

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OXLEY). The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 312, noes 120, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 431]

AYES—312

| | | |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Allard | Doyle | Kennelly |
| Andrews | Dreier | Kildee |
| Archer | Duncan | Kim |
| Army | Dunn | King |
| Bachus | Edwards | Kingston |
| Baesler | Ehrlich | Klug |
| Baker (CA) | Emerson | Knollenberg |
| Baker (LA) | English | LaHood |
| Baldacci | Ensign | Lantos |
| Ballenger | Everett | Largent |
| Barcia | Ewing | Latham |
| Barr | Fawell | LaTourette |
| Barrett (NE) | Fields (LA) | Laughlin |
| Bartlett | Fields (TX) | Lazio |
| Barton | Flanagan | Lewis (CA) |
| Bass | Foley | Lewis (KY) |
| Bateman | Forbes | Lightfoot |
| Bentsen | Ford | Lincoln |
| Bereuter | Fowler | Linder |
| Bevill | Fox | Lipinski |
| Bilbray | Franks (CT) | Livingston |
| Bilirakis | Franks (NJ) | LoBiondo |
| Bishop | Frelinghuysen | Longley |
| Bliley | Frisa | Lucas |
| Blute | Frost | Luther |
| Boehkert | Funderburk | Manton |
| Boehner | Gallegly | Manzullo |
| Bonilla | Ganske | Martinez |
| Bono | Gekas | Martini |
| Brewster | Gephardt | Mascara |
| Browder | Geren | McCarthy |
| Brown (FL) | Gillmor | McCollum |
| Brown (OH) | Gilman | McCreary |
| Brownback | Gingrich | McDade |
| Bryant (TN) | Goodlatte | McHugh |
| Bunn | Goodling | McInnis |
| Bunning | Gordon | McIntosh |
| Burr | Goss | McKeon |
| Burton | Graham | McKinney |
| Buyer | Green | McNulty |
| Callahan | Gunderson | Menendez |
| Calvert | Gutierrez | Metcalf |
| Camp | Gutknecht | Meyers |
| Canady | Hall (TX) | Mica |
| Castle | Hamilton | Miller (FL) |
| Chabot | Hancock | Molinari |
| Chambliss | Hansen | Mollohan |
| Chapman | Harman | Montgomery |
| Chenoweth | Hastert | Moorhead |
| Christensen | Hastings (WA) | Moran |
| Chryslers | Hayes | Morella |
| Clayton | Hayworth | Murtha |
| Clement | Hefley | Myers |
| Clyburn | Hefner | Myrick |
| Coble | Heineman | Neal |
| Coburn | Herger | Nethercutt |
| Collins (GA) | Hilleary | Neumann |
| Combest | Hilliard | Ney |
| Condit | Hobson | Norwood |
| Cooley | Hoke | Nussle |
| Costello | Holden | Ortiz |
| Cox | Hostettler | Oxley |
| Cramer | Houghton | Packard |
| Crane | Hunter | Pallone |
| Crapo | Hutchinson | Parker |
| Creameans | Hyde | Paxon |
| Cubin | Inglis | Payne (VA) |
| Cunningham | Istook | Peterson (FL) |
| Danner | Jacobs | Peterson (MN) |
| Davis | Jefferson | Pickett |
| de la Garza | Johnson (CT) | Pombo |
| Deal | Johnson (SD) | Pomeroy |
| DeLay | Johnson, E.B. | Portman |
| Deutsch | Johnson, Sam | Pryce |
| Diaz-Balart | Jones | Quillen |
| Dickey | Kanjorski | Quinn |
| Dooley | Kasich | Radanovich |
| Doolittle | Kelly | Rahall |
| Dornan | Kennedy (MA) | Ramstad |

| | |
|---------------|-------------|
| Regula | Smith (MI) |
| Richardson | Smith (NJ) |
| Riggs | Smith (TX) |
| Roberts | Smith (WA) |
| Roemer | Solomon |
| Rogers | Souder |
| Rohrabacher | Spence |
| Ros-Lehtinen | Spratt |
| Rose | Stearns |
| Roth | Stenholm |
| Roukema | Stockman |
| Royce | Stump |
| Salmon | Stupak |
| Sanford | Talent |
| Saxton | Tate |
| Scarborough | Tauzin |
| Schaefer | Taylor (MS) |
| Schiff | Taylor (NC) |
| Seastrand | Tejeda |
| Sensenbrenner | Thomas |
| Shaw | Thompson |
| Shuster | Thornberry |
| Sisisky | Thornton |
| Skeen | Thurman |
| Skelton | Tiahrt |

| |
|-------------|
| Torkildsen |
| Towns |
| Traficant |
| Tucker |
| Upton |
| Volkmer |
| Vucanovich |
| Waldholtz |
| Walker |
| Walsh |
| Wamp |
| Watts (OK) |
| Weldon (FL) |
| Weldon (PA) |
| Weller |
| Whitfield |
| Wicker |
| Wilson |
| Wise |
| Wolf |
| Wynn |
| Young (AK) |
| Young (FL) |
| Zeliff |
| Zimmer |

NOES—120

| | |
|--------------|---------------|
| Abercrombie | Gibbons |
| Ackerman | Gilchrest |
| Barrett (WI) | Gonzalez |
| Becerra | Greenwood |
| Beilenson | Hall (OH) |
| Berman | Hastings (FL) |
| Bonior | Hinches |
| Borski | Hoekstra |
| Boucher | Hoyer |
| Brown (CA) | Jackson-Lee |
| Bryant (TX) | Johnston |
| Cardin | Kaptur |
| Clay | Kennedy (RI) |
| Clinger | Klecza |
| Coleman | Klink |
| Collins (IL) | Kolbe |
| Collins (MI) | LaFalce |
| Conyers | Leach |
| Coyne | Levin |
| DeFazio | Lewis (GA) |
| DeLauro | Lofgren |
| Dellums | Lowey |
| Dicks | Maloney |
| Dingell | Markey |
| Dixon | Matsui |
| Doggett | McDermott |
| Durbin | McHale |
| Ehlers | Meehan |
| Engel | Meek |
| Eshoo | Mfume |
| Evans | Miller (CA) |
| Farr | Mineta |
| Fattah | Minge |
| Fazio | Mink |
| Finer | Nadler |
| Flake | Oberstar |
| Foglietta | Obey |
| Frank (MA) | Olver |
| Furse | Orton |
| Gejdenson | Owens |

NOT VOTING—3

Horn Moakley Reynolds

□ 1540

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Before announcing the vote, the Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House, and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I missed the last rollcall on the constitutional amendment since I was

circulating a letter to the President on behalf of the base closure situation in California.

If present, Mr. Speaker, I would have voted for the Solomon resolution concerning the authority given to pass legislation to deal with the flag and desecration.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 79, the constitutional amendment that just passed the House.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 896

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 896.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1289

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1289.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. DUNN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, yesterday during the House's consideration of H.R. 1868, I inadvertently voted "no" on rollcall vote No. 420. I rise to ask that the RECORD reflect I intended to vote "yes" on that vote.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 170 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1868.

□ 1543

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1868) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. HANSEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, June 27, 1995, amendment No. 17, offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] had been disposed of, and title V was open for amendment at any point.

Are there amendments to title V?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PORTER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PORTER: Page 78, after line 6, insert the following new section:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO TURKEY

SEC. 564. Not more than \$21,000,000 of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading "ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND" may be made available to the Government of Turkey.

□ 1545

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Has the bill been called up, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. CALLAHAN. The amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] has been read?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's amendment has been designated.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Then, Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman want to proceed with his point of order at this point?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I will just reserve the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] reserves his point of order, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know the gentleman's point of order. If he has one, what point of order is he making?

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment adds a limitation to a general appropriation bill. Under the revised clause 2, rule XXI, such amendments are not in order during the reading of a general appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, the revised rule states in part:

Except as provided in paragraph (D), no amendment shall be in order during consideration of a general appropriation bill proposing a limitation not specifically contained or authorized in existing law for the period of the limitation.

The gentleman's amendment adds limitation and is not specifically contained or authorized in existing law,

and, therefore, is in violation of clause 2(c) of rule XXI, and I will ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HANSEN). The Chair rules that the amendment does contain a limitation and, therefore, would have to wait until the end of the bill to be offered.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. VOLKMER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. VOLKMER. I ask, Would the amendment not be in order if the motion to rise at the end of the bill after all amendments are completed is defeated?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not making that ruling at this particular time.

