia Foundation.

These institutions are small but very cost-effective. They complement the foreign policy objectives of the United States by providing another dimension of engagement with leaders in Asia, the Pacific, and Latin America and help to increase the mutual understanding and cooperation that is essential for constructive relationships among the nations of these important regions.

The East-West Center is the only national program that has a strategic mission of developing a consensus on key policy issues in U.S.-Asia Pacific relations through intensive cooperative research and training. Many who initially came to the Center as students or researchers have risen to positions of power and influence in government, academia, business, and the media in countries throughout Asia and the Pacific. These opinion leaders formed deep ties with the Center and understand first-hand the value of democracy, an open society, and a free press.

The Center has earned the trust and respect of the nations of this region and enjoys a prestige disproportionate to its small size. We cannot afford to continue to starve this unique and valuable institution.

I urge all my colleagues to defeat the Sanford amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 247, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) will be postponed.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT) having assumed the chair, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R.

2415) to enhance security of United States missions and personnel overseas, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 995, TEACHER EMPOWERMENT ACT

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-240) on the resolution (H. Res. 253) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1995) to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to empower teachers, improve student achievement through high-quality professional development for teachers, reauthorize the Reading Excellence Act, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

AMERICAN EMBASSY SECURITY ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 247 and rule XVIII, 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. 2415.

□ 2030

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. 2415) to enhance security of United States missions and personnel overseas, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes, with Mr. MILLER of Florida (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

□ 2030

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 106-235 had been postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in Part B of House Report 106-235.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. PAUL

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B amendment No. 8 offered by Mr. PAUL:

Page 16, strike line 5 and all that follows through line 17 on page 21, and insert the following: None of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a) are authorized to be appropriated for a United States contribution to the United Nations, any organ of the United Nations, or any entity affiliated with the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 247, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield half of my time to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY) and ask unanimous consent that she be allowed to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY) will be recognized for 2½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

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

Mr. Chairman, my amendment strikes the authorizations in section 106 for all U.N.-related operations. We have a bill here tonight dealing with embassy security, U.S. embassy security, and we are all very concerned about it.

But in typical fashion, about all we have been offered so far has been just to put more money into our embassies and never raising the question about why our embassies might be more vulnerable. My amendment deals with that, because I would like to deal with the foreign policy involved with our commitment to the United Nations.

There are many in this Congress who readily admit they are internationalists. I readily admit that I am not an internationalist when it comes to political action and warmongering. Therefore, I think much of what we do in foreign policy makes ourselves more vulnerable. If we look at the two most recent bombings in Africa, these were brought about by our own foreign policy.

Those supporters of internationalism generally accuse those of us who are opposed to it by saying that we are isolationists. This is not true. I am not an isolationist. But I do believe in national sovereignty. I happen to sincerely believe that one cannot become an endorser of some form of internationalism without some sacrifice of our own sovereignty. I think this is the subject that we must address.

I believe in free trade. I do not believe in protectionism. I am not a protectionist. I think people, goods, and services and ideas should flow across borders freely. But when it comes to our armaments, under the guise of the U.N. orders or NATO orders, I do not believe this should be called something favorably as internationalism and