

larger freedom." Such lofty goals and objectives are comparable to those found in the preamble to the Constitution of the United States of America: "to . . . establish Justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the Blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity . . ."

There is, however, one difference that must not be overlooked. The Constitution of the United States of America is a legitimate constitution, having been submitted directly to the people for ratification by their representatives elected and assembled solely for the purpose of passing on the terms of that document. The Charter of the United Nations, on the other hand, is an illegitimate constitution, having only been submitted to the United States Senate for ratification as a treaty. Thus, the Charter of the United Nations, not being a treaty, cannot be made the supreme law of our land by compliance with Article II, Section 2 of Constitution of the United States of America. Therefore, the Charter of the United Nations is neither politically nor legally binding upon the United States of America or upon its people.

Even considering the Charter of the United Nations as a treaty does not save it. The Charter of the United Nations would still be constitutionally illegitimate and void, because it transgresses the Constitution of the United States of America in three major respects:

(1) It unconstitutionally delegates the legislative power of Congress to initiate war and the executive power of the president to conduct war to the United Nation, a foreign entity;

(2) It unconstitutionally transfers the exclusive power to originate revenue-raising measures from the United States House of Representatives to the United Nations General Assembly; and

(3) It unconstitutionally robs the states of powers reserved to them by the Tenth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States of America.

It is time for this Congress to return to these time-honored American principles of liberty; not to put their hope in the promise of some international organization like the United Nations which would replace the Constitution of the United States of America with its Universal Declaration of Human Rights, thereby compromising American liberties in favor of government-imposed programs designed to enhance the economic and social well-being of peoples all around the world.

RESTORE FUNDING FOR INTERNATIONAL FAMILY PLANNING PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the past few weeks, thousands of doctors from the frontline in the global fight to save women's lives were here in our Nation's Capital as part of the International Federation of Gynecologists and Obstetricians conference. Many of these doctors have launched a petition drive urging the President and all of us to end the onerous gag rule that impedes their ability to treat their patients.

For these doctors, the death of some 600,000 women each year from pregnancy-related causes is not just a sta-

tistic. It represents their neighbors, their friends, their relatives, and their patients. It represents the fact that one out of every 48 pregnant women in their communities will not survive childbirth because of preventable complications. For these doctors, the fact that U.S. funding for international family planning and related reproductive health programs has declined 30 percent since 1995 has very real consequences.

Last week, we heard from Dr. Friday Okonofua, a physician that heads the Action Health Research Center in Nigeria, about his fight to save women and children's lives. In Nigeria, 50,000 women die annually from pregnancy and childbirth complication, 20,000 of these deaths from unsafe abortions.

□ 1915

This accounts for almost 10 percent of maternal deaths worldwide.

We also heard from Dr. Godfrey Mbaruka, an ob-gyn in Tanzania. When he started working in rural Tanzania 14 years ago, he worked in a hospital where there were only two beds for delivery. Many women in his clinic would deliver babies on the floor. He saw that women were dying in conditions that could have easily been prevented, dying from bleeding during and after delivery, and from convulsions during labor and from anemia.

He spoke about the simple changes that additional resources allowed him to make, such as training and basic supplies including contraceptives, that helped reduce maternal mortality in his clinic by 50 percent.

However, this hospital could not sustain this improvement. Resources for reproductive health care started to fall in rural Tanzania, just at the time when an influx of refugees, some 500,000, of which 70 percent are women and children, further drained their resources.

Then we heard from Dr. Enyantu Ifenne, a pediatrician from Nigeria, who spoke at the White House on World Health Day about the differences family planning makes in the lives of women in Nigeria.

She spoke about an adolescent girl, Jemala, who was married at 12 and pregnant at 13. Jemala did not have access to desperately needed reproductive health care. She was in labor for 4 days and suffered life-altering damage.

Jemala is not alone. Complications of pregnancy in childbirth are some of the leading causes of disability for women in developing countries.

These are just a few stories, but there are countless others from Colombia to Kenya, from Nigeria to Nepal. Although these countries are very different from one another, what unites them is the fact that in each one women are dying needlessly because of the lack of access to effective family planning programs.

Last November, Congress enacted the onerous global gag rule, which sought to stifle doctors and health providers

from advocating for or against, with their own money, abortion reforms in their countries. The ob-gyns here in New York last week put it best when they said, "We are at a loss to understand how it is that the U.S. is now exporting as a matter of foreign policy a position that may expose more women to unnecessary health risks."

These doctors are calling on the United States to end the global gag rule because they cannot understand, as they said in their own words "being subjected to such a policy that not only would never be tolerated within the United States, but would be unconstitutional if applied to citizens of America."

Last week, we heard from Maria Isabel Plata, the executive director of Profamilia in Colombia, about how difficult it is to explain the gag rule to women in her country. In Colombia, unsafe abortion is the second leading cause of maternal mortality; and abortion is illegal, even in cases to save the life of the mother. Yet local organizations are afraid to talk to their policymakers about the impact of these laws on women's health.

Ms. Plata told us that women in her country now view the United States as a Nation that believes in two types of women: first, those who have human rights, those who can freely debate laws and policies in their own country; and, second, Colombian women who do not have those same basic human rights.

Mr. Speaker, for those who would question the value of U.S. dollars going overseas for family planning, for those of you who support the onerous global gag rule, I'd like you to consider the women of rural Tanzania; the adolescent girls from Nigeria; and all of the women around the world.

On behalf of the doctors on the front-line for women and children's health around the world, let's restore funding for international family planning programs without unconstitutional gag rules.

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION OCCURRING IN TURKMENISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULSHOF). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Helsinki Commission, and also as the Cochair of the Religious Prisoners Congressional Task Force, I rise today to speak on behalf of a young man who has had his human rights violated, a young man with a wife and five young children, a man who, because of the peaceful practice of his religious beliefs, is in prison in Turkmenistan.

In December of 1998, security officials arrested and imprisoned Mr. Shageldy Atakov, pursued trumped-up charges against him, and on March 19, 1999, Mr. Atakov was sentenced to 2 years in prison. Why? Simply because he decided to change his religion from Muslim to Christian.

Despite the fact that the government of Turkmenistan is a signatory to the Helsinki Accords and other international agreements, officials have blatantly violated Mr. Atakov's and other individuals' rights to freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, and the freedom of assembly.

Before KNB officials, that is the new name for the KGB, arrested Mr. Atakov, they, along with local religious community leaders, told him if he converted back to his previous religion, he would receive a car, a house and a good job, a great offer in a country like Turkmenistan where people make approximately \$40 per month.

However, these community leaders and security officials made it clear that if Mr. Atakov refused this offer, they would "find" charges against him and ensure that he was imprisoned. Over a 2-month period, various officials visited Mr. Atakov to repeat this offer and threats. In one of the visits, secret police officials said he would be imprisoned and "we will quickly force you into silence."

The KNB secret police have tried to silence Mr. Atakov in prison. Reports show that in July of 1999 and March of 2000 Mr. Atakov was forced into the special punishment cell in which he was severely beaten by guards, denied water, and fed only every other day. His family saw him at the end of the 10 days in 1999, and they reported that he was barely alive.

In July of 1999, it was reported that President Niyazov gave Mr. Atakov presidential amnesty, as allowed under Section 228 of the criminal code; but for some strange reason, security officials did not release him. Instead, they put him in the punishment cell described above.

In fact, because of the pressure from the prosecutor, who said the previous sentence was too lenient, a new trial was held in August of 1999; and Mr. Atakov was sentenced to 4 years in prison and fined \$12,000. That is an amount equivalent to about 25 years of salary for the average Turk citizen.

Since February of this year, KNB officials forced his family into internal exile, the principal has kicked his children out of school, his wife has been told she will remain in exile until she renounces her faith, Mr. Atakov's brother was arrested and tortured in April of 1999, and other family members have lost their jobs and suffered as well.

In December of 1999, during a raid on a Russian family living in Turkmenistan, KNB officials told them, "First we will deport all of you foreign missionaries, then we'll strangle the remaining Christians in the country."

All of this government attention to one man and his family simply because of religious beliefs.

This injustice is an outrage. The tactics of the KNB show that the KGB forces and methods of operations did not disappear with the demise of the

Soviet Union, but are still alive and well. The arrest and subsequent imprisonment of Mr. Atakov are not isolated events, but are a result of the KNB secret police policy in Turkmenistan.

In 1997, the legislature adopted severe restrictions on religion, imposing compulsory re-registration of all religious communities. According to the legislation, a religious community must have at least 500 members before it can obtain registration. Without this legal status, all religious groups are considered illegal and their activities therefore are punishable under the law.

Since June of 1997, the secret police have detained, interrogated and physically assaulted many religious believers. In addition, these officials have raided churches, interrupted worship services, searched homes and confiscated over 6,700 pieces of literature. In each instance, the KNB warned citizens that the Christian faith in particular is forbidden in Turkmenistan.

Religious believers throughout Turkmenistan suffer if they practice their religion but do not belong to either of the two "registered" religions. One is the Islamic faith, the other is the Russian Orthodox.

Mr. Speaker, I recently received reports that Mr. Atakov's health has deteriorated rapidly and he may be at the point of death. I urge the government of Turkmenistan to allow an international organization, such as the Red Cross, to visit Mr. Atakov, assess his health, and provide any medical assistance he might need. Even, I might say, the old ruthless Soviet regime allowed prisoners medical health.

I urge the government of Turkmenistan to live up to its commitments under the Helsinki Accords and other international agreements to uphold and to protect freedom of speech, assembly and belief.

Further, I urge the government of Turkmenistan to release Mr. Atakov under their own president's amnesty granted to him last year.

Finally, I urge the government to stop harassing and persecuting people of faith and recognize their important and rich contribution to their nation.

ALLOWING REFERENCE TO RETIRING MEMBER OF OTHER BODY DURING MORNING HOUR DEBATES TOMORROW

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members be permitted to refer to a retiring Member of the other body in tributes during morning hour debate tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING IMPORTANCE OF SELECTIVE SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr.

KUYKENDALL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, for many of us about my age, when you turned 18 you went off and registered for the draft. I happen to have come of age during the Vietnam War, so it was very controversial. But last Thursday, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 402, which recognizes the importance of the Selective Service System on the occasion of its 60th anniversary of a peacetime military registration effort.

It was first passed on September 16, 1940. I believe that willingness and tradition of America's citizens to defend not only their homeland, but also the very precept of freedom throughout the world, is the cornerstone of what makes America the greatest Nation on Earth.

The Selective Service System serves as a reminder to many in the world that America's young men stand ready to continue in the tradition of protecting democracy. As a result of the Vietnam era draft, some feel we should abolish it. Others feel we should not fund it during times of peace. And with all due respect to those Members, I disagree with them.

But the bill that I introduced is not anything to do with those two controversial subjects. The bill seeks to honor America's Selective Service System and recognize the historical role it played in America's history, especially during the past 60 years.

But before that last 60 years, what was the history of the draft in America? It began in the Civil War, and during that time, we conscripted people, and the way you got out of it was you provided a replacement. You had to go find someone to stand in your stead. It ended after the Civil War.

Again, when America went to war in World War I, we passed the Selective Service Act of 1917, and it provided for a general conscription. We even had a clause in that one, for the first time, that talked about exemptions for conscientious objectors. By the time the war ended, we had inducted 2.8 million men.

Then, during World War II, we bring ourselves to the time that we end up recognizing the anniversary of, that the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 established the first peacetime, I stress peacetime, conscription; and it was in response to all the tension in the world at that time. You could imagine, we had had Germany recently invade Poland; the Japanese were on the march in the Pacific.

The service obligation was originally 12 months. It was quickly changed to 18 months in 1941. By the end of that war, we had conscripted over 10 million men, and the world had been made peaceful again.

Following that, in 1948, we continued conscription; and we continued registration, and we said anyone between the ages of 18 and 26 be available for service as we then entered that era of the Cold War.