Mr. VOLKMER. Well, I mean at that time an amendment with a limitation is in order only after the motion to rise is defeated; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. That would be correct, except if the motion to rise and report is not offered.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment merely changes the level of funding in the bill by making a cut of \$25 million. It has no limitation that I am aware of if we are talking about amendment No. 34.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will tell the gentleman from Illinois that it does limit funds in the bill, and the Chair has ruled on the form of the amendment. It would have to wait until the end of the bill.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I might inform the gentleman that it is certainly not our intention to deny him the ability to introduce his amendment or the opportunity to debate it to its fullest extent. It is just being introduced at the wrong time because the rule puts in point of order three amendments prior to his, so we do intend to afford the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] every opportunity that he needs to present his amendment, and there will be no indication, coming from me at least, there is no indication that I will deny him the—

Mr. PORTER. If the gentleman would yield, then why not take it up right now?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Because the rule says we are going to take up the three bills that the Committee on Rules approved—

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title 5?

Mr. DEUTSCH. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Would it be our understanding that this amendment coming into order, that we would have to defeat the motion to rise?

The CHAIRMAN. Unless the motion to rise and report is not made, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. DEUTSCH. So the fact is the Porter amendment would not automatically be made in order at the end of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Except, Mr. Chairman, if I might be recognized, I would just like to inform the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] that under no circumstances is this committee going to rise and vote on final passage of this bill until such time as he has had the opportunity to fully debate his amendment regarding Turkey, so it is not our intention to—

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, could we make a unanimous-consent request that that would be done at this time? As I understand, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] would be willing to do that, but it would not prevent any other Member to make that motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman made a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DEUTSCH. Well, I would not if the gentleman would just make clear that we would have the opportunity to debate the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has the opportunity to make his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we take up the Porter-Wolf-Smith amendment immediately following the three amendments that the rule makes in order.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly object. I have given the gentleman my word. I have told him we are going to give him full opportunity for as much time as he likes to debate his amendment. We are not going to do anything to preclude him this opportunity. We are going to do it as the rule permits, and that is the three amendments that were allowed under the rule, we are going to debate them this afternoon, and then immediately following the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] can offer his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard from the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey: Page 78, after line 6, insert the following new section:

PROHIBITION OF FUNDING FOR ABORTION

SEC. 564. (a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or other law, none of the funds appropriated by this Act for population assistance activities may be made available for any private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organization until the organization certifies that it does not and will not during the period for which the funds are made available, directly or through a subcontractor or sub-grantee, perform abortions in any foreign country, except where the life or the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term or in cases of forcible rape or incest.

(2) Paragraph (1) may not be construed to apply to the treatment of injuries or illnesses caused by legal or illegal abortions or

to assistance provided directly to the government of a country.

(b) LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.—

(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or other law, none of the funds appropriated by this Act for population assistance activities may be made available for any private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organization until the organization certifies that it does not and will not during the period for which the funds are made available, violate the laws of any foreign country concerning the circumstances under which abortion is permitted, regulated, or prohibited, or engage in any activity or effort to alter the laws or governmental policies of any foreign country concerning the circumstances under which abortion is permitted, regulated, or prohibited.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to activities in opposition to coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization.

(c) COERCIVE POPULATION CONTROL METHODS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or other law, none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be made available for the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), unless the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that (1) the United Nations Population Fund has terminated all activities in the People's Republic of China; or (2) during the 12 months preceding such certification there have been no abortions as the result of coercion associated with the family planning policies of the national government or other governmental entities within the People's Republic of China. As used in this section the term "coercion" includes physician duress or abuse, destruction or confiscation of property, loss of means of livelihood, or severe psychological pressure.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering today is both pro-life and anticoercion. It is essentially identical to the one that the House adopted to the American Overseas Interests Act, H.R. 1561, last month. The amendment would do nothing more and nothing less than reinstate the "wall of separation" between family planning and abortion, and particularly coercive abortion, which was torn down 2 years ago by the Clinton administration.

The prochild, provoluntarism policy that my amendment would reinstate was the law of the land for a decade. It was repeatedly upheld by the Federal courts against a wide range of both statutory and constitutional challenges brought by the abortion industry. Recent experience suggests that this policy is needed now, more than ever before.

Mr. Chairman, the government of the People's Republic of China, as I think more and more Members are realizing, routinely compels women to abort their, quote, unauthorized children. The usual method is intense persuasion, using all of the economic, social, and psychological tools a totalitarian

state has at its disposal. When these methods fail, the women are taken physically to abortion mills, often in handcuffs, and coerced to have abortions. Sometimes this happens very late in the pregnancy: the baby's skull is crushed with forceps, or lethal chemical shots are administered into the soft part of the skull.

Mr. Chairman, forced abortion was properly construed to be a crime against humanity at the Nuremberg war crime tribunals, and again it is being used pervasively throughout the People's Republic of China. Population control organizations, with the United Nations Population Fund at the helm, are promoting population control in China and have had a hand-in-glove relationship with the hardliners in the PRC.

As a matter of fact, I would remind Members that during the Reagan and Bush years we did not provide funding to those organizations because of that kind of complicity in these heinous crimes against women. It is not just that the child is being killed. It is also that the woman is being exploited in this very cruel manner.

I would ask all of my colleagues to take a look at the report by Amnesty International, released just yesterday. It is under the heading "Human Rights Violations Resulting from Enforced Birth Control." They point out that birth control has been compulsory in China since 1979. Women must have official permission to bear children.

Mr. Chairman, the report in its entirety is as follows:

WOMEN IN CHINA—A PRELIMINARY REPORT
FROM AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL, JUNE 1995
HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS RESULTING FROM
ENFORCED BIRTH CONTROL

Birth control has been compulsory in China since 1979. . . . Government demographers set a target for the stabilization of the population by the year 2000. The target currently stands at 1.3 billion, which they claim can only be achieved through "strict measures".

The policy involves the strict control of the age of marriage and the timing and number of children for each couple. Women must have official permission to bear children. Birth control is enforced through quotas allocated to each work or social unit (such as school, factory or village). The quotas fix the number of children that may be born annually in each unit. Local party officials (cadres) have always monitored the system, but since 1991 they have been held directly responsible for its implementation through "target management responsibility contracts". A cadre's performance is now evaluated not just on the region's economic performance but also on its implementation of the birth control policy. Cadres may lose bonuses or face penalties if they fail to keep within quotas.

The policy has become known as the "one-child" policy. In fact, it is more complex than that and is applied differently in various areas. While the authorities issue ideological directives, targets and guidelines, at present the detailed regulations, sanctions and incentives are left almost entirely to the county level administration, who determine them "according to the local situation". In most regions, urban couples may have only one child unless their child is disabled, while

rural couples may have a second if the first is a girl. A third child is "prohibited" in most available regulations. Regulations covering migrant women indicate that abortion is mandatory if the woman does not return to her home region. Abortion is also mandated for unmarried women.

The authorities in Beijing initially insisted that ethnic groups with populations of less than 10 million were exempt from the one child policy or even from family planning entirely. It is clear, however, that controls have been applied to these groups for many years, including more stringent sanctions for urban residents and "prohibitions" on a third child. There have also been reports since 1988 of controls extending to enforcement of one-child families, in particular for state employees. Currently, as with the rest of the population, specific regulations and their implementation are decided by "Autonomous Regions and Provinces where the minorities reside".

Couples who have a child "above the quota" are subject to sanctions, including heavy fines. In rural areas, there have been reports of the demolition of the houses of people who failed to pay fines. Peer pressure is also used as work units may be denied bonuses if the child quota is exceeded. State employees may be dismissed or demoted. Psychological intimidation and harassment is also commonly used to "persuade" pregnant woman to have an abortion. Groups of family planning officials may visit them in the middle of the night to this end. In the face of such pressure, women facing unwanted abortions or sterilization are likely to feel they have no option but to comply.

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL'S CONCERNS

Amnesty International takes no position on the official birth control policy in China, but it is concerned about the human rights violations which result from it, many of which affect women in particular. It is concerned at reports that forced abortion and sterilization have been carried out by or at the instigation of people acting in an official capacity, such as family planning officials, against women who are detained, restricted or forcibly taken from their homes to have the operation. Amnesty International considers that in these circumstances such actions amount to cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment of detainees or restricted persons by government officials.

The use of forcible measures is indicated in official family planning reports and regulations, and in Chinese press coverage. Amnesty International also has testimony from former family planning officials as well as individuals who were themselves subjected to such cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment.

Details of county level regulations are difficult to obtain. Most available documents are ambiguous and full of euphemisms such as the "combined method" (abortion and sterilization) or "remedial measures" (abortion). Despite this, some insight can be gained into the use of coercion from provincial, as well as county reports. For example, in 1993 family planning officials in Jiangxi Province stated: "Women who should be subjected to contraception and sterilization measures will have to comply". Regulations published in January 1991 for Gonghe county in Qinghai (which has a substantial Tibetan population) state "the birth prevention operation will be carried out before the end of 1991 or in any case within the year 1992 and no excuses or pretexts will be entertained".

In a 1993 interview with Amnesty International, a former family planning official described the threat of violence used to implement the policy:

"Several times I have witnessed how women who were five to seven months pregnant were protected by their neighbors and relatives, some of whom used tools against us. Mostly the police only had to show their weapons to scare them off. Sometimes they had to shoot in the air. In only one case did I see them shoot at hands and feet. Sometimes we had to use handcuffs."

Several family planning officials who worked in Liaoning and Fujian Provinces from the mid-1980's to the mid-1990's are now in exile and have given testimony. They say they detained women who were pregnant with "out of plan children" in storerooms or offices for as long as they resisted being "persuaded" to have an abortion. This could last several days. One official reported being able to transfer such women to the local detention centre for up to two months if they remained intransigent. Once a woman relented, the official would escort her to the local hospital and wait until the doctor performing the abortion had signed a statement that the abortion had been carried out. Unless the woman was considered too weak, it was normal for her to be sterilized straight after the abortion.

A refugee from Guangdong Province described how he and his wife had suffered under the birth-control policy. The couple had their first child in 1982 and were subsequently denied permission to have another. In 1987 the authorities discovered that his wife was pregnant and forced her to have an abortion. In 1991 she became pregnant again and to conceal it, the couple moved to live with relatives in another village. In September that year local militia and family planning officials from the city of Foshan surrounded the village in the middle of the night and searched all the Houses. They forced all the pregnant women into trucks and drove them to hospital. The refugee's wife gave birth on the journey and a doctor at the hospital reportedly killed the baby with an injection. The other women had forced abortions.

The implementation of the birth-control policy has also resulted in the detention and ill-treatment of relatives of those attempting to avoid abortion or sterilization. Significantly, the Supreme People's Court felt the need to specifically outlaw the taking of hostages by government officials in a directive in 1990. However, the practice continues, as shown by a series of reports since late 1992 from Hebei Province.

Journalists from Hong Kong visited Zhao county, Hebei province, in November 1992 while a birth-control campaign was in progress. They saw villagers detained outside the county government offices in freezing temperatures who were under arrest for non-payment of fines for illegal birth. Villagers reported that those who could not pay the heavy annual fine had their property confiscated or that their relatives were held hostage until the money was paid.

In January 1994 an official Chinese newspaper published a letter from Xiping county, Hebei Province, complaining that the reputation of the People's Emergency Militia (minbing ying ji fendui) was being ruined because cadres were misusing them to enforce unpopular family planning policies.

In April 1994 the annual review of family planning work in Hebei Province mentioned the use of "law enforcement contingents" and admitted that some cadres believed that any method was acceptable in pursuit of the family planning policy. Such cadres had "resorted to oversimplified and rigid measures and even violated laws . . . thus affecting the party-populace and cadre-populace relations". It is not clear what, if any, action was taken against these abuses, and viola-

tions have persisted in the province since then.

For example, villagers in Fengjiazhuang and Longtiangou in Lingzhou country, Hebei Province, alleged they were targeted in a birth-control campaign initiated in early 1994 under the slogan "better to have more graves than more than one child". Ninety per cent of resident in the villages are Catholic and many have been fined in the past for having more children than permitted because they reject on religious grounds abortion and sterilization.

An unmarried woman was one of those targeted. One of her brothers had fled the village with his wife fearing sterilization as they had four children. The sister had adopted one of their children and was detained several times, including once in early November 1994 when she was held for seven days in an attempt to force her brother and his wife to return and pay more fines. She was taken to the county government office and locked in a basement room with 12 to 13 other women and men. She was blindfolded, stripped naked, with her hands tied behind her back, and beaten with an electric baton. Several of those detained with her were suspended and beaten, and some were detained for several weeks.

A report by the Union of Catholic Asian News stated that other villages had been targeted in a similar way. Despite complaints to the county and provincial government and to the people's procurator, the family planning teams ignored the procurator's order to stop their actions, blaming the Catholics for "causing problems".

The taking and ill-treating of hostages by family planning officials was also reported in Fujian Province, in 1994. An elderly woman who lived near Quanzhou city was detained for three months when her daughter-in-law fled from family planning officials; they had found out she was pregnant with her second child one year earlier than local regulations on both spacing allowed. The elderly woman was reportedly kept in a cell with little ventilation or light, with 70 other people, and was only released when she became ill.

Despite assurances from the State Family Planning Commission that "coercion is not permitted", Amnesty International has been unable to find any instance of sanctions taken against officials who perpetrated such violations. This is in stark contrast to the treatment of those who assist women to circumvent the policies, or who shelter women from the threat of forced abortion and sterilization.

In December 1993 a district court in Guangzhou reportedly sentenced a man to 10 years' imprisonment and three years' deprivation of political rights for his part in a "save the babies and save the women group", which had assisted 20 women to give birth in excess of the plan. The court reportedly claimed that by his actions he had entered into rivalry with the party and state, and had therefore committed counter-revolutionary crimes as well as jeopardizing social order.

The same month Yu Jian'an, the deputy director of the No. 2 People's Hospital in Anyang, Henan Province, was sentenced to death for collecting bribes of 190,000 yuan for issuing bogus sterilization papers. The hospital affairs director, Sun Chansheng, was sentenced to death with a two-year reprieve, and four others were given sentences of five years' to life imprisonment in connection with the offense.

In the light of the information available about serious human rights violations resulting from the enforcement of the birth control policy and the lack of explicit and unequivocal prohibition in published regulations of coercive methods which result in

such violations, Amnesty International calls on the Chinese Government to include such provisions in relevant regulations. It also calls on the authorities to take effective measures to ensure that officials who perpetrate, encourage or condone such human rights violations during birth control enforcement are brought to justice.

Let me just remind Members we are talking about a country where children are declared illegal simply because they do not fit into a certain quota that has been articulated and promulgated by the government. Couples who have a child above the quota are subject to sanctions, Amnesty International writes, including heavy fines. They talk about psychological and physical pressure. They talk about degrading treatment, the use of handcuffs, detentions. They also get into the fact that not only are they just focusing on the women and their husbands, they also go after other relatives who try to shield and protect some kind of safe haven for their sisters or daughters who are the object of a forced abortion, and throw them into jail as well.

This report from Amnesty International, which takes no position on the right-to-life issue, the defense of the unborn, is another nail in the coffin of the PRC's heinous practice of forced abortion and forced sterilization.

As my colleagues know, they also point out there is a movement under way in some of the provinces where they say—and this is a slogan used by the government—"Better to have more graves than one more child." Children are treated very cruelly in China, not by their parents, but by the government, and they are the subject of forced abortion.

Let me also remind Members, too, there is a growing disproportionate number of baby boys vis-a-vis baby girls and young people because of this. When you've only allowed one child, what happens is that many of the families, when they are told that they can only have one, have a sonogram. If a baby girl is detected, that baby girl is killed, and now there are tens of millions of missing girls in the People's Republic of China.

Where are the feminists on this? Why are they not speaking out against this cruel practice of targeting baby girls for extinction in the People's Republic of China? They have been abysmally silent in this regard.

Let me also point out, there were some people that were recently, as the Amnesty report points out, thrown into prison for, quote, initiating a save-the-babies and save-the-women's group. The man got 10 years in prison because he tried to defend some of the women in China against this terrible practice. Please read this.

The United Nations Population Fund meanwhile applauds the Chinese programs against all of this evidence, and let me remind Members that it is indeed overwhelