

| | | |
|-----------|-----------|---------|
| Towns | Watt (NC) | Woolsey |
| Velazquez | Waxman | Wynn |
| Vento | Wexler | Yates |
| Visclosky | Wise | |

NOT VOTING—23

| | | |
|------------|----------------|------------|
| Archer | Gillmor | McDermott |
| Becerra | Gonzalez | Millender- |
| Bonilla | Harman | McDonald |
| Brown (FL) | Houghton | Payne |
| Cannon | Jackson-Lee | Rangel |
| Cardin | (TX) | Royce |
| Conyers | Jefferson | Waters |
| Crapo | Johnson, E. B. | |
| Ford | Kasich | |

□ 1359

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Royce for, with Mr. McDermott against.

Mr. Bonilla for, with Mr. Rangel against.

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, for the purpose of facilitating compliance by small businesses with certain Federal paperwork requirements, to establish a task force to examine the feasibility of streamlining paperwork requirements applicable to small businesses, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3310, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1757, FOREIGN AFFAIRS REFORM AND RESTRUCTURING ACT OF 1998

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 385 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 385

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1757) to consolidate international affairs agencies, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and to ensure that the enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) proceeds in a manner consistent with United States interests, to strengthen relations between the United States and Russia, to preserve the prerogatives of the Congress with respect to certain arms control agreements, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 385 waives all points of order against the conference report that accompanies this bill, the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998, and against its consideration. The rule also provides that the conference report be considered as read. This of course is the traditional type of rule for considering conference reports and will allow expedited consideration of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, on the conference report itself, I am pleased to say that I will be able to support a State Department authorization bill for the first time in many, many years. I am not in the habit of voting for foreign aid of any kind, and I am not in the habit of voting for the State Department authorization bill. But I think all Members ought to listen up, particularly those of conservative persuasion who may have some concern about this bill.

First of all, one reason I support it is because of the excellent work by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the rest of the conferees who have managed to retain some very excellent provisions relating to NATO expansion overseas, abortion issues and the United Nations. I am most pleased with the retention of the provision of the European Security Act, which supports something near and dear to my heart, and that is the expansion of NATO, which will guarantee peace in that part of the world for many years to come.

Twice in this century, American soldiers have gone to war on behalf of Europeans, and we fought a very, very costly financial war with the Cold War. The European Security Act designates Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Romania as eligible countries for transition assistance under the NATO Participation Act of 1994. It further expresses a sense of Congress that those four countries should be invited to become full NATO members at the earliest possible time.

Mr. Speaker, as we see democracy breaking out all over Eastern Europe, in countries that were enslaved by communism for decades, it is morally and strategically imperative that we do not shut these people out of the Western system, that we not draw a line in the sand as we did back in Yalta, which created this terrible situation of enslaving tens of millions of people behind this philosophy of deadly atheistic communism. Especially as they struggle valiantly to establish democracy and reform their economies, these great friends of America need security and stability.

That in itself is reason enough to come over here and vote yes on this

bill. NATO of course is the key to security and stability in that part of the world. For 49 years, it has kept peace and helped nourish democracy and prosperity in Europe. Some say, let us shut it down, or let us keep the status quo. Mr. Speaker, some over in the other body wish to establish some sort of pause after Poland and the Czech Republic and Hungary get in. What an irresponsible and myopic policy that would be. We must not let that happen. That in itself is sending signals that we are willing to once again draw that line in the sand, and we cannot let that happen. In addition to betraying the people of that region, after decades of Communist slavery, leaving a gray area in Central Europe will only tempt demagogues and potential aggressors in that region and make it more, yes, more likely that United States soldiers will have to fight in Europe once again.

To those who say why should U.S. soldiers die for Danzig or Bucharest or Riga, I say they are right, they should not, and if they do not want it to happen, support NATO expansion that appears in this bill, because that is exactly what this bill does.

This conference report also retains the very strong restrictions supported by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) on funding of overseas abortions and advocacy of abortions. There is not a more principled Member of this body than the gentleman from New Jersey. I commend him for standing up for what is right for the children of this Nation.

Finally, I am pleased that this conference report places strict conditions on the payment of our supposed arrears to the U.N. Members ought to listen up, because I am the author of the Kassebaum-Solomon amendment that has withheld dues from the United Nations until they cleaned up their house and they put their house in fiscal order. Yet I am the one standing up here today saying we ought to support this bill. It is because of what is written into this bill.

I have a great deal of trouble with paying these so-called arrears to the U.N., given its history of waste and abuse and, frankly, its lack of gratitude for all the expenses and danger on our troops that we incur in support of U.N. resolutions.

I also have trouble handing out any more money over to an organization whose Secretary General Kofi Annan has just cut an appeasement deal with Saddam Hussein, said that Saddam Hussein is a man he can work with and called U.S. weapons inspectors cowboys. That is what this head of the U.N. said? He ought to be horse whipped for saying it. I resent that, Mr. Speaker.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the conferees have done excellent work in placing strings on the money, strings that will help reduce bureaucracy, help reduce waste and abuse at that U.N. I am particularly pleased that they have retained

my legislation, which would prevent any arrearages from going to the U.N. if that body attempts to create taxes on American citizens, and they are talking about that, as my colleagues know. We know that U.N. bureaucrats would like to do exactly that. This legislation is a shot across the bow. Do not try it.

The conferees have also included, and this is very, very important, conditions requiring that the U.N. reduce the U.S. share of the peacekeeping budget down to 25 percent and that the regular budget be no more than 20 percent. All fiscal conservatives, if they are listening, that is the reason they ought to come over here and vote for this bill.

What is extremely important is that the conference report also requires the President to seek and obtain a commitment from the United Nations that it will provide reimbursement to the United States for the costs incurred by our military in support of U.N. missions. Right now we get no credit. We just pay all that extra money in and it is a terrible, terrible drain on our military budget to do so. This bill says that they will take into consideration all of the moneys that we pay in in that respect and reimburse us for it. These and other conditions which should lead us to spending less on the United Nations in the future, as well as the previously mentioned support for NATO expansion, and the excellent anti-abortion provisions are why I grudgingly support this measure.

Mr. Speaker, in sum, this is a good conference report. I urge adoption of the rule so that we can get on with the expedited consideration.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) for yielding me this time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This resolution, H.Res. 385, is a rule that provides for consideration of the conference report on H.R. 1757, which authorizes appropriations, it makes policy changes for the State Department and related agencies. As the gentleman has described, this rule waives all points of order against the conference report. The bill, in my opinion, has some good sections and good ideas, especially humanitarian ideas and humanitarian concerns and human rights. I do have some concerns, though, about the bill and about the process. In his statement to the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON), the ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations, said that the conference report was rushed through a highly partisan process without any consultation with the minority. The gentleman from Indiana stated that Democrats had almost no opportunity to review the language in the report. I am also very concerned about the reduced funding levels that will cause cuts in American embassies. In this area of global uncer-

tainty, our need for strong worldwide diplomatic presence has never been greater.

I want to take this opportunity to address a particularly difficult issue related to this bill. This is the stalemate between Congress and the administration over restrictions on international family planning and the payment of U.S. dues to the United Nations and funding for the International Monetary Fund. I am considering an alternative proposal that would allow some restrictions on family planning funds and that would require all future IMF financial packages to include microcredit programs to the poorest of the poor. Both sides could win something and the larger national and international interests would be advanced. I suggest microcredit programs because of their success, particularly with women. These small loans help women to invest in projects which can double or triple their family income. It helps pull families out of poverty. It reduces abortion and reduces the size of families.

Most individuals on both sides of this issue act out of deep convictions, and they should. Perhaps there is no middle ground on this fundamental issue. But as legislator, we are charged with finding a middle ground on legislation and there is a difference. We need to support the United Nations. Despite its problems, it is the best hope for peace in many of the troubled regions of the world. We need to support the International Monetary Fund. The IMF stands as a buffer between the financial shock in Asia and the world economy, including the United States. Lives are affected by the decisions on population planning funds. But the greater number of lives today and among future generations are threatened by our failure to deal with the bigger issues involved. Congress and the administration must be open to creative solutions to resolve this stalemate.

If my proposal is not satisfactory, then both sides need to work together to explore other options. I urge both sides to find common legislative ground so that we can pay our debts to the United Nations and fund the International Monetary Fund.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), one of the most respected and distinguished Members of this body who has been here for about 16 years now. He has led the fight for the children of this country and for human rights for all American people.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) for those kind remarks. My sentiments are the same for him. He has always been a champion for human rights in China and in other captive nations. I applaud and deeply respect him for that work. I also want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) for his support for the

rule and the bill, H.R. 1757, and for pointing out that there are a large number of very important human rights provisions in this bill that Members should be aware of, that will advance the goals that we care about so deeply with regard to human rights around the globe.

□ 1415

First, let me just make this point to all of my colleagues that this is not, per se, a foreign aid bill. It is a State Department bill. It contains important restrictions on foreign aid but authorizes no appropriations for these purposes except for a \$38 million package of humanitarian assistance for the anti-Saddam Hussein, pro-democracy movement in Iraq.

The bill contains a compromise version of the pro-life Mexico City, cutting off funds to foreign organizations that promote abortion—lobby for abortion or attempt to influence legislation or policy as it relates to abortion. The compromise would allow the President to waive the prohibition on assistance to abortion providers. This was very hard for our side to concede, but in the legislative tug of war this is half a loaf, and our hope is that the administration will take note of that. There needs to be some give and take.

This bill also conditions funding to the U.N. Population Fund on an end to the UNFPA activities in cooperation with the coercive population control program in China.

Wei Jing Sheng testified before our subcommittee a few weeks ago and was absolutely aghast and appalled and outraged that the UNFPA worked side by side with the oppressors of women in the People's Republic of China, and said so in very, very clear and unambiguous language at the subcommittee. Wei asked how the U.N. could join and support the oppressors of women, babies—the family.

H.R. 1757 also contains U.N. reform and arrearages packages which, unlike some proposals, is not a blank check to the U.N. The U.N. arrearage money is delivered, in 3 tranches. Each payment is contingent on U.N. implementation of specific reforms, including reduction of U.S. dues from its current 25 percent to ultimately 20 percent but 22 percent on the near term, and a reduction of U.S. peacekeeping assessments from 31 percent down to 25 percent.

The bill reduces the number of Federal agencies by two. It merges the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and USIA, U.S. Information Agency, into the State Department to achieve savings through efficiency and resource sharing. But it structures this merger very carefully to preserve the integrity of arms control process and especially of the pro-freedom and pro-democracy functions of USIA's public diplomacy programs like the radios.

This legislation enhances Radio Free Asia to provide a 24-hour pro-freedom broadcasting to China.

It also contains provisions designed to force deadbeat diplomats at the U.N.

to pay child support judgments and to ensure that diplomats who commit crimes in the U.S. will be prosecuted for those crimes.

It reforms the State Department personnel law to restore the Secretary's power to fire convicted felons from the Foreign Service and to eliminate duplicative pension and salary provisions that allow double dipping at taxpayers' expense.

It contains provisions that will ensure vigorous enforcements of the Helms-Burton law which is designed to bring freedom and democracy to the Cuban people.

It sets aside \$100 million of the State Department budget for implementation of the congressional directive that the U.S. Embassy in Israel be moved to Jerusalem, and it incorporates the McBride principles designed to end employment discrimination against Catholics in northern Ireland as a condition of U.S. foreign aid.

H.R. 1757 also includes a number of important provisions relating to human rights and refugees from Tibet, Burma, Vietnam, Cuba, Africa and elsewhere. These provisions have been endorsed by leading organizations, including the U.S. Catholic Conference, the Council of Jewish Federations, the Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service, and the U.S. Committee for Refugees.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a yes on the rule, and I hope the Members will also vote yes on the conference report.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield another 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for the purpose of a colloquy with the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my friend and colleague on this measure, and I understand the gentleman from New Jersey wants to engage in a colloquy.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes. First of all, I want to call attention to the language, Mr. Speaker, that deals with incorporation of the U.S. Information Agency into the State Department.

Mr. Speaker, the conference committee on H.R. 1757 carefully structured the merger of the U.S. Information Agency into the State Department so as to preserve the integrity of the pro-freedom, pro-democracy public diplomacy activities now carried out by USIA. This bill should not be interpreted as an authorization for the State Department to take the money and run by converting USIA resources into a massive domestic State Department public relations operation.

Accordingly, the programs to which the Smith-Mundt and Zorinsky amendments apply must be construed broadly in accordance with the purpose of the legislation to ensure that these important protections continue to apply to

the activities now conducted by USIA once they have been incorporated into the State Department.

This is a matter on which a number of House conferees on both sides of the aisle felt very strongly. We should never have agreed to incorporate USIA into the State Department except on the understanding that the integrity of all USIA functions will be preserved. "Programs" means not just the materials that USA produces and disseminates, but also the resources, including personnel and support services, that are necessary to conduct our public diplomacy abroad. I would ask the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) to comment on this very important provision.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's understanding is correct. USIA is to be incorporated into the State Department for protection for the integrity of its activities. The managers in this legislation do not contemplate any diminution of our public diplomacy activities or an expansion of the State Department's public affairs activities as a result of this merger.

I understand we have a bipartisan consensus on the issue both in the House and in the other body, and will engage in vigorous oversight to make sure the purpose of this legislation is faithfully implemented.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on H.R. 1757, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act (FY 1998-99).

I would like to call attention to several important features of the bill:

First, this legislation is not a foreign aid bill. It contains several important restrictions on foreign aid, but authorizes no appropriations for these purposes—except for a \$38 million package of humanitarian assistance to the anti-Saddam Hussein pro-democracy movement in Iraq.

This bill contains a compromise version of the pro-life "Mexico City Policy", cutting off funds to foreign organizations that perform or promote abortion. It enacts this policy as permanent law—not just for this year but forever. The compromise would allow the President to waive the prohibition on assistance to abortion providers—but not promoters—in exchange for a reduction in total population assistance.

This bill also conditions funding to the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) on an end to UNFPA activities in co-operation with the coercive population control program of the government of China, or on an end to forced abortions in that program.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1757 contains a U.N. reform and arrearsages package which, unlike some other proposals, is not a blank check to the U.N. The U.N. arrearsage money is delivered in three "tranches"; each payment is contingent on U.S. implementation of specific reforms, including reduction of U.S. dues from 25% to 22%, reduction of U.S. peacekeeping assessments from 31% to 25%, and an end to UN "global conferences" after 1999.

The bill reduces the number of federal agencies by two. It merges the Arms Control Agency and the US Information Agency into

the State Department, to achieve savings through efficiency and resource-sharing. But its structures this merger carefully, to preserve the integrity of the arms control process and especially of the pro-freedom and pro-democracy functions of USIA's "public diplomacy" programs.

This legislation enhances Radio Free Asia to provide 24-hour pro-freedom broadcasting to China. It also contains provisions designed to force "deadbeat diplomats" at the U.N. to pay U.S. child support judgments, and to ensure that diplomats who commit crimes in the United States will be prosecuted for these crimes.

It reforms State Department personnel law to restore the Secretary's power to fire convicted felons from the Foreign Service, and to eliminate duplicative pension and salary provisions that allow "double-dipping" at taxpayer expense.

It contains provisions that will ensure vigorous enforcement of the Helms-Burton law, which is designed to bring freedom and democracy to the Cuban people.

It sets aside \$100 million of the State Department's budget for implementation of the Congressional directive and that U.S. embassy in Israel be moved to Jerusalem.

It incorporates the "McBride Principles", designed to end employment discrimination against Catholics in Northern Ireland, as a condition of U.S. foreign aid.

H.R. 1757 also includes a number of important provisions relating to human rights and refugees from Tibet, Burma, Viet Nam, Cuba, Africa, and elsewhere. These provisions have been endorsed by organizations including the U.S. Catholic Conference, the Council of Jewish Federations, the Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service, and the U.S. Committee for Refugees.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and on the conference report.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if the chairman of the Committee on International Relations will stay on his feet, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN). He is one of the few Members who has been a Member of this body longer than I have, and he has truly been a great, great leader in the field of foreign policy.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to support the rule on the conference report on the Foreign Relations Authorization Act. This measure reflects the serious efforts of Members of both sides of the aisle and the administration to try to craft a workable foreign affairs agency consolidation, to also provide reasonable funding levels to sustain our overseas operations and embassies, and to provide necessary forms linked to payment of our arrearsages to the United Nations.

I think it is shortsighted of the administration to threaten a veto on this comprehensive measure because they are unwilling to work on a family planning compromise. This Congress needs to advance the authorities, to consolidate the foreign affairs agencies in

keeping with the President's decision to merge those agencies and to hold the United Nations accountable for reforms while committing to the payment of arrearages.

Accordingly, I urge our colleagues to vote yes on this important rule.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) a member of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to House consideration of H.R. 1757, the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act. This bill seeks to send our Nation's foreign policy back to the dark ages of women's reproductive health. This act would reinstate the Reagan-era Mexico City policy which seeks to limit the reproductive freedom of women in other nations, but it goes even further than Mexico City in posing arbitrary and cruel restrictions on women's legal health choices.

Not only does H.R. 1757 ban U.S. foreign assistance to any organization that engages in any kind of lobbying on the issue of abortion, but it defines lobbying to cover attending conferences or workshops, drafting and distributing materials on abortion laws. It is not enough that the majority wants to deny women access to reproductive health services, now they want to restrict the freedom of assembly and speech for women's health organizations.

We have this same debate time and time again on the House floor, and yet still many cannot grasp the critical importance of providing full and balanced information on reproductive health to women in developing nations.

This is a matter of life and death for many women. Denying access to vital health information and services will lead to the cruelest birth control of all: death. If we do not fund family planning organizations, women in the developing world will and are suffering.

For my colleagues who profess to be proponents of children's health, I would note that the availability of contraception has important health benefits for both women and their families. By spacing births, infant survival improves dramatically and families can ensure that they have the resources to support their children.

Studies indicate that spacing births at least 2 years apart could prevent an average of 1 in 4 infant deaths. Studies have also proved time and again that access to family planning reduces abortion. In Russia, where for decades abortion was the primary form of birth control, contraception first became widely available in 1991. Between 1989 and 1995 abortions in Russia dropped from 4.43 million per year to 2.7 million per year, a decrease of 16 percent.

Someone must speak for the millions of women around the world who desperately want access to family planning. Pregnancy and childbirth are still a very risky proposition for women in many parts of the globe that

often lack electricity, clean running water, medical equipment or trained medical personnel.

The statistics are grim. In Africa, women have a 1 in 16 chance of death from pregnancy in childbirth during their lifetime. Over 585,000 women die every year from complications of pregnancy and birth. For each woman who dies, 100 others suffer from associated illnesses and permanent disabilities, including sterility.

According to the United Nations Fund for Population Activities, family planning can prevent at least 25 percent of all maternal deaths, and many of these are women with families who then leave their children motherless.

How dare we in the United States, blessed as we are with information overload and the best health care system in the world, attempt to deny the only source of information and services to families in the developing world? Who are we to dictate the terms under which these groups provide essential services across the globe? We would be outraged, and rightly so, if the legislative body of any other nation had the audacity to impose its will over organizations operating legally in our country by dictating the terms under which those groups would continue to receive the financial support that they need to operate.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on the rule and send this proposal back to the committee for revision.

Other reasons that I have, Mr. Speaker, for not voting for this bill is that Democrat Members of this House were completely excluded from any participation in this conference report. Indeed, the Democrat Members were not even shown a copy of the conference report until after it was filed. All Democratic Members refused to sign the conference report, and the partisan procedure undermines the longstanding tradition of bipartisanship on foreign policy issues.

For these reasons and all others, Mr. Speaker, I urge a no vote on the rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) a very distinguished Member from close by in Maryland and a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I want to rise in support of the rule but, reluctantly, in strong opposition to the bill itself. What this bill does is to unfence \$100 million that was fenced in appropriations last year and sends it on its way to the United Nations. It also authorizes another roughly \$900 million, and this was about a billion dollars total. All that stands between that and moving our taxpayers' money to the U.N. is the appropriation of that money. The GAO report indicated that from 1992 to 1995 we spent \$6.6 billion on legitimate U.N. peacekeeping activities. We were credited with 1.8 billion of that against dues. That recognizes the legitimacy of these figures.

More recently, CRS, the Congressional Research Service, says that between 1992 and May of last year we spent \$11.1 billion on legitimate U.N. peacekeeping activities.

□ 1430

The Department of Defense, the Pentagon itself, says that, last year, where he spent \$3 billion dollars on legitimate U.N. peacekeeping activities. We are shortly going to vote on an emergency appropriations bill to cover the expenditures that are at \$1.3 billion. We have spent, since 1992, about \$14 billion on legitimate U.N. peacekeeping activities. We have been credited with only \$1.8 billion of that against our dues.

What we want is a recognition in this bill that we may owe them some back dues, but they owe us five or more times as much money in legitimate expenditures against U.N. peacekeeping activities. We want an accounting of that before any of our hard-earned taxpayers' money goes to support the U.N.

What we get in return for this, if we vote this bill, is, by the admission of my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey, a really watered-down Mexico City language.

The President is going to veto this bill. The Senate voted 90 to 10 yesterday on a Helms amendment that there was no dues until there was a tally. That is an accounting. The Senate has voted 90 to 10.

All we would do in this vote is to send the message that we owe a billion dollars dues to the U.N., and we are not going to require an accounting. That is the wrong message to send.

It is not the message that the American people want sent. I have been on dozens of talk shows across the country. I have not had one caller that called in to say cough up a billion dollars for U.N. dues.

I have had unanimous support for our position that we need an accounting, we need an accounting before this becomes law. Please vote no on this bill. Do what they should have done, take it back to conference, and bring out a bill that the American people can support.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON).

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, there is some distance between myself and the gentleman who just completed speaking on this subject. While our interests may have differences, I certainly agree that we ought to reject the rule, and we ought to reject the bill.

This is both bad policy and bad process. Bad process often is ignored, but it is usually a symptom of an inability to confront the real issues. It is wrong simply to take the Mexico City language and tie in knots our entire foreign policy apparatus.

Additionally, I would say that those who are in favor of the Mexico City language in this bill, as earnest as they

are, their logic is faulty. If their argument is that any dollars going to organizations that help with family planning are fungible, and thereby even 1 cent to tell people about birth control policies actually increase the availability of abortion, one, statistically that is wrong. If you look at countries where there is more information for alternatives, for education, for contraception, there is less abortion.

But if you carry their argument to its illogical conclusion, you have to come away believing that even food assistance to these countries would somehow leave more dollars for family planning and other areas where there is an objection.

I think the United States has a right to come to an agreement on a family planning policy that may not necessarily reflect my own views completely. But what is clear here is that the Congress and this country is being hammered on this issue and preventing us from moving forward on the fundamental foreign policy of the Nation.

There are serious issues at hand here. I have differences with the substance of the underlying legislation, but it seems to me that, as a Congress, the lesson we should have learned in the great government shutdown was that the losers are, one, the American people. And they get very annoyed at the political participants who will not compromise.

The right action to take is to reject this, to come forward with legislation the President will sign. After all, the constitutional responsibilities on us are such that we need to negotiate and come to a compromise and then, try as they might, force their particular family language on the rest of us.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEJDENSON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for regular C-SPAN viewers they are going to think this Congress is topsy-turvy because, usually it is the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Connecticut, that is standing up here arguing for this bill, and it is the JERRY SOLOMONS of this Congress that are standing up here arguing against it, and yet the tables are turned here.

Besides that issue, and the gentleman makes his point, and I do not question the gentleman's philosophy, but ordinarily he would be supporting this bill. What is the gentleman opposed to, other than that? The European Security Act is so terribly, terribly important. I know the gentleman shares my view on that and shares President Clinton's view as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The time of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) has expired.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. Gejdenson).

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I think, first of all, for us to effectuate a

policy, it is clear that we need to have a product that can either be signed by the President or have a congressional override. Since it is clear there will be no congressional override on this legislation, what we are essentially doing is playing chicken in the center of the road until there is some calamity.

I might tell the gentleman from New York one story. One of our officers at the State Department during the great government shutdown, I do not know if this really caused it, was on his way to meet with the Kurds to try to broker a deal where the Kurds would all come together.

Well, we had the government shutdown, and it turned out that his travel plans were deemed nonessential, and the meeting never happened, and that is where all the turmoil happened with some of the Kurds going over to the Iranians and others.

I would say that it is too important for the United States to continue to tie this up in a process that has excluded the minority party completely in this final presentation and that deals with an issue that we know will not become law.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would let me use up the balance of my time that I yielded him, I just think, in fairness to those Members that are watching the debate or those people back home, that the gentleman really ought to elaborate on the good points in the bill like the U.N. restrictions that we are making, things that I know you support. But all we talk is about the one issue.

Mr. GEJDENSON. I agree.

Mr. SOLOMON. I just wanted, sometime during debates, as TONY HALL did, perhaps the gentleman can say that we are not opposed to the main portion of the bill, just that one portion. It would help, I think.

Mr. GEJDENSON. I think the honest answer is, however, that this activity we are involved in is not going to lead to a law. It is clear the President said he is going to veto it. It is clear that we do not have the votes to override it. So we are involved in an exercise, but it is not going to affect policy directly. We need to separate these two, both sides, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Smith), who believes very strongly as he does, has shown his commitment; the President has shown his commitment. The only thing we are doing is avoiding the responsibility to deal with those other issues.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is saying we should not pass the bill because the President is going to veto it. I could also say, if the bill comes back without the pro-life position in it, I am not going to vote to pay these U.N. arrearages; and, therefore, we are at a stalemate. We have to work to compromise.

Mr. GEJDENSON. If the gentleman would yield, we have been in that fight, and that is why we need to separate the issues.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes again to the very distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to make very clear, when we talk about legislative process, the Mexico City policy was offered on this floor, it mustered a clear majority vote when it was considered. The House even went on record and instructed conferees to retain the policy in conference. So it was a very real and legitimate part of the House/Senate conference that occurred.

The flip side of it is that, on the issue of arrearages, that measure did not pass here but passed on the Senate, but we acceded to the Senate to move that ball forward.

Let me also make a point, when Members suggest that my friends on the other side of the aisle were locked out of the price, let me just note that I chaired the subcommittee that wrote the major product that emerged as the State Department authorization bill. We had five hearings that preceded the markup of the bill that is now before us.

My good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), and the Democrats were absolutely free to ask any question, to be part of that process, as they so engaged themselves. We had a markup in subcommittee. Twenty one amendments were offered. That markup went very well and the bill passed onto the full committee.

We went to the full committee. During several days of markup we considered 22 amendments to the State portion of the bill. The bill came over to the floor. We spent 4 days on the floor of the House of Representatives. Members who wanted to offer amendments on the other side of the aisle were free to do so provided they were germane. A total of 34 amendments were offered, fully debated, recorded votes occurred.

We then went to conference. On issue after issue, our staffs, as well as Members, met, talked about language and sections of the bill. There were some things that we came to an impasse on. The major issue upon which deadlocked the conference was the Mexico City policy.

This House instructed the conferees to stay with that the pro-life position. We did so on the State Department bill as well. So this is a clear manifestation of House sentiment. That is part of this bill.

I would argue that this has been a give-and-take. We have provided a compromise Mexico City policy. We also provide the arrearages, which is an anathema to many Members of this side of the aisle, and many on that side of the aisle as well, but there are some reform provisions that make it very meaningful.

So there is give-and-take in the legislative process. The President regrettable or some on the other side want it

to be all give from us and all take by them. That's unacceptable. Let me again say very clearly 77 amendments were offered to this legislation in subcommittee, full committee, and on the floor. The gentleman's side of the aisle had every effort to participate.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. The bill cuts family planning funding and imposes the gag rule on family planning organizations. It eliminates funding for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The President has said very clearly that he will veto this bill.

Let us put this vote in perspective. This vote is the 82nd vote against choice in this body since 1995. This bill with this language in it is yet another attempt by extremists on the other side of the aisle to roll back a woman's reproductive choices, program by program, procedure by procedure. Now anti-choice extremists are trying to intimidate reproductive health workers restriction by restriction.

This agreement is a clear attempt to restrict the delivery of family planning information. It is misguided and just plain wrong. In developing countries, death from pregnancy-related causes is the single largest cause of death among women in reproductive ages.

Simply providing unhindered family planning information to all who need it could reduce maternal mortality by one-fifth. The proponents say they want to prevent abortions, but we all know that international family planning actually reduces the number of abortions around the world.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to speak with former Ambassador Wisner who represented our country in India. I asked him what was the single most important thing that we could do as a country in our foreign policy to aid the world's largest democracy? Quite frankly, I was surprised by his response.

He said family planning money. He said that, in India, you could go out into various cities and see families that were lined up for miles just trying to get basic information on family planning.

This language has absolutely no business being on the State Department authorization bill. I urge my colleagues to vote against it. I urge them to join the President in voting against it.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the misguided Mexico City policy is not the only reason to oppose this bill. This bill will have a profoundly important impact on our nation's foreign policy.

We have heard today that this bill streamlines our foreign policy agencies.

Mr. Speaker, this bill streamlines our foreign policy agencies in the same

way that last year's tax bill simplified the tax code. It is riddled with inconsistencies. For example, it claims to pay back dues to the United Nations, but actually increases them. It claims to streamline the State Department, but it establishes a new regulatory system to micromanage embassy staff. Never before have we tried to micromanage what the State Department can do with its individual embassies and their staffing policies.

It claims to get tough on war criminals like Saddam Hussein, but, actually, it cuts U.S. involvement in the international criminal justice system.

Furthermore, the reorganization plan has simply not been well thought out in my estimation.

We need only look to the genocide that occurred in Bosnia and Rwanda because of the hatred that was fanned by an evil propaganda machine. How, then, can we abolish the United States Information Agency? In reality, that is what we do by incorporating it within the State Department. It needs its independence.

Misinformation is best attacked at the grassroots level in an objective, credible fashion, not as part of a tightly controlled foreign policy agenda.

□ 1445

Our U.S. Information Agency should be able to provide the kind of information that relies upon local opinion leaders, not merely heads of state with all of their political agendas. I have great respect for the State Department, but USIA is independent for a reason. It guarantees that the focus will be on the unfettered, objective truth.

This bill zeroes out the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency at a time when nonproliferation efforts have never been more critical.

Mr. Speaker, I also am especially disappointed that we have not been able to include an agreeable compromise on the Mexico City policy. The conference agreement still includes the inhumane Mexico City language that denies some of the most destitute people in the world the ability to choose healthy and safe family planning practices while also denying them their health practitioners the fundamental right of free speech.

This is another of those misguided attempts that some people in the majority have made to deny economically disadvantaged women, both here and abroad, access to quality, reproductive health care and the information they need to plan their families.

The leadership knows that the Hyde amendment already ensures that no U.S. funding is being spent on abortions, and yet they would jeopardize final passage of this important legislation by including this regressive language under the guise of reducing the number of abortions performed with U.S. tax dollars. Studies have shown that family planning funds actually decrease the number of abortions per-

formed. Private, non-governmental organization funds save lives and empower people. This bill does not let them accomplish this most critical mission and should be defeated.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), a very distinguished Member of this body, who is a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), the very fair chairman of the Committee on Rules, for coming forth with a rule that all of us can adopt; and I would like to especially thank the Chairman of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), who held a very long series of hearings on this bill where everyone had the opportunity to present amendments and discuss the controversial issues in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, there are some very good areas that we can all agree on, I think, in this conference report. I would like to especially thank our colleagues in the Committee on International Relations for allowing me to present and to have them approve, without problems, some amendments that I have dealing with the Castro dictatorship.

There are two provisions that I think are very important in establishing a firm position of U.S. policy toward that dictatorship. The first one stresses the concern of the United States Congress about Fidel Castro's completion of the very dangerous nuclear power plant in Juragua near Cienfuegos, Cuba.

Also, another amendment asked the Clinton administration to give us information about individuals and companies that are not complying with Helms-Burton, and this title IV gives us the opportunity to further protect U.S. property rights because these are people who are exploiting the Cuban worker and using illegally confiscated U.S. property that used to belong to U.S. citizens. We want to make sure that folks have the opportunity to take their cases to court, and that the U.S. Government will bar entry to anyone who is not complying with our laws.

So I would like to thank the chairs of both committees, the Committee on Rules and the Committee on International Relations, for their very fair process; and I urge my colleagues to adopt both the rule and the conference report.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), a distinguished member of the Committee on Rules, for yielding to me, and I rise in opposition to the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule because this bill was put together without any involvement of the Democratic conferees. The Democrats

did not see a copy of the 350-page conference report until after it was filed. Because all Democrats refused to sign the conference report, a member had to be replaced on the conference in order to obtain enough signatures to sign the report.

The process had started in a bipartisan manner. Unfortunately, it ended in a cynically political way. Sad to say that the Republican majority did not want to bring this bill to the floor in a bipartisan manner.

Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons to oppose this bill, and the many reasons why the Democrats refused to sign the bill will be spelled out by the distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON) when we take up the bill. But while we are on the rule, I oppose the process under which it was brought to the Committee on Rules, and therefore, oppose it on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons to object to this bill is that giving our negotiators at the U.N. the tools they need to achieve reform, to reduce our financial obligations, and to achieve consensus on issues such as Iraq is what we should do in this bill. What it does instead is to denigrate the U.S. in the eyes of the world because Congress has insisted on micromanaging the U.N. once again.

Last fall, the Congress had the opportunity to get a good deal for the American taxpayer. With a reasonable amount of arrears in place and guaranteed by Congress, we had a good opportunity to achieve a lower assessment rate, concrete budget caps, and even negative growth in U.N. budgets. Congress made the mistake of not acting at that time, and now Congress is making another mistake with the provisions in this legislation.

The real impact of the inaction last fall was to raise the amounts owed by the United States by at least \$100 million. The bill is increasing every day. Our responsibility now is to give our negotiators at the U.N. the funds and flexibility they need to get the best deal they can for the U.S. taxpayer. What this bill does, unfortunately, is guarantee that any reduction in U.S. assessment rates will not occur.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report also makes good on the Republican majority's threat to link two totally unrelated issues, the U.N. arrears and the funding for international family planning. This legislation includes an altered version of the Mexico City restrictions on international family planning. Supporters of this language offered today will call it a "compromise." We who support family planning call it totally unacceptable.

What we compromise with this language are the lives of poor women and families throughout the world. The impact of this language will be equally devastating as previous restrictive amendments on international family planning. It will impose a global gag rule on family planning organizations,

dictating what materials they may distribute and prohibiting them from participating in public debates; and this is important, Mr. Speaker, with their own private funds. We would certainly find a gag rule like this in violation of the First Amendment were it implemented in our own country.

The use of U.S. funds to perform abortion has been prohibited by law since 1993. No U.S. funds are used for the performance of abortion or abortion-related activities. No U.S. funds are used to promote abortion. That is the law. So there is no need to have this restrictive gag rule put in place under the guise of supporting the language that I just mentioned. It is already the law.

The cuts in funding set in motion by this language will limit the ability of family planning and reproductive health services to poor women and families. It will reduce access and quality of services. Programs will be terminated which will cause the number of abortions to rise and the number of deaths from unsafe abortions to increase, exactly the reverse effect it would have if we put out the funds, unrestricted, for international family planning, which would reduce abortion; and I think that is the goal that we all share.

We have debated this issue many, many times over, at least six times in the first session of the 105th Congress last year. Each time, we stand here and agree that we want to reduce the number of abortions. Voluntary family planning programs do just that. They prevent unintended pregnancies, unsafe abortion and infant deaths. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this conference report.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting here listening patiently to speakers who oppose this rule and this legislation. The previous speaker, for whom I have the greatest respect has fought many battles, along with me, on human rights issues, and stated very clearly that, yes, it is the law of the land that U.S. tax dollars shall not be spent on abortions in America. And she is right. There are those of us that do not believe that U.S. tax dollars should be spent on abortions anywhere in the world; those are U.S. tax dollars. And yet we are hard-pressed to prevent that, and therein lies the argument.

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

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, just to clarify the point, perhaps this is good news to the gentleman, there would be no Federal dollars spent internationally to perform abortions.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I know the gentlewoman believes that, but I

have traveled throughout this world and what I have seen just does not concur with that.

Nevertheless, we had another previous speaker from New York who said that someone had told her that there were lines 4 miles long, I believe she said, with people waiting to get information on family planning. I will tell my colleagues, as a member of the Committee on International Relations for many, many years, and someone who has been active for more than 20 years all around this world on these issues, I have never seen lines like that waiting for family planning information.

I find them in refugee camps waiting for food, but never have I seen anybody waiting for anything other than food in lines 4 miles long.

Mr. Speaker, let me just talk to the conservatives in this body about why they should come over here and vote for this bill. First of all, it does have the pro-life issue, and that is a compromise, and whether one is President of the United States or whether one is just a rank-and-file Member of this Congress, one has to learn to compromise. Ronald Reagan taught me that. We cannot always have it our own way, we have to give a little bit; and that is the success of legislating.

Secondly, this does reorganize the State Department somewhat. It is another step in the right direction to shrinking the size of the Federal Government and making it lean and workable, and that is what we are doing here. JESSE HELMS and Madeleine Albright both agree with what we are doing. So that is another reason why conservatives should come over here.

But more than that, what this bill does, this is a 2-year authorization bill, so listen up, conservatives. What this bill says is that it must be certified to include that the United States has no plans to tax U.S. citizens. There are people all around this world that belong to the U.N. These leaders that want to have a worldwide tax, they want to tax my people up in the Adirondacks and Catskill Mountains; and in the Hudson Valley, they want to levy, have a tax. Some One World government wants to levy a tax. This bill says we cannot do that or else we do not give them any money; it is as simple as that. It says that nothing in the U.N. will assume sovereignty over U.S. parks and lands. That is very important to me and the people I represent. It says that if there is any violation of the U.S. Constitution, we will not pay any more dues. Now, conservatives ought to come over here and vote for that.

More importantly, in the 2-year authorization bill, in the first year, coming next year in 1999, this says there will be a reduction in the U.S. share of the peacekeeping budget, down to 25 percent. That means that we are going to get credit for all of this extra money that we are spending on U.S. troops in Bosnia and in all of these peacekeeping efforts.

□ 1500

In addition, this says we are going to reduce the United States' share of the regular U.N. budget down to 22 percent. That is in the first year of this 2-year authorization bill.

In the second year of this 2-year authorization bill, it says we are going to reduce that regular budget cost to the American taxpayer down another 2 percent, down to 20 percent. Conservatives, what more do we want? That is what we have been fighting for, to get a fair share of the burden shared by other countries throughout this world.

I can go on and on with the reasons that we ought to come over here and support the bill, but I think one of the best reasons of all is the fact that this bill caps U.S. contributions to all international organizations.

Let us face it, America pays most of the costs for all of these international organizations, whether it is the IMF, the World Bank, or any of the rest. This caps our total contributions to all of these cumulative organizations to no more than \$900 million, and we are paying way over \$1 billion now. We are reversing that sieve of U.S. tax dollars going out of this country. We are turning it around. That is the reason Members ought to come over here and vote for this bill.

I am going to talk to each of the conservative Members as they come through that door. I ask them to please come by and say hello to me, and I will further convince them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 172, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]

YEAS—234

| | | |
|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Aderholt | Blagojevich | Chambliss |
| Archer | Bliley | Chenoweth |
| Army | Blunt | Christensen |
| Bachus | Boehlert | Coble |
| Baker | Boehner | Coburn |
| Ballenger | Brady | Collins |
| Barcia | Bryant | Combest |
| Barr | Bunning | Cook |
| Barrett (NE) | Burr | Cooksey |
| Bartlett | Burton | Costello |
| Barton | Buyer | Cox |
| Bass | Callahan | Crane |
| Bateman | Calvert | Cubin |
| Bereuter | Camp | Cunningham |
| Berry | Campbell | Davis (VA) |
| Bilbray | Canady | Deal |
| Bilirakis | Chabot | DeLay |

| | | | | | |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------|----------------|------------|
| Diaz-Balart | Kildee | Ramstad | Minge | Roybal-Allard | Strickland |
| Dickey | Kim | Reid | Mink | Rush | Tanner |
| Doolittle | King (NY) | Regula | Moran (VA) | Sabo | Tauscher |
| Dreier | Klug | Riggs | Murtha | Sanchez | Thompson |
| Duncan | Knollenberg | Riley | Nadler | Sanders | Thurman |
| Dunn | Kolbe | Rogan | Neal | Sandlin | Tierney |
| Ehlers | Kucinich | Rogers | Obey | Sawyer | Torres |
| Ehrlich | LaHood | Rohrabacher | Olver | Schumer | Towns |
| Emerson | Largent | Ros-Lehtinen | Ortiz | Scott | Turner |
| English | Latham | Roukema | Owens | Serrano | Velazquez |
| Ensign | LaTourrette | Ryun | Pallone | Sherman | Vento |
| Everett | Lazio | Salmon | Pascrell | Sisisky | Visclosky |
| Ewing | Lewis (CA) | Sanford | Pastor | Skaggs | Watt (NC) |
| Fawell | Lewis (KY) | Saxton | Pelosi | Skelton | Waxman |
| Foley | Linder | Scarborough | Pickett | Slaughter | Wexler |
| Forbes | Lipinski | Schaefer, Dan | Pomeroy | Smith, Adam | Weygand |
| Fossella | Livingston | Schaffer, Bob | Price (NC) | Snyder | Wise |
| Fowler | LoBiondo | Sensenbrenner | Reyes | Spratt | Woolsey |
| Fox | Lucas | Sessions | Rivers | Stabenow | Wynn |
| Franks (NJ) | Manzullo | Shadegg | Rodriguez | Stark | Yates |
| Frelinghuysen | McCollum | Shaw | Roemer | Stenholm | |
| Galleghy | McCrery | Shays | Rothman | Stokes | |
| Ganske | McDade | Shimkus | | | |
| Gekas | McHugh | Shuster | | | |
| Gibbons | McInnis | Skeen | Bonilla | Gonzalez | McNulty |
| Gilchrist | McIntosh | Smith (MI) | Brown (FL) | Harman | Millender- |
| Gilman | McKeon | Smith (NJ) | Cannon | Houghton | McDonald |
| Goode | Metcalf | Smith (OR) | Cardin | Jackson-Lee | Moakley |
| Goodlatte | Mica | Smith (TX) | Conyers | (TX) | Conyers |
| Goodling | Miller (FL) | Smith, Linda | Crapo | Jefferson | Rangel |
| Goss | Mollohan | Snowbarger | Edwards | Johnson, E. B. | Royce |
| Graham | Moran (KS) | Solomon | Ford | McDermott | Waters |
| Granger | Morella | Souder | Gillmor | McGovern | |
| Gutknecht | Myrick | Spence | | | |
| Hall (OH) | Nethercutt | Stearns | | | |
| Hall (TX) | Neumann | Stump | | | |
| Hansen | Ney | Stupak | | | |
| Hastert | Northup | Sununu | | | |
| Hastings (WA) | Norwood | Talent | | | |
| Hayworth | Nussle | Tauzin | | | |
| Hefley | Oberstar | Taylor (MS) | | | |
| Hergert | Oxley | Taylor (NC) | | | |
| Hill | Packard | Thomas | | | |
| Hilleary | Pappas | Thornberry | | | |
| Hobson | Parker | Thune | | | |
| Hoekstra | Paul | Tiahrt | | | |
| Horn | Paxon | Traficant | | | |
| Hostettler | Pease | Upton | | | |
| Hulshof | Peterson (MN) | Walsh | | | |
| Hunter | Peterson (PA) | Wamp | | | |
| Hutchinson | Petri | Watkins | | | |
| Hyde | Pickering | Watts (OK) | | | |
| Inglis | Pitts | Weldon (FL) | | | |
| Istook | Pombo | Weldon (PA) | | | |
| Jenkins | Porter | Weller | | | |
| John | Portman | White | | | |
| Johnson (CT) | Poshard | Whitfield | | | |
| Johnson, Sam | Pryce (OH) | Wicker | | | |
| Jones | Quinn | Wolf | | | |
| Kasich | Radanovich | Young (AK) | | | |
| Kelly | Rahall | Young (FL) | | | |

NAYS—172

| | | |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Abercrombie | DeLauro | Kanjorski |
| Ackerman | Deutsch | Kaptur |
| Allen | Dicks | Kennedy (MA) |
| Andrews | Dingell | Kennedy (RI) |
| Baesler | Dixon | Kennelly |
| Baldacci | Doggett | Kilpatrick |
| Barrett (WI) | Dooley | Kind (WI) |
| Becerra | Doyle | Kingston |
| Bentsen | Engel | Kleczka |
| Berman | Eshoo | Klink |
| Bishop | Etheridge | LaFalce |
| Blumenauer | Evans | Lampson |
| Bonior | Farr | Lantos |
| Borski | Fattah | Leach |
| Boswell | Fazio | Levin |
| Boucher | Filner | Lewis (GA) |
| Boyd | Frank (MA) | Lofgren |
| Brown (CA) | Frost | Lowey |
| Brown (OH) | Furse | Luther |
| Capps | Gejdenson | Maloney (CT) |
| Carson | Gephardt | Maloney (NY) |
| Castle | Gordon | Manton |
| Clay | Green | Markey |
| Clayton | Greenwood | Martinez |
| Clement | Gutierrez | Mascara |
| Clyburn | Hamilton | Matsui |
| Condit | Hastings (FL) | McCarthy (MO) |
| Coyne | Hefner | McCarthy (NY) |
| Cramer | Hilliard | McHale |
| Cummings | Hinchev | McIntyre |
| Danner | Hinojosa | McKinney |
| Davis (FL) | Holden | Meehan |
| Davis (IL) | Hooley | Meek (FL) |
| DeFazio | Hoyer | Meeks (NY) |
| DeGette | Jackson (IL) | Menendez |
| Delahunt | Johnson (WI) | Miller (CA) |

| | |
|---------------|------------|
| Roybal-Allard | Strickland |
| Rush | Tanner |
| Sabo | Tauscher |
| Sanchez | Thompson |
| Sanders | Thurman |
| Sandlin | Tierney |
| Sawyer | Torres |
| Schumer | Towns |
| Scott | Turner |
| Serrano | Velazquez |
| Sherman | Vento |
| Sisisky | Visclosky |
| Skaggs | Watt (NC) |
| Skelton | Waxman |
| Slaughter | Wexler |
| Smith, Adam | Weygand |
| Snyder | Wise |
| Spratt | Woolsey |
| Stabenow | Wynn |
| Stark | Yates |
| Stenholm | |
| Stokes | |

NOT VOTING—24

| | | |
|------------|----------------|------------|
| Bonilla | Gonzalez | McNulty |
| Brown (FL) | Harman | Millender- |
| Cannon | Houghton | McDonald |
| Cardin | Jackson-Lee | Moakley |
| Conyers | (TX) | Conyers |
| Crapo | Jefferson | Rangel |
| Edwards | Johnson, E. B. | Royce |
| Ford | McDermott | Waters |
| Gillmor | McGovern | |

□ 1525

Messrs. RUSH, MILLER of California, HEFNER and VENTO changed their vote from "yea" to "nay".

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 385, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1757) to consolidate international affairs agencies, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and to ensure that the enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) proceeds in a manner consistent with United States interests, to strengthen relations between the United States and Russia, to preserve the prerogatives of the Congress with respect to certain arms control agreements, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Tuesday, March 10, 1998, at page H956).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON) each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

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

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

□ 1530

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today our committee brings before the House a

conference report on the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998. This measure has three major components. It provides for the consolidation of international affairs agencies. It provides funding in other authorities to support the State Department and related agencies, and it provides a U.N. reform and arrearage package.

Through this bill, support is provided for our government's activities abroad to include U.S. embassies, American citizens' services, passport and visa issuance, and international broadcasting programs, such as Radio Free Asia and broadcasting to Cuba.

In addition, it funds U.S.-Mexico and U.S.-Canada commissions that have been tasked with matters related to fisheries, sewage disposal, and other border issues. The bill authorizes \$6.1 billion for fiscal year 1998 and \$6.7 billion for fiscal year 1999. The authorized level for fiscal year 1999 is \$125 million below the President's request.

Funding for a strong U.S. presence abroad is in our vital national interest and provides a platform for a myriad of U.S. overseas interests. Specifically, we need to have a healthy diplomatic presence abroad to develop markets to maintain stability, to protect our friends in this still dangerous world, and to meet humanitarian needs.

This bill incorporates the President's decision to consolidate the U.S. Information Agency and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency into the State Department. The consolidation is the first step toward reforming the international affairs apparatus to meet the changed post-Cold War world.

The third major component of this conference report is the United Nations Reform Act of 1998, which includes payment of our U.N. arrears for reductions in our U.N. assessments, freezing of our overall payments to all international organizations, and the implementation of major reforms throughout the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, according to a February GAO report on the U.N. financial status, our unpaid arrears have impeded progress in reducing our Nation's assessment rate and in encouraging other countries to pay their fair share of the costs of running this international organization. Many of our colleagues agree on the need for a plan to repay our debts to the U.N. which is linked to implementation of fundamental and thorough reform.

This conference report is a comprehensive multitrack approach that advances our Nation's interest while also overhauling the entire UN bureaucracy. It reduces our annual assessment to the U.N. down to 22 percent and ensures that our peacekeeping assessment rate would be capped at 25 percent. It also ensures that U.N. imposes no taxes or proposals for standing armies on member states. A further condition of the package is that the U.N. agrees that our arrears would be reduced to zero after implementation of the reform package.

In addition, this bill would cut through the underbrush of programs, commissions, and other committees that have grown up over the past 50 years, and it sunsets unneeded programs and strengthens the office of the U.N. Inspector General.

We can state that the American taxpayer comes out ahead with the full implementation of this U.N. reform package. The implementation of these reform proposals will save more money than the total of arrearages we are proposing to pay off over a 3-year period.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge our Members to fully support this measure to ensure efficiencies in our foreign affairs agencies and to advance reforms with the United Nations.

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

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to the conference report. This conference report is presented to us through a highly partisan process. I oppose it and I urge other Members to do the same.

We began last summer with a bipartisan product on this conference report. The conference committee did its work in a bipartisan basis. We halted our work at the end of July, as we got hung up on the Mexico City provisions. Since that time, not a single meeting of the conference has taken place.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) met with Senate Republican conferees in recent weeks to craft a Republican conference report. They gave no notice to the minority that they were reconvening the conference. They did not consult us in any way. They simply were not interested in the minority view.

In order to get this report to the floor, the Speaker of the House removed a very distinguished and senior member on the majority side from the conference committee. He appointed another member, and they were able to vote out the conference report because of the change in membership in the conference committee. With this kind of a process, Mr. Speaker, we are not deliberating, we are politicking; we are not making law, we are making political speeches; we are not working together, we are working separately.

Let me call to my colleagues' attention some of the troublesome issues, first with respect to the United Nations. This conference report creates more U.S. arrears to the United Nations. We are not going forward, we are creating larger arrears. And it fails to provide sufficient funds even for our current dues. It does not pay what we acknowledge we owe to the United Nations. It ties the funds to conditions which are very desirable in this Chamber and all of us would agree with them. The only problem is, those conditions are not doable in the context of the United Nations. When we pay late and in part and with imposed conditions, it is not likely that the United Nations is going to cancel hundreds of

millions of dollars in debt that we say we will not pay.

The United States is already being called into question in the United Nations. We have already lost our position on the Committee on the Budget, perhaps the key committee of the United Nations. The Secretary General was here a week or 2 weeks ago, and he told us that we could lose our vote in the General Assembly.

Secondly, this conference report micromanages the State Department. It requires a whole new bureaucracy to report every single time a U.S. government official from any agency travels to an international conference. It tells the State Department how to staff its embassies overseas. It even tells the State Department how to submit nominations to the Senate for confirmation. It imposes a whole slew of new report requirements on the executive branch on everything from a proposed alliance on drug trafficking to child abduction in Vietnam and Laos.

It limits our ability to participate in the international criminal court. It mandates \$38 million in various types of assistance for Iraq, but 20 million of that is for humanitarian assistance which Saddam Hussein is supposed to be providing to his own people out of oil-for-food funds. So the effect of this bill is to relieve Saddam Hussein of some of his responsibilities.

Third, this conference report contains a number of provisions designed to undermine the President's authority and undermine his ability to conduct foreign policy. It cuts funding for voluntary contributions to international organizations, including such key ones as the IAEA, a key agency in the fight against proliferation. It threatens the leadership position of the United States in helping parties to negotiate peace agreements in the Middle East and in Ireland. It requires the President to jump through all sorts of written and legal hoops before providing any assistance to the United Nations, even in an emergency, resulting in a holdup of a large number of funds even for peacekeeping. It zeros out funding for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Mr. Speaker, this report is a political product. We must understand it is not going to become law; it is going to be vetoed. It is not designed to become public law. It is not a carefully crafted document that would assert the role of the Congress in determining foreign policy. I urge a no vote on the conference report.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding, the distinguished chairman of the full committee, and for his work on

this very important legislation before us.

I just want to remind Members that during the course of the process of consideration of this bill we had 77 amendments that were offered in subcommittee, full committee, and on the floor from both sides of the aisle, 4 days on the floor for consideration and a number of very important and productive meetings of the conference committee. The issue that it all came down to, frankly and in all candor, was the Mexico City policy. It was the right-to-life issue.

Let me just say a couple of things on that this afternoon. I think it is important to clear up some of this information about the compromise language in the conference report that would impose some restrictions on U.S. assistance to foreign organizations that perform and promote abortions overseas.

During the last 3 years, the House has voted 10 separate times for the pro-life Mexico City policy, which prohibits U.S. population assistance to foreign organizations that perform abortions, violate the abortion laws of foreign countries, or engage in activities that change these laws. We have also voted to restrict aid to the United Nations Population Fund unless the UNPF ended its participation in the forced abortion program.

The People's Republic of China and the Mexico City policy was enforced throughout the Reagan and Bush administrations. It did not reduce family planning money by one dime. Rather, it protected genuine family planning programs by erecting a wall of separation between family planning and abortion. President Clinton repealed that policy. We in the House, thankfully, again and again have gone on record saying that wall of separation needs to be reerected.

Mr. Speaker, I and other pro-life Members were reluctant to agree to the compromise, and I want to say that very candidly and up front. We do give on this. Regrettably, we give but thus far there has been no give by the other side on this issue. We have done so because we believe this compromise is necessary to save some babies lives. We believe it will protect some unborn children by prohibiting a particularly ugly form of cultural imperialism in which U.S. taxpayers support entities that are actively engaged in bullying smaller nations into rejecting the traditions and moral values of their people.

Many of my colleagues have received some talking points sent out by population control organizations. These talking points are misleading and in many cases flatly untrue. First, the population control groups tell us over and over again that they are using what they call their own money to perform and promote abortions. This is a red herring. It is designed to divert attention from the undeniable fact that millions of our foreign aid dollars can and did finance some of the biggest abortion providers in the world.

Similarly, some of the biggest international population control grantees are actively engaged in efforts to overturn pro-life laws in countries around the world. This is because existing laws require only that the organization keep a set of books that shows that it did not use our money to pay for the actual abortions or for proabortion lobbying. This bookkeeping trick ignores the fact that money is fungible. When we subsidize an organization, we unavoidably enrich and empower all activities of that organization.

The Mexico City policy recognizes that money is fungible. Every million U.S. tax dollars that go to an abortion provider frees up another million dollars to pay for abortions and more proabortion lobbying.

□ 1545

The Mexico City policy also recognizes that our family planning grantees are seen as representatives in the countries within which we operate as extensions, as surrogates for U.S. foreign policies. When organizations prominently associated with the United States family planning programs perform and promote abortions, people in these countries logically associate these activities with the United States.

Opponents of the Mexico City policy also claim that if we require our family planning grantees to pledge not to perform or promote abortion, they will not participate in our programs. Yet when the Mexico City policy was in force, hundreds of population grantees agreed not to perform or promote abortions. Only two, let me repeat that, only two organizations decided not to agree to that and therefore were deprived of that money. More than 350 grantees took the money, and that wall of separation between destroying an unborn child and promoting violence against children and family planning was erected.

Some of the talking points that my colleagues have seen in their office claim that the compromise language would punish grantees for merely attending conferences at which somebody else discusses abortion. This too is demonstrably false. The Clinton administration knows it is false and the population control groups know it is false as well. The bill prohibits assistance of foreign organizations that, and I quote, engage in any activity or effort to change the laws of foreign countries with respect to abortion.

Every legislative provision has to be interpreted by the rule of reason. It is unreasonable to claim that activities that change laws includes merely attending a conference. As the conference report makes crystal clear, there is a world of difference between mere attendance and a situation in which an organization finances, sponsors and conducts a conference that is clearly designed to bring about the repeal of laws against abortion, as the International Planned Parenthood Federation recently did in the

Francophone countries of West Africa and has done in other countries around the world.

Such sponsorship, financing and organizing should fairly be construed as an activity to change the abortion laws. But nobody on our side of this issue has suggested that such activities include mere attendance at a conference.

Finally, when pro-abortionists run out of arguments, they fall back on slogans that this is somehow a global gag rule because it says to organizations they have to choose, either be international abortion lobbyists or they can be representatives and surrogates of the United States in family planning programs.

The administration says that the purpose of our family planning program is to prevent abortions. If we want to prevent alcoholism, would we hire the liquor industry to do it for us? If we wanted to stop gambling, would we do it by giving grants to casino owners? If we wanted to spend hundreds of millions of dollars on an international anti-drug campaign, would we give the money to organizations that use their own money to lobby for the legalization of drugs? Of course not. If Congress stands behind the position that there must be a wall of separation between abortion lobbying and U.S. family planning programs, we can save innocent lives. That is what this is all about. Nothing could be more important. I urge a yes vote on the conference report.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. Hastings).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that this measure is before us as the President is in Africa with 17 of our colleagues, one of whom is the chairwoman of the Black Caucus that asked that we not proceed in this matter. The historic visit and the important foreign policy statements by the President and our colleagues are undermined by our taking action on this extremely untimely and partisan process. This report was never even shared with Democrats before it was filed and the final product was signed only by Republicans, but not even all the Republicans originally on the conference committee.

Not surprisingly, the report that came out of the process is loaded with bad policy. Let me give my colleagues an example. The President announced last April that he would consolidate two foreign policy agencies into the Department of State. Those agencies are the United States Information Agency and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

The Republicans purport to have done that in this conference report. They claim that they have done in this conference report only what the President announced last April. This is just

not the case. The statement of managers for this flawed bill asserts that the State Department will be responsible for designing foreign assistance programs. This assertion is totally inconsistent with the language of the underlying bill. The bill consolidates USIA and ACDA into the State Department, but leaves to USAID the role of designing foreign assistance programs under the overall foreign policy guidance of the Secretary of State. Is this a mistake? Is this our Republican colleagues saying one thing but really meaning something completely different? We do not know, Mr. Speaker, because the regular process was short-circuited and upended.

I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 1757. This is a flawed conference report, the product of a flawed process, and it will result in flawed policy.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to my colleagues who are fighting to get U.N. reforms and those who are fighting to protect the rights of the unborn. I urge them to vote yes on H.R. 1757, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act.

This bill has a version of the pro-life Mexico City policy supported by pro-life organizations, by pro-life leaders like the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), which will end all U.S. subsidies to organizations that lobby for legalized abortion in developing countries. This bill denies funding for the United Nations Population Fund if they support China's forced abortion or population control programs.

Further, the bill scales back U.N. arrearages from the administration's request and conditions the funding upon U.N. reforms. The bill has a number of U.N. reforms which are very important. In year number one in order to receive the \$100 million appropriated in fiscal year 1998, the U.N. must not require the United States to violate the U.S. Constitution or any U.S. law, it must not attempt to exercise sovereignty over the United States or require the U.S. to cede authority, it must not make available to the U.N. on its call the armed forces of any U.N. member nation, must not exercise authority or control over any United States national park, wildlife preserve, monument or private property of a U.S. citizen without that citizen's permission, must not amend its financial regulations to permit external borrowing.

In year two, in order to receive the second arrearage payment, the U.N. must reduce the U.S. dues from 25 to 22 percent of the total budget, must reduce U.S. peacekeeping assessments from 31 to 25 percent.

In year three, they must agree to reduce their staff by 1,000 persons, agree to a no growth budget, must agree to hold no more global conferences, among other reforms.

Mr. Speaker, we have a number of reforms in addition. Let us not lose this

opportunity to reduce taxpayer forced abortions. Let us not use the chance to save babies overseas. This is a vote that is going to be scored by the National Right to Life Committee. That is important for the pro-life vote. I urge all the Members to vote yes on H.R. 1757 and save the lives of children overseas.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. TORRES).

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

Mr. TORRES. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this conference report on the State Department authorization legislation. As we have already heard from the gentleman from Indiana, I object not only to its substance but to the process that was used here and how we came about it today. Democrats were not involved in the fashioning of this conference report and there were no Democratic signatures on this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think this is the best way to conduct foreign policy decisions. There is much in this conference report which I find objectionable. First, once again it contains the Mexico City restrictions on international family planning programs that are clearly unacceptable to the administration as well as to many Members of this body.

Secondly, the conference report does not solve the arrearages problems of the United Nations. It makes it worse. Rather than providing the extra funds, the conference report actually cuts authorized funding for U.S. dues.

Thirdly, I would note that the conference report contains provisions on Cuba which go really the wrong way. Certainly the Pope's visit, the unprecedented worldwide publicity and exposure about life in Cuba, the increase in religious freedom and practices and the recent release of Cuban prisoners are clear signals that the Cuban government is seeking a change in relationship to the United States. The conference report makes it appear that our foreign policy turns a blind eye to the signals for a change in Cuba or that we do not want a change, and we want to continue to punish the Cuban people because we disagree with their government. I urge my colleagues today here to reject this conference report and to make a more responsible approach to dealing with the crucial foreign policy questions of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this conference report on the State Department Authorization legislation. I object not only to its substance but to the process by which it has come to us today. Democrats were not included in the fashioning of this conference report and there are no Democratic signatures on this measure. Mr. Speaker, this is not the way to make important foreign policy decisions.

There is much in this conference report which I find objectionable. First, once again, it

contains the Mexico City restrictions on international family planning programs that are clearly unacceptable to the Administration as well as to many member of this body. The conference report prohibits U.S. funding from going to foreign NGO if the organization uses its own money to engage in advocacy. Ultimately, its impact limits the availability of family planning services to poor women and families around the world, and will, tragically, result in an increase in abortions.

Second, the conference report doesn't solve the arrears crisis of the United Nations. It makes it worse. Rather than providing the extra funds, the conference report actually cuts authorized funding for U.S. assessed dues to the U.N. and other international organizations by over \$40 million from the President's request. In essence, it creates even more arrears.

Third, I would note that the conference report contains provisions on Cuba which go the wrong way. Certainly, the Pope's recent visit, the unprecedented worldwide media exposure about life in Cuba, the increase in religious freedoms and practices, and the recent release of Cuban prisoners are clear signals that the Cuban government is seeking a changed relationship with the U.S. This conference agreement makes it appear that our foreign policy turns a blind eye to the signals for change from Cuba, or that we do not want change, and want to continue to punish the Cuban people because we disagree with their government.

I urge my colleagues to reject this conference report and take a more responsible approach to dealing with crucial foreign policy questions.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. Mr. Speaker, we must reject this conference report and allow families in the developing world to plan their families just as we insist upon planning our own. How many times are we going to have to scrub this bill of abortion to allow impoverished women and families life-saving funds for family planning?

Do we care about life? We have taken care of the life of the fetus in this bill because there is not one dime for abortion. It is time to move on to care about millions of children in Africa and in South America and in Asia.

Do we care about life? Then care about family planning, the most important and effective tool against abortion.

Do we care about life? Then care about the 20 children and the one pregnant woman who lose their lives per day in the developing countries for lack of family planning.

Do we care about life? Then care about the 25 percent of women who lose their lives in childbirth because they have no family planning.

Do we care about life? Then care about sparing the lives of millions of children who are twice as likely to lose their lives before their first birthday because they are spaced less than 2 years apart because of lack of family planning.

First care about life, millions of these lives, and then care about the freedom to speak and to petition your government. We do nothing in this Chamber but talk and listen to our constituents talk. How can Americans, flag bearers of the First Amendment, condition funds on silencing people on any subject when we censor other nations for doing just that?

You might oppose abortion, my friends, you might oppose family planning, but not one of you would limit the right of any American to advocate abortion or family planning. Who are we to tell Africans and South Americans what they must say? We are Americans. We promote speech. We do not pay people to silence them.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the conference report and commend my colleagues on the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), and the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee, for their hard work on this bill and appreciate their perseverance in ensuring it is brought to the floor for a vote.

Historically, it seems appropriate we are discussing the world today because it was on this very day in 1979 that Egypt and Israel reached an agreement for peace at Camp David that many thought was impossible, was resisted by those on both sides within those countries, but everyone understood that while the accord was not perfect, it was a giant step in the right direction on a very significant issue. This bill is as well not perfect, but a very good step in the right direction on very important issues to this world. I believe the most important provisions of the conference report will curb finally United States support for overseas abortion programs.

Specifically, it contains compromise language on the Mexico City policy that will deny funding to foreign organizations that perform or promote abortions. In return, our leadership fulfills its promise to provide authorization for arrearage payments to the United Nations, provided long awaited and much needed reforms occur. Such reforms include lowering our share of the United Nations budget from 25 to 22 percent, decreasing our portion of peacekeeping dues from 31 to 25 percent, and other reforms to streamline that huge U.N. bureaucracy.

The final version also ensures that no U.S. funds will go to the United Nations Population Fund unless that agency ceases to assist the People's Republic of China in implementing China's strict birth quota plan. Mr. Speaker, as a pro-life Member of Congress, I am pleased to support these provisions which will genuinely move us forward toward the goal of protecting unborn children.

□ 1600

Mr. Speaker, these very important provisions authorize assistance to the democratic opposition in Iraq building toward the eventual end of the Saddam Hussein regime.

I am also pleased that the bill reaffirms the position taken by Congress in 1995 when it overwhelmingly passed the Jerusalem Embassy Act which requires that official government documents list Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and that the U.S. move its embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem by May 31 of next year.

Finally, this bill also accomplishes our long term objectives of consolidating international affairs agencies within the State Department.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the President to sign this bill into law.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues have noted, there is little to like in this conference report, but the worst of it is the restrictions on international family planning.

Let us be clear. We are not talking here about eliminating funding for abortions overseas. We have already done that. What we are talking about is eliminating U.S. funding for international family planning. Well, if my colleagues want to increase abortions and jeopardize the health of millions of women and children around the world, they should vote for this conference report to limit international family planning.

If my colleagues promised their constituents they would work to deny women across the globe desperately needed reproductive health services and vital pre- and postnatal care, they should vote for this conference report. If my colleagues want to drive women and families in developing countries further into poverty and despair, then they should vote for this conference report. And if my colleagues want to put a global gag on people around the world talking about these issues, then they should vote for this legislation. But if my colleagues care about saving lives and improving the quality of lives, then they should vote no on this conference committee report.

If enacted, this legislation will gut one of the jewels of the U.S. foreign policy. Voluntary family planning services work. They work in this country, they work around the world, and they work to reduce unwanted pregnancies and improve the quality of life for millions of families around the world.

I urge a no vote on this conference committee report.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, each year in the developing world, 600,000 women die from pregnancy-related complications. Maternal mortality is the largest single cause of death among women in their reproductive years. That is why, Mr. Speaker, support for reproductive health services becomes more important every day. Voluntary family planning services give mothers and their families new choices and new hope. These services increase child survival, they promote safe motherhood. Without support for international family planning, women in developing nations face more unwanted pregnancies, more poverty and more despair.

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

Mr. Speaker, I wish that we were here today to support legislation that would pay for a full range of reproductive health services. But at the very, very least, we should keep the doors open for more family planning clinics. And we must do this so that we can provide these individuals and these families with the information and the services they need.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this conference report.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, there is no question that family planning has promoted the health and survival of women and children in undeveloped nations. For over 30 years, the United States has been a leader and a healer with family planning aid throughout the world. We have led an international crusade to promote child survival in the world, decrease maternal and infant deaths, and end the spread of disease. We have saved the lives of young girls by encouraging them to postpone childbearing. Because of our aid, our help, the size of the average family in poor countries has dropped from six to three. This reduction in family size has helped millions escape poverty. It has increased the prospects of an education and a richer, healthier life for women and children. It has given thousands of families a way up and a way out and helped them survive and thrive.

Despite all of our success, despite the distance we have traveled, there are some who do not understand the importance of our work. This legislation effectively cuts funding for family planning. It has a chilling effect on our family planning efforts abroad. This legislation is a step backward, it is a step in the wrong direction.

Let me be clear. Not one penny of U.S. family planning aid has ever been

used to fund an abortion abroad. Our laws prevent it. We are not trying to change that. We are simply trying to continue a successful program that saves human lives. It is cruel and barbaric to stand in the way of poor families getting basic information about their health in this country or some distant land.

I urge my colleagues to support healthy families worldwide and vote down this destructive and mean legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is unfortunate this legislation is coming to us today when 16 Members of our body, black Members, are in African countries, and I wish it could have been postponed and come up some time later.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this conference report. At this critical time, we should not hold U.N. and IMF funding hostage to the hardliners who oppose family planning funding. Business' economic and financial experts have told us that this IMF funding is needed to contain the Asian financial crisis and to protect American jobs. Our economy is too important to play Russian roulette with. But that is what this conference report does when it adds Mexico City language.

I remind my colleagues, under current law not one dollar of U.S. family planning funds can be used to perform or even counsel women to obtain abortions anywhere in the world. Women and children around the world depend on U.S. family planning funds to improve their health and to give them a real chance at a healthy life. If my colleagues vote for the Mexico City policy, they are voting to abandon these women and children. The President has said he will veto this legislation if this language is included.

Do not waste any more time. Vote against this bill. Remove this language from the conference report. Let us protect American jobs and let us get on with the people's business.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mrs. Lowey).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this conference report. Once again the lives and well-being of women around the world are being held hostage. We are faced with a bill that forces the Mexico City global gag rule upon us. This bill, like so many defeated before it, prohibits organizations from receiving any U.S. funding if they use their own funds to provide abortion services or advocate on the abortion issue. The need for family planning services to prevent unintended pregnancies in developing countries is urgent, and the aid we provide is critical. When women are unable to control the number and timing of births, they have more dangerous

and complicated pregnancies, and too many will turn to abortion, often illegal, unsafe and life threatening.

Passage of this conference report will mean more abortions, not fewer. It will mean women dying and children dying. It will mean an increase in unintended pregnancies, and it will mean women taking desperate, dangerous measures to end those pregnancies. And that is the fact, that is the reality.

Mr. Speaker, I am also opposed to the provisions in this bill regarding the United Nations. The funding level provided is too low, and the requirements attached to that funding micromanage the President as he attempts to push the U.N. to reform itself further. Our debt to the U.N. leaves the United States with no leverage to reduce our annual assessments and weakens our leadership in the organizations. This bill will not solve the critical problem.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately this bill was pushed through to the floor with no bipartisan support and with a veto promise from the White House. I urge my colleagues to defeat H.R. 1757.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the distinguished subcommittee chairman of our committee.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I just want to advise Members that one provision in this legislation deals with the United Nations Population Fund, and it says very clearly and unambiguously that unless the UNFPA gets out of China, they lose the \$25 million that they are slated to get.

I want to remind colleagues that in China, it is illegal to have more than one child. Brothers and sisters are illegal. The Government is aggressively antibaby. Wei Jing Sheng, the great human rights activist who appeared before my subcommittee just a few weeks ago, said he could not believe, he said he was outraged that the U.N. Population Fund and U.N. personnel were working side by side with those family planning cadres, those oppressors of women, who enforce the one-child-per-couple policy in China with forced abortion.

Forced abortion was construed to be a crime against humanity at the Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal. It is no less a crime against humanity today. Our conference report says that we are serious in dealing with those crimes against humanity and any organization like the U.N. Population Fund will lose its funding unless they get out of China.

Earlier the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) said that for 30 years we have been the leaders in family planning. That was no less true during the Reagan and Bush years when the Mexico City policy was in effect. We provided 40 percent—40 percent of all the population control aid during the Reagan and Bush years. That is a fact, that is not an opinion, with the Mexico City policy in full effect.

It is a red herring when Members on the other side stand up and say that we

are holding hostage family planning. Monies flowed; people were given the opportunity to take that money and give out condoms and do all kinds of family planning, but a wall was erected between performing child abuse, killing unborn children, the promotion of violence against children and preventive means.

One hundred countries around the world protect their unborn children from the violence of abortion on demand. The main engine trying to topple those laws are these so-called family planning organizations. Some see it as their mission to nullify pro-life laws in other lands. Planned Parenthood, in their "Vision 2000" statement adopted in 1992, lays out an action plan to vanquish legal protection for unborn children in other nations.

□ 1615

Here is what it says in part. It declares that family planning organizations around the world, and I quote this, must bring "pressure on governments and campaign for policy and legislative change to remove restrictions against abortion."

We provide the money to these organizations that "campaign" and "pressure" governments to topple their pro-life laws. That is what this is all about. That is why my good friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle would not sign the conference report. The pro-life safeguards in a compromise version were in there.

I think we have a moral obligation to say, if we are going to pour hundreds of millions into groups that advertise as family planners, let us have a truth in advertising. Let us separate abortion out of it, because abortion takes a life, a life of a child—it is not family planning.

Finally, just let me say, Mr. Speaker, this conference report and the work that went into it was a bipartisan process, 77 amendments in subcommittee, full committee, and on the floor of the House, and many, many conference meetings.

We went through a give and take. We had Democratic staff and Republican staff studying and working on the provisions of this conference report.

It is another red herring to say that they were not part of it. Yes, maybe in the end, when it came to signing it, but that is because the pro-life Mexico City policy was in there.

Again I say, if we are going to send out roughly \$400 million to abortion providers or family planning providers, and they wear the same hat as abortion providers, those of us who do not want to see any more babies die or any more women exploited or any more forced abortion in China must stand up and say, well, on this bill or any other bill that comes down the pike, we will be offering this language. It is absolutely not going to go away. We have compromised as far as we can go. We have half of Mexico City in here. It is a significant half, but it is only half.

It is about time the President and those on the abortion rights side met us halfway, and then those other issues could go forward unencumbered. Fail to meet us halfway—and we will fight and unceasingly raise this issue on every vehicle imaginable.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mrs. KENNELLY).

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this conference report, and I do it with some pain, because I have always supported fully the men and women who work for the State Department and who represent us so well around the world.

But no matter how emotionally one speaks or how strongly one feels about both sides of this question, the fact of the matter remains that we do not have to codify the Mexico City language. It is unnecessary, because we know for a fact and we know from statute that U.S. funds cannot be used for abortion.

Second, if the President waives the Mexico City restrictions, there is the effect also that the bill would reduce the amount of money available for family planning. This is unacceptable because we all understand that family planning, and we agree, that family planning saves the lives of both mothers and children in developing countries. We do not think this should be the vehicle for reducing those funds.

But I think the thing that bothers me most, and I think worst, about this conference report is it is such a sharp limit on debate and discussion of the issue before us that is in contention: Choice.

Here we are today on the floor of this House, saying exactly how we feel, saying it as strongly as we might want to. Some of us are feeling very, really emotional about this issue, but understanding that we all can have those strong feelings and express them on this floor and then walk out and everything will be fine because we are in the United States of America. But the limits we put in this conference report would be unconstitutional in this country; and, yet, we ask other countries to abide what we are saying in this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, as the United States seeks to lead the world into a new century of democracy, I find it deeply disappointing that some seek to deny people in other nations the opportunity that we are carrying out and exercising at this very moment on this floor.

So as I say, with pain, I oppose this report. I do wish, as the gentleman before me said, that we could get together and face it and in the correct way.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT).

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, my friend from New Jersey

says that the antiabortion compromise with this bill leaves us with half a loaf. In reality, it leaves us with a thin slice.

The President can waive the anti-abortion provision and use hundreds of millions of dollars to promote and perform abortions. And even the thin slice we are left with will be vetoed by the President.

The fact that this report is scored both ways by family values groups indicates how weak this language is. But let me tell you what this report will do. It will send \$100 million on its way that was appropriated last year. It is unfenced by this authorization. It goes to supposed U.N. dues. It also authorizes the rest of nearly a billion dollars and starts it on its way.

But in this report, there is no recognition of a GAO report that says from 1992 to 1995, we spent \$6.6 billion on legitimate U.N. peacekeeping activities, \$1.8 billion that was credited to us for dues that recognizes the legitimacy of these expenditures.

CRS, more recently, reported that between 1992 and May of last year, we spent \$11.1 billion. The Pentagon said that last year alone, we spent \$3 billion. Shortly, we are going to vote \$1.3 billion, a supplemental emergency supplemental for Iraq.

We spent, since 1992, about \$14 billion. We have been credited with \$1.8 only. This is a fatal flaw in this bill. We need to send the message that we cannot pass this bill until there is a recognition of all the money that we have spent.

The Senate voted 90 to 10 yesterday, no dues without a tally of the peacekeeping. Please vote no on this, send it back to the conference so they can bring a bill to us that we can pass, recognizing the legitimacy of our U.N. peacekeeping activities, and trade those off against any dues we might owe them.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON) for yielding, and would ask this question: Why would we want poor children growing up in nations that are getting only poorer? Why would we oppose family planning money which prevents pregnancies and, in some cases, abortions?

It just does not seem logical to me that many on my side of the aisle would oppose family planning money which actually prevents abortions. Family planning money is not used for abortions or even to promote abortions. It is used to help women have the number of children they want and can afford.

When my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, talks about a compromise, I think the compromise was struck a long time ago. That compromise was the pro-life movement won. Federal dollars could not be spent worldwide for abortions. But under this

compromise, it seems logical to me that family planning funds can be used to prevent abortions.

I think in the pro-choice movement, there is an extreme group that opposes the ban on partial birth abortions. The pro-choice movement opposes the ban on partial birth abortions and uses it as a litmus test. If you vote for the ban, you are not pro-choice. But I think there is also an extreme in the pro-life movement that opposes family planning. I just hope that this Congress can get to the point where we can have the extremes fall by the wayside and we can have a sensible policy.

I strongly support family planning money being used for family planning, and I believe that nations throughout the world need the help that we can provide them. As a country like Egypt sees its economy grow, it sees its population outpacing this economic growth, and it becomes a poorer and poorer nation. Why would we want children to continue to grow up in such a poor environment? They are basically the seed for the terrorists that ultimately may destroy this world.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose the conference report, I think it is a mistake, and I am sad that my party has moved forward on this issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON) has 5½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Indiana, the ranking member of the committee, for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the bill. Undoubtedly, there are some good things in the bill, and I really wish that I could vote for the bill. But this bill is mixing apples with oranges. The Mexico City language, the whole controversy over abortion, does not belong in this bill. It sullies the bill and takes away from the bill. As far as I am concerned, it is really improperly in the bill.

It is an embarrassment that our country is the biggest deadbeat in the world of the United Nations. For the United Nations to function, we say that we are the leaders of the world, and we are the leaders of the world. We want to have influence on the world. We want to have influence.

We encourage countries to turn to free market economies. We encourage countries to turn to democracy. Then what do we do? We do not pay our U.N. dues. So we owe a billion dollars. Then when we want to try to attempt to pay our dues, we attach it to abortion language and Mexico City language and other language to placate the lobby, the pro-life lobby. But, in reality, it does not make any sense to put it in this bill.

If we want to build an international coalition against Saddam Hussein, if

we want to build a coalition to march forward into democracy, then we really should not act irresponsibly. I believe this bill is acting irresponsibly by mixing apples with oranges and putting this abortion language in the bill.

We all know the President is going to veto this bill in its present form. So we know, in essence, this is a game and a charade. I do not know why we have to play again. We played this game last year, it was an embarrassment to the world, and we are playing it again this year.

I think the language pertaining to abortion ought to be struck out, and we ought to pass a bill that can go, pass a bill that will make us proud, pass a bill and act like the leaders of the world which we are. I cannot for the life of me understand why we continue to play these games. I do not doubt the sincerity of anybody on the other side, or of anybody else, but I think we ought not mix apples with oranges. This bill should be defeated.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I do so for the purpose of reading a letter from the White House, addressed:

Dear Representative Hamilton, I am writing to advise you that if H.R. 1757, the Conference Report on State Department Authorization, were presented to the President, he would veto the bill.

Sincerely, Larry Stein, Assistant to the President and Director of Legislative Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following letter for the RECORD.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 26, 1998.

Hon. LEE H. HAMILTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HAMILTON: I am writing to advise you that if HR 1757, the Conference Report on State Department Authorization, were presented to the President, he would veto the bill.

Sincerely,

LARRY STEIN,
Assistant to the President and
Director for Legislative Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield the balance of our time to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), senior member of our Committee on International Relations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 8½ minutes.

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana, ranking member of our Committee on International Relations.

This has been an interesting debate, and not too complicated, because there are a couple of ideas that are pretty crystal-clear that separate us. First of all, we have a lot of conservatives who do not like foreign aid. And anything that reeks of the U.N. is tainted and that involves us overseas, and we ought not to get into those sort of entanglements.

So we have a mountain to climb on our side to get enough people to support this. After all, this pays our U.N. arrearages, not perhaps in the manner in which the Democrats would like it paid, but it is \$819 million plus \$107 million in debt forgiveness over 3 years. That certainly beats where we are now, with zero. So if you think our membership in the U.N. is useful, I would think this is the best opportunity to get caught up on the arrearages.

I have always had a couple of fantasies about the U.N. One is I would like to move it from New York to Beijing. I think that would be a wonderful headquarters. We have had the glory of the U.N. being in New York and avoiding and evading our parking tickets. Let us give the rest of the world a chance at it. But I do not decry the U.N. I think it is useful. I think we should belong to it. I think we are a world leader, and we should lead in the U.N.

□ 1630

And so if we belong to it, we should pay our dues, and this is a medium by which we pay our dues. So I think we should do this.

Now, a couple of other things about the U.N. that bother me. We pay too much in peacekeeping cost, 31 percent. I would like to get that down to 25 percent. And our dues, it seems to me, ought to be reduced from 25 to 20 percent. We can do that with this bill. So that gives me an added incentive for voting for it.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), who has been heroic in defending the defenseless unborn, talks about Mexico City, and I was trying to communicate with him that he should explain Mexico City. People think that is a page out of National Geographic.

What it is is a policy that we followed under Presidents Reagan and Bush that said we will give you millions of dollars for family planning, but not to organizations that advocate or perform abortions. In other words, American money should not go to pay for killing unborn children, even if they are Third World unborn children, especially if they are Third World unborn children.

So that is the Mexico City policy, and that sticks in the craw of the left. That is the one thing, that common theme, why, my God, we are going to stop the torrent of abortions with this bill, and therefore, this is a bad bill. Why American taxpayers' money should be used to subsidize abortions overseas I cannot figure out.

Well, we hear that the money of the organizations spent for abortions is their own money. They are not mixing our money in with theirs. I wish my colleagues would stop insulting our intelligence. My colleagues know and I know that if we give them a few million dollars, we free up their own money for their own purposes. It is a bookkeeping transaction. We are subsidizing, effectively, abortions.

Some of us think there is a moral issue here, that this cultural imperialism of ours, telling a country, you have too many people, is across the line. It goes too far.

Now, this bill has so many good things in it that may not come this way again. One of them is the moving of our embassy to Jerusalem and another is requiring the McBride fair employment practices in Northern Ireland; there is full funding for Radio Marti to Cuba, Radio Free Iran, Radio Free Asia to Communist China. This bill authorizes a new assistance package to assist the democratic opponents of Saddam Hussein and Iraq. This bill begins that process of rolling back Saddam Hussein's tyranny in Iraq.

So there are so many reasons why this is a good idea, but most of all, I would like to please make clear family planning is distinct from abortion. Family planning is either getting one pregnant or keeping one from getting pregnant, it is not killing an unborn child once one is pregnant. Family planning, properly understood, does not include abortion, so why should we subsidize organizations that lobby countries to repeal their pro-life laws and that perform abortions?

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), compromised as far as he could. Go ahead and perform abortions with a presidential waiver, but do not advocate, lobby countries to repeal their pro-life laws. That little speck of respectability you are unwilling to give us. You are not compromising; there is no compromise here, and that is tragic.

There is much that is good in this bill; there is much that strengthens our position in the international forum. It helps us get back in good graces with the U.N., it starts to roll back the arrogance of Saddam Hussein. There are so many good things.

It consolidates agencies that ought to be consolidated like the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the United States Information Agency, by putting them in the State Department. And so I just hope that my friends, the conservatives who cannot move their hand to vote for something that has foreign aid in it, would understand that this is important. There are many things in this bill that we ought to take advantage of, and most importantly, that little part of the Mexico City policy that is salvaged in this bill.

My friends over here, I know the President is the premier pro-abortion rights human being in the galaxy, but we have our own independent responsibilities, and we should make a statement that child survival, as I heard the gentleman from Georgia say, is important. One cannot have child survival when one aborts that child. Please support this legislation.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today the House considered H.R. 1757, the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act conference report and passed it by a stealth vote; with no warning, while most of us were working in committees. This bill may contain some

good provisions, such as those that deny funding to foreign organizations that perform or promote abortions, but Mr. Speaker, this bill contains far more provisions that are harmful. Most notably, this bill contains language that authorizes \$100 million in FY 1998, \$475 million in FY 1999, and \$244 million in FY 2000 for payments to the United Nations. This is a grand total of \$819 million that is to be paid to the United Nations for so-called "arrears-ages." It was the U.N., I remind you, that went to Iraq and let Saddam Hussein off the hook.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure what I object to more, the U.N. funding or the way this bill was passed. For you see Mr. Speaker, although the voters of the 7th District sent me here to represent their views, on this and other important legislation, I wasn't allowed to vote on this important bill. I don't mind losing a vote; I understand the process. But I do mind being denied the opportunity to do what my constituents sent me here to do. It is a shame that this important bill was stealthily passed by an unannounced voice vote when it certainly should have come up for an up-front, honest, recorded vote. This is not way to run a railroad, Mr. Speaker. It may be good for the U.N. but it's not good for America.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support for Title XVI of H.R. 1757, "The European Security Act," particularly those sections relating to NATO enlargement. The language contained in this section is designed first and foremost to preserve the effectiveness and flexibility of NATO as a defensive alliance. For nearly five decades, the North Atlantic Alliance has served and advanced the interests of the United States in Europe by preserving peace, promoting economic prosperity, and advancing our shared principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law. As a long-standing advocate of NATO enlargement, and Co-Chairman of the Helsinki Commission, I have consistently emphasized the importance of Helsinki principles, including human rights, in the expansion process.

Today's consideration of the European Security Act language comes at a critical time, Mr. Speaker, as the United States Senate will soon vote on ratification of the necessary instruments for the admission of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic as full members of NATO. Despite the fact that the NATO leaders committed themselves to a robust 'open door' policy concerning further accession, some seem determined to slam the door shut to other candidates. Instead of spurning those countries aspiring to future NATO membership, we should embrace those states that have demonstrated—in word and in deed—their commitment to the shared values enshrined in the North Atlantic Treaty.

The language designates Romania, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Bulgaria as eligible to receive assistance under the NATO Participation Act of 1994. Each of these countries has made important strides in political and economic reforms. With respect to the Baltic States, it is worth noting the Charter of Partnership, signed in Washington on January 16, 1998, acknowledges the fact that the United States has a "real, profound and enduring interest in the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity, and security of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania." In this historic document, the U.S. welcomes the aspirations and supports efforts of the Baltic States to join NATO,

reiterating that enlargement of NATO is an ongoing process. Mr. Speaker, European Security Act provisions will advance U.S. interests by supporting the efforts of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania to provide for their legitimate defense needs, including the development of appropriate and interoperable military forces.

It would be an injustice of historic proportions, Mr. Speaker, if we did not take advantage of the unique opportunity we have today to embrace those countries of Central and Eastern Europe demonstrably committed to democracy, human rights and the rule of law. Having persevered for 50 years and overcome the odds by regaining their independence, the Baltic countries deserve to be fully integrated into the West, including NATO, without further delay.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Chairman GILMAN's willingness to incorporate several of my suggestions into the text of Title XVI. The first concern stems from the fact that Russia has not agreed to the demarcation of its international borders with several neighboring countries, including Estonia and Latvia. In addition, while a Framework Treaty has been concluded between Russia and Ukraine and signed by Presidents Kuchma and Yeltsin, the Russia's State Duma has yet to ratify this key accord which would among other things demarcate the Ukrainian-Russian border, including in the Sea of Azov. Moscow has purposefully dragged its feet on this important issue with the aim of intimidating a number of the countries concerned and erecting a potential obstacle to those aspiring to NATO membership.

The second issue concerns the deployment of Russian forces on the territory of other states. The language I introduced calls for the immediate and complete withdrawal of any armed forces and military equipment under the control of Russia that are deployed on the territories of the independent states of the former Soviet Union without the full and complete agreement of those states.

Today, there are thousands of Russian troops deployed in and around the Ukrainian port of Sevastopol. Meanwhile, an estimated 3,010 Russian troops continue to be stationed in Moldova along with a considerable supply of military equipment and munitions which could prove particularly destabilizing in the Trans-Dniester region.

Finally, the Title XVI calls for a commitment by the Russians to take steps to reduce nuclear and conventional forces in Kaliningrad, where Moscow has amassed a considerable arsenal that poses a potential threat to the Baltic States and Poland.

Mr. Speaker, progress in resolving these outstanding security concerns would go a long way to advance peace and stability throughout Europe, a region of critical importance to the security, economic, and political interests of the United States. I am pleased that the language of the European Security Act is included in the bill. We have an obligation to maintain the effectiveness and flexibility of NATO as a defensive alliance open to the inclusion of new members committed to the shared principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law, and able and willing to assume the responsibilities and obligations of membership.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to register my strong opposition to the conference report for the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act.

I urge my colleagues not be fooled by some of the bill's features such as payments to the United Nations because it also contains some incorrigible features. For example, it eliminates the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, thereby denying our foreign policy makers the benefit of an independent voice on arms control matters. H.R. 1757 also resurrects the so-called "Mexico City" language that restricts funding for abortions overseas—even if they are paid for with private funds. But the offensive provisions in particular that I want to bring to your attention today deal with Haiti.

On September 25, 1997, Congresswoman WATERS and I wrote a letter to the chairman and the ranking member of the International Relations Committee, expressing our concern with provisions reflected in this bill in Section 1228. We were joined by CHARLIE RANGEL, ED TOWNS, JIM CLYBURN, RONALD DELLUMS, BILL JEFFERSON, EARL HILLIARD, JOHN LEWIS, BOBBY RUSH, and JULIAN DIXON. I am enclosing this information for the RECORD. Despite our efforts and those of the gentleman from Indiana, the ranking member, this problematic language stands.

Section 1228 creates vague new authority by which the Secretary of State can prevent certain Haitians from entering the United States. The fact of the matter is that the Secretary of State already has the authority to deny entry to persons who are suspected of human rights violations or terrorism under Title 8 USC Section 1182(a)(3). This bill has a new, ambiguous standard under which the Secretary of State can deny entry to someone who has been "credibly alleged to have ordered, carried out, or materially assisted" in specific killings listed in the conference report.

This new language in H.R. 1757 will be inconsistent with the existing law and create a new untested standard that will be open to manipulation by anyone who simply makes an allegation. Rather than promoting justice for all victims of violence, this will be used to politicize the murders of some Haitians, rather than serving as a tool to advance justice for all Haitians.

Furthermore, by singling out specific violators the bill fails to send a broad message about human rights violators in general. Perhaps worst of all is that the most egregious enemies of human rights, such as Toto Constant, the head of the paramilitary group FRAPH, are already in the United States. Constant slipped into the U.S. (and is comfortably living in New York) not because the Attorney General or the Secretary of State lacks the power to keep him out, but because like other opponents of democracy from Haiti, he is an old CIA asset. We've got to start dealing with these facts if we really want justice for Haiti.

I oppose H.R. 1757 for all these reasons and I thank the gentleman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, September 25, 1997.

Hon. BEN GILMAN,
Chairman, House International Relations Committee, Rayburn 2170, Washington, DC.

We are writing in reference to amendment 383 of S. 903, the Senate Foreign Affairs Reform Act, offered by Senator DeWine. This provision would seek to deny entry into the United States to those whom the Secretary of State "has reason to believe is a person who has been credibly alleged to have ordered, carried out, or materially assisted in extrajudicial and political murders" in Haiti.

We strongly support the bill's basic premise that persons involved in political murders be denied entry to the United States. But, we believe this language raises a number of problematic legal issues, may weaken the ability of the U.S. to deal with extrajudicial killers, and may even make it easier to evade prosecution. We also wish to note that the substance of these provisions appear to be covered by existing law. As a result, we urge you to strike this contentious language and avoid the confusion and litigation guaranteed to result if it becomes law.

U.S. Code currently grants the Secretary of State the legal authority to deny a visa from individuals that the Secretary believes have engaged in extrajudicial killings. The Secretary of State can deny a visa application based either on anti-terrorist or foreign policy grounds.¹ A decision to deny a visa based on these grounds is not reviewable by any court.

In fact, the Secretary of State in the consular offices in the field already maintains a list of people who fall into one of these two exclusionary categories. This list, commonly known as the "lookout book" is kept by every American consulate. If your name is in the lookout book, the consular officer will deny your visa application.

The DeWine Amendment lists specific individuals, specific dates, and specific factual allegations. Although this may seem to focus the legislation and get tough on the alleged killers, in fact this language limits the ability of a prosecutor to bring these killers to justice. Any skilled attorney would recognize how any one of these named individuals could escape justice if the fact or dates cited turned out to be incorrect. By writing the legislation so narrowly Mr. DeWine and his cosponsors risk giving human rights abusers a legal escape hatch.

Beyond the legal problems with this proposed legislation, we also believe the DeWine amendment fails on moral grounds. In limiting the focus to Haiti this legislation fails to convey a universal condemnation against extrajudicial and political murders. We believe it is imperative to communicate our country's worldwide aversion to political assassinations. It is a matter of principled policy making to deny entry to all persons involved in political assassinations, whether they be from Bosnia, Russia, Guatemala, Haiti or anywhere else in the world.

We hope you agree with our analysis of this bill. We urge you to strike this amendment from the proposed legislation. We look forward to working with you on this important issue.

Sincerely,

John Conyers; C.B. Rangel; James E. Clyburn; William J. Jefferson; Julian C. Dixon; Bobby Rush; Maxine Waters; Edolphus Towns; Ronald V. Dellums; Earl F. Hilliard; John Lewis.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, DC, September 25, 1997.

Hon. LEE HAMILTON,

Ranking Member, House International Relations Committee, Washington, DC

We are writing in reference to amendment 383 of S. 903, the Senate Foreign Affairs Reform Act, offered by Senator DeWine. This provision would seek to deny entry into the United States to those whom the Secretary of the State "has reason to believe is a person who has been credibly alleged to have ordered, carried out, or materially assisted in extra judicial and political murders" in Haiti.

We strongly support the bill's basic premise that persons involved in political

murders be denied entry to the United States. But, we believe this language raises a number of problematic legal issues, may weaken the ability of the U.S. to deal with extra judicial killers, and may even make it easier to evade prosecution. We also wish to note that the substance of these provisions appear to be covered by existing law. As a result, we urge you to strike this contentious language and avoid the confusion and litigation guaranteed to result if it becomes law.

U.S. Code currently grants the Secretary of State the legal authority to deny a visa from individuals that the Secretary believes have engaged in extrajudicial killings. The Secretary of State can deny a visa application based either on anti-terrorist or foreign policy groups.¹ A decision to deny a visa based on these grounds is not reviewable by any court.

In fact, the Secretary of State in the consular offices in the field already maintains a list of people who fall into one of these two exclusionary categories. This list, commonly known as the "lookout book" is kept by every American consulate. If your name is in the lookout book, the consular officer will deny your visa application.

The DeWine Amendment lists specific individuals, specific dates, and specific factual allegations. Although this may seem to focus the legislation and get tough on the alleged killers, in fact this language limits the ability of a prosecutor to bring these killers to justice. Any skilled attorney would recognize how any one of these named individuals could escape justice if the fact or dates cited turned out to be incorrect. By writing the legislation so narrowly Mr. DeWine and his cosponsors risk giving human rights abusers a legal escape hatch.

Beyond the legal problems with this proposed legislation, we also believe the DeWine amendment fails on moral grounds. In limiting the focus to Haiti this legislation fails to convey a universal condemnation against extra judicial and political murders. We believe it is imperative to communicate our country's worldwide aversion to political assassinations. It is a matter of principled policy making to deny entry to all persons involved in political assassinations, whether they be from Bosnia, Russia, Guatemala, Haiti or anywhere else in the world.

We hope you agree with our analysis of this bill. We urge you to strike this amendment by the proposed legislation. We look forward to working with you on this important issue.

John Conyers; C.B. Rangel; James E. Clyburn; William J. Jefferson; Julian C. Dixon; Bobby Rush; Maxine Waters; Edolphus Towns; Ronald V. Dellums; Earl F. Hilliard; John Lewis.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, last year's attempts by some in Congress to tie the Mexico City Policy to the issues of funding for the United Nations (UN) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) this week come back to haunt those of us who believe in the sanctity of human life, the inviolability of US Sovereignty, and the rights of the U.S. taxpayers to keep the fruits of their own labor. This week, we see, the "grand deal" struck which will see liberals back down from their opposition to Mexico City Language in exchange for conservative members voting to support funding of the United Nations, affirmative action, peacekeeping activities, and the National Endowment for Democracy.

MEXICO CITY POLICY DETAILED

The Mexico City Policy was drafted in the Reagan years as an attempt to put some limi-

tations on US foreign aide being used for certain abortions overseas. While I believe that those who put this policy forward were well-motivated, I believe that time has shown this policy to have little real effect. I have continued to vote for this policy when it came up as a stand alone issue in this Congress because, by itself, its effect tends to be positive rather than negative, as I say, I consider it largely ineffective.

I believe that the only real answer to the concerns of sovereignty, property rights, constitutionality and pro-life philosophy is for the United States to totally de-fund any foreign aid for international "family planning" purposes. I introduced a resolution to that effect in 1997 and we received 154 votes in support of cutting off this unconstitutional funding program.

In fact, the deficiencies of the Mexico City Policy are such that the pro-family conservative group Concerned Women for America has withdrawn its support for the Mexico City Policy all together. This, in part, due to the fact that while the policy requires more creative accounting, it does not, by any stretch of the imagination, prohibit funding of many abortions.

UNITED NATIONS

The United Nations is an organization which frequently acts in a manner contrary to the sovereign interests of the United States. As such, I have sponsored legislation to get the United States out of this organization.

Currently, the most pressing battle is to stop the US from paying phony "back dues" which we supposedly "owe" this organization. Congressman ROSCOE BARTLETT put forward a bill to stop any payment of this phony UN debt and I proudly cosponsored Mr. BARTLETT's legislation.

LINKING THESE TWO ISSUES

We were able to put the breaks to the funding of the false UN debt and the IMF at the end of the last session of Congress by linking these items with the Mexico City Policy language. For political reasons President Clinton has steadfastly refused to sign any legislation which contains any anti-abortion language at all.

This linkage presented us with a short term tactical victory but its long term costs are now becoming quite apparent. In linking these two issues together an opportunity for a "deal" has become apparent, a deal which will compromise principles on several fronts.

THE SO-CALLED "BARGAIN"

The so-called bargain here is maintaining the flawed Mexico City language in exchange for paying the alleged back-dues to the United Nations. But this, from a true conservative standpoint, is a double negative. In a world of so-called give-and-take, this is a double-take. This is no bargain at all. Obviously, the Mexico City policy is riddled with fungibility holes in the first place. Moreover, it is morally repugnant to undermine our nation's integrity by trading votes in this fashion. Worse still, it is now apparent how willing "some" members have become to water the Mexico City Policy down still further in order to get President Clinton to sign legislation which shouldn't exist in the first place. Even the abortion restrictive language has been diluted to state that "the President could waive the restriction on funding groups that perform or promote abortion, but such a waiver would automatically reduce total U.S. funding for family planning activities

¹Sec. 212(a)(3) [8 U.S.C. Sect. 1182(a)(3)] re: terrorism and Sec. 212(a)(3)(C) re: foreign policy.

¹Sec. 212(a)(3) [8 U.S.C. Sect. 1182(a)(3)] re: terrorism and Sec. 212(a)(3)(C) re: foreign policy.

to \$356 million, 11% less than current appropriations. In other words, Abortion is A-O-K if done with 11% fewer taxpayer dollars. Now that's not worth compromising principle.

"PEACEKEEPING"

This compromise authorizes \$430 million for U.S. contributions to our "police the world" program carried out through various arms of the United Nations. International peacekeeping operations are currently ongoing in the Middle East, Angola, Cambodia, Western Sahara, and the former Yugoslavia. Additionally, the measure authorizes \$146 million to international operation in the Sinai and Cyprus.

ADDITIONALLY

This "agreement" authorizes \$1.8 Billion for multilateral assistance in excess of the previously mentioned contribution to the United Nations; \$60 million dollars for the National Endowment for Democracy; \$20 million for the Asia Foundation; \$22 million for the East-West Center for the study of Asian and Pacific Affairs; \$1.3 billion for international migration and refugee assistance and an additional \$160 million to transport refugees from the republics of the former Soviet Union to Israel. Also, \$100 million is authorized to fund radio broadcasts to Cuba, Asia and a study on the feasibility of doing so in Iran.

Lastly, foreign policy provisions in this report suggest an ever-increasing role for the United States in our current police-the-world mentality. Strong language to encourage all emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe to join NATO area amongst these provisions in the conference report. It also authorizes \$20 million for the International Fund for Ireland to support reconciliation, job creation, investment therein. For Iraq, the bill authorizes \$10 million to train political opposition forces and \$20 million for relief efforts in areas of Iraq not under the control of Hussein.

Apparently contrary to the first amendment, the conference report contains language that the U.S. should recognize the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Istanbul, Turkey, as the spiritual center of the world's 300 million Orthodox Christians and calls upon the Turkish government to reopen the Halki Patriarchal School of Theology formerly closed in 1971. "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion * * * (Except abroad?)"

CONCLUSION

Fortunately, many genuinely conservative pro-life and pro-sovereignty groups are making it known that they do not support this so-called "compromise." I, for one, refuse to participate in any such illusion and oppose any effort to pay even one penny of U.S. taxpayer dollars to the United Nations, subsidize family planning around the world, and intervene at U.S. taxpayer expense in every corner of the globe.

Ms. DANNER. Mr. Speaker, I regret the fact that H.R. 1757, The State Department Authorization Conference Report, was passed today on the floor of the House of Representatives by a voice vote, thereby authorizing payments to the United Nations by the United States of \$819 million over fiscal years 1998 through 2000.

This legislation also includes language that would forgive up to \$107 million in U.N. payments to the United States for U.S. military contributions in peacekeeping efforts. I do not believe that this widely-disputed amount takes into account all of the costs and expense incurred by the taxpayers of the United States in various peacekeeping missions.

I am very disappointed that I did not have an opportunity to cast a recorded vote on this measure. Had I been given the opportunity to cast a vote on this legislation in a rollcall vote, I would have voted against H.R. 1757.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues I am not completely happy with the final version of this bill. However, I have been around here long enough to know that some times you have to take what you can get.

While I am no fan of the United Nations, and I have serious reservations about paying any of the so-called debt to the U.N., we have an opportunity to make some very substantive changes to our nation's foreign policy regarding abortions. We need to seize this opportunity.

By ensuring that the Mexico City Policy is written into law we will send an important message of how much we cared and understood the needs of the unborn. For far too long, we have allowed the President to provide foreign aid to organizations that promote the use of abortion, even in countries that have laws on the books prohibiting the procedure. This is wrong, and by passing H.R. 1757, we can hopefully put a stop to it.

I understand that voting "Yes" on this bill is a tough pill to swallow. But, if we don't take action today, millions of abortions will occur around the world with the assistance of U.S. taxpayer dollars. This is unconscionable and it is time Congress stopped it. Vote "yes" on H.R. 1757.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Conference Report on H.R. 1757, the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act. All I can think of as I stand before you this afternoon is "here we go again." It is disheartening to see certain Members of this body once again hold funding to meet our nation's commitment and investment in foreign affairs hostage to provisions placing stringent and unacceptable restrictions on funding for international family planning. And once again, those Members are inaccurately attempting to characterize this as a vote about abortion.

Proponents of the Conference Report on H.R. 1757, the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act wrongly claim that release of family planning funds without restrictions will allow U.S. aid to support abortion services abroad. These funds, however, can not by law be used to provide or promote abortions. Proponents of this legislation argue that funding is fungible, but the Agency for International Development has a rigorous process to ensure that the current ban on the use of U.S. funds for abortions is adhered to and that no U.S. funds are spent on abortion services.

Funds to support family planning are not funds for abortions. Family planning funds are used to provide contraceptives to persons who would otherwise not have access to them. Family planning funds support education and outreach on family planning options, family counseling, health care, and technical training for personnel. These funds help to improve the health and increase the survival rate of women and children during pregnancy, in childbirth, and in the years after. Family planning allows parents to control the number of children that they have and the timing of those births. And in so doing it allows women the opportunity to reach beyond the walls of their homes, to get an education and to work outside of the family.

A recent report of the Rockefeller Foundation argued that devoting less time to bearing children, reducing family size, and improving the health and survival of women and children results in better economic prospects in developing countries. Withholding these funds will reduce access to contraception and in so doing increase unintended and unwanted pregnancies. Experience demonstrates that as unintended pregnancies increase, so does the abortion rate.

In fact, U.S. funding to Hungary has coincided with a 60% reduction in abortions in that country. In Russia, increased use of contraceptives has led to a 30% reduction in abortions.

My colleagues, this is not a vote on abortion. A vote against this Conference Report is a vote to provide more options and opportunities for the people of developing nations around the world. Once again we are here debating language that will codify a global gag rule—language that is clearly unacceptable to pro-family planning Members of this Congress and to the Administration and that the Administration has indicated that it will veto. For these reasons, I call upon each Member to signal their support for the health and welfare of women, children and families and vote against the Conference Report on H.R. 1757, the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the Foreign Affairs Reform Act. In this time of competitive interests and thoughts, the United States presence is more important to world peace and progress than ever before. As our world becomes more interdependent than ever before the United States must improve its relations. Most Americans know this. We must not ignore the benefits of cooperation nor must we ignore our own interdependence and responsibility as a leading nation to share the blessings of the entire world.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly reject the dangerous Mexico City Policy. It is my determination that any delay will cause serious, irreversible and avoidable harm. We must remember that in the balance are the lives and well-being of many thousands of women and children and American credibility as the leader in family planning programs around the world.

For half a decade anti-family planning lawmakers have attempted relentlessly to impose the Mexico City Policy on organizations that receive U.S. international family planning money, and make this debate a referendum on abortion. International family planning is not about abortion. No U.S. dollars are used to provide abortion services and in fact, access to international family planning services is one of the most effective means of reducing abortion.

I oppose the provision which allows the U.S. to renounce its full debt to the United Nations. The United States is \$321 million behind in its payment. There is a great international game is being played out here today. Why must we continue to barter for the health and well being of millions of people around the world? I think it is the wrong time to do this and we will reap disastrous results.

We must remember and act as though this is an interdependent world. It cannot be overstated that building the Global Village and a better world for the 21st century requires a United Nations that is supported, fully funded,

and respected. Achieving this momentous task must begin in the country where the U.N. was born.

Lastly, I have grave concerns with the Haitian language of the bill. I believe this is a step to decrease U.S. presence in a country which so desperately needs intervention. The secretary of state already has the authority to deny entry to persons who are suspected of human rights violations. This language is inconsistent with the existing law, which is working well, and I am worried this new untested standard will be open to manipulation by anyone who makes an allegation.

I urge members to vote against this bill and vote for preserving world peace, better conditions for the world's families, caring for refugees and sharing the blessings of progress around the world.

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to register my strong opposition to H.R. 3246, the misnamed "Fairness for Small Business and Employees Act." This legislation is an outright attack on the rights of working men and women in this country and would erode many of the fundamental freedoms guaranteed by the National Labor Relations Act. I certainly hope that my colleagues will recognize this mean-spirited attempt to discriminate against organized labor and vote against the bill.

The right of workers to organize is a precious freedom, which I have fought for many years to strengthen and protect. Employers currently have at their disposal an arsenal of weapons with which to fight unionization, and tens of thousands of American workers lose their jobs illegally each year simply as a result of their support for union organizing campaigns. I fail to understand how my colleagues on the other side of the aisle can, with a straight face, claim that this bill is a necessary tool for employers. This bill is anything but necessary. Rather, it adds more injustice to an already uneven balance of power between workers and employers and effectively allows working men and women to be denied employment for exercising their federally-protected rights to organize to protect their interests.

Mr. Speaker, I serve as a member of the Small Business Committee, and I am proud of my strong efforts on behalf of the small business owners of this country. I recognize their contributions and am committed to working on behalf of their interests. But H.R. 3246 is not about fairness for small businesses, and it most certainly is not about fairness for their employees. Instead, it is nothing more than another attack on the hard-fought and fundamental rights of America's working men and women and a vicious attempt to further erode the already precarious ability of workers to organize. I will oppose this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I am a strong supporter of our foreign policy initiatives, including payment of our arrears to the United Nations but I cannot support passage of this bill. I have actively supported the creation of Radio Broadcasting for Iran and Iraq and strongly approve of the new money for Radio Free Asia. My concerns lie with the reforms proposed in this bill for the UN and the restrictions placed on the funds of international organizations that provide family planning assistance.

The creation of the UN was prompted by United States leadership after World War II.

The UN provides a multilateral forum for peace to be negotiated so that international tensions will never again escalate to another world war. H.R. 1757 does help to pay off the arrears that we have accumulated so that we can hopefully regain our leadership position in this organization. However, this bill also conditions this money on unilateral reforms that run in direct opposition to the spirit under which the UN was created. This lack of U.S. support for and leadership in the UN is an embarrassment which has also greatly encumbered the performance of our foreign policy.

In addition to the conditions on funding for the UN, this legislation also attaches extremely controversial and damaging restrictions on private organizations that provide family planning assistance. There has always been a prohibition on these organizations using U.S. funds to perform abortions. However, many feel that this is not a great enough safeguard and have chosen to also place an effective gag rule on what these organizations can do with their own funds. This restriction is in violation of our own Constitution yet many approve of requiring it abroad. To me, this is the greatest form of hypocrisy to which I am strongly opposed.

While I believe that nothing is more important to our foreign policy at this moment than paying our UN dues and regaining our credibility and leadership abroad, I cannot support this legislation because I believe it may do more harm than good for the long term. Placing unilateral conditions on UN funding and enacting unconstitutional requirements for family planning organizations into permanent law will only prolong the problems that have impeded our foreign policy. As we continue to experience international crises, whether they are military, economic or social, the UN and our foreign policy only become more important. We need to fully support the UN now and free our foreign assistance programs from restrictions that do nothing more than waste money and damage the effectiveness of our international development assistance programs.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report to H.R. 1757, the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act. This conference report accomplishes three important international goals by authorizing assistance to the democratic opposition in Iraq; reforming and consolidating the State Department; and most importantly, denying funding to foreign organizations that perform or promote abortions.

There is no justification for using our federal money to perform or promote abortions overseas, or here at home for that matter. This bill also takes an important step in consolidating two out of three international affairs agencies back into the State Department. And, it is important for the U.S. to support the democratic opposition in Iraq. The problems in the Middle East have continued for too long. It is time to put an end to Saddam Hussein's reign of terror.

I do not like the provision authorizing U.S. arrears to the United Nations. I am no fan of the United Nations, and do not trust that institution to respect American sovereignty. It is our job as constitutionally elected representatives of the American people to protect our sovereignty. I am disappointed that this provision was included in such important legislation.

Again, I strongly support three out of the four key provisions of this bill, particularly regarding no U.S. funds being used to perform or promote foreign abortions. American foreign policy should not include promoting abortions, and no federal funding should be authorized abroad or domestically to pay for abortions. I urge President Clinton to do the right thing and sign this important legislation.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, the conference report before us today is badly needed, but it is seriously flawed in its present form, and so, I'm sad to say, it should be defeated. The bill authorizes funds for the State Department and related agencies, and for money this country owes the United Nations. But the addition of the international gag rule on foreign nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) relating to international family planning funds is unacceptable. It attempts to do overseas something that would be unconstitutional if done here at home.

The "lobby" ban means that the United States would be using the threat of withholding U.S. money to blackmail foreign NGOs to promise not to use their own money not to lobby their own governments. The definition of "lobbying" is so broad that it includes making public statements that may call attention to "alleged defects" in abortion laws.

One of this country's most cherished foreign policy goals is to bring democracy and the values of civil society to other countries. This provision would stifle the kind of debate on a critical issue that we are free to conduct in this country.

As Secretary of State Madeleine Albright said: "This is basically a gag rule that would punish organizations for engaging in the democratic process in foreign countries and for engaging in legal activities that would be protected by the First Amendment if carried out in the United States."

The practical effects of the lobby ban would be ridiculous. For example, the "lobby" ban would mean that a foreign NGO could lose its U.S. family planning support if, with non-U.S. funds it writes a paper or makes a public statement that cites the incidence of maternal death due to illegal abortion, thus showing a "defect" in abortion laws. Or, in a country where abortion is legal, an NGO could lose U.S. support if it offered its own government advice on how to make abortion safer.

The gag rule approach contradicts deeply-held American values of free speech and participation in the political process. In the 104th Congress, we rejected a similar attempt to use the leverage of federal funds to prevent domestic NGOs from engaging in advocacy with their own money. We should not impose on foreign NGOs an anti-democratic gag rule that would be unconstitutional to impose on domestic organizations.

It is most unfortunate that this issue has delayed payment of U.S. arrears to the United Nations. This country uses the United Nations to seek international support for many important foreign policy goals, most recently to enforce compliance by Iraq with its commitment to destroy its weapons of mass destruction. We risk influence in the international community on critical foreign policy goals by being seen as international deadbeats when it comes to paying our bills.

The same controversy over family planning funds last fall kept us from paying our arrears to the UN. As a result, we lost negotiating leverage at the United Nations to lower the

percentage assessment that determines our annual UN dues. That mistake is likely to cost us hundreds of millions of dollars in lower dues payments. Assessments were renegotiated last fall, and we have had to ask to reopen those negotiations. And now it is very unlikely that we can succeed in lowering our assessment from 25 to 20 percent, as called for in this conference report.

By the year 2000, Japan's assessment will be 20 percent. Surely the United States, which has a larger economy than Japan's will be expected to pay more than Japan. Other Asian countries, which had expected to take on larger assessments, are no longer able to because of the Asian financial crisis. At best, we're likely to get our assessment lowered to 22 percent, still saving taxpayers millions of dollars every year, but only if we pay our arrearages.

The simply truth is that we will continue to suffer a loss of influence and credibility in the United Nations if we continue to fail to pay these arrearages. I see no reason why this critical international responsibility should be held hostage to an extension of our domestic abortion debate. I urge my colleagues to defeat the conference report.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, the State Department Authorization bill would place an international gag rule on organizations that use their own non-U.S. funds to provide abortion services. It also threatens to cut off \$29 million from our international family planning efforts if the President attempts to defer the ban on funding to organizations that use their own private funds for abortion services. This policy is clearly unacceptable, and is not supported by the President or by the American people.

Why? Because the American people understand that family planning is necessary, successful, and addresses a critical need. According to the World Health Organization, nearly 600,000 women die each year of causes related to pregnancy and childbirth. International family planning efforts have been remarkably successful and have saved women's lives. I am shocked that proponents of these so-called "Mexico City" restrictions claim that our family planning programs actually increase the number of abortions, when, in fact, the exact opposite is true. Studies show that our efforts, as part of an international strategy, have prevented more than 500 million unintended pregnancies.

International family planning improves women's health, helps reduce poverty, and protects our global environment. Our family planning programs save lives, and they should be continued without unnecessary restrictions.

There is no need to impose this type of gag rule on organizations that use their own money to further their objectives and to make women's lives safer. The "Mexico City" restrictions are pernicious, unnecessary, and harmful. If this bill were to be enacted, it would severely limit family planning efforts and simply result in more unwanted pregnancies, more fatalities among women, and more abortions. I strongly oppose these provisions of the State Department Authorization bill.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address several aspects of this legislation which authorize appropriations for activities under the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, which I chair.

First, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from New York for his hard work on

this conference report. He has produced a product that deserves our full support.

Sections 1104 and 1231 of the conference report authorize funds for International Organizations and Programs and for Migration and Refugee Affairs. There are several sub-authorizations within these sections. However, the level appropriated for the accounts in 1989 is such that these subauthorizations will not result in the earmarking of funds for the purposes specified. For fiscal year 1999, I do not feel bound by the limitations imposed by the authorizations for specific activities within these accounts. The programs mentioned may all be meritorious, but they must receive funding on the basis of a balance among all the programs within the appropriations accounts.

Section 1815 of the conference report would earmark not less than \$2,000,000 in fiscal years 1998 and 1999 for activities in Cuba. Despite the fact that the State Department has indicated that it will be obligating at least this level of funds in fiscal year 1998, this earmark does not conform with the proper roles of each committee in the allocation of appropriated funds. It is the role of the International Relations Committee to establish policy and to place a ceiling on the amount of funds that should be made available for appropriations accounts and activities. However, the allocation of funds within those authorization levels is reserved for the Appropriations Committee.

I must respectfully inform the House, and the authorization committee, that I will not be bound by such earmarks or limitations when I make my recommendations for fiscal year 1999 for the Foreign Operations appropriations act.

Once again, I congratulate the gentleman from New York for his work on this legislation. Aside from these minor matters, it is a conference report that deserves our full support.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) for his remarks, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just adopted.

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

There was no objection.

EXPRESSION FOR APPRECIATION FOR HARD WORK OF MEMBERS ON CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this vote, and I appreciate the work of the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, and I appreciate all the hard work that has been put into this bill. Our Members are very appreciative of all of the cooperation of all of the Members on the floor.

We think this is an excellent bill, and we want to give credit where credit is due to the Members of the House, and particularly the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. The chairman of the Committee on International Relations has done a great service for this House, and the gentleman is to be commended for a bill that is consolidating the State Department and bringing some very needed reforms.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank our distinguished whip for his kind remarks, and I just want to remind our Members that there are a number, as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) indicated, of significant provisions in the measure we have just adopted.

We consolidated foreign affairs agencies into the State Department, something that we have been advocating for a number of years, something the Senate has been advocating. We provided \$38 million in assistance to the democratic opposition in Iraq, in attempting to move Iraq away from the violations that have occurred with regard to the biological and chemical weapons. We strictly conditioned U.N. arrearage payments on a number of internal reforms that we are seeking. We initiated long-term reforms of the United Nations; that is the Helms-Burton package. We are saving taxpayers money by reducing the United States assessment at the United Nations. And most importantly, we initiated the McBride fair employment principles for the troubles in Northern Ireland.

Mr. Speaker, we have accomplished a great deal by this measure.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and I think this is a wonderful day for the House of Representatives in reflecting this vote.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3246, FAIRNESS FOR SMALL BUSINESS AND EMPLOYEES ACT OF 1998

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 393 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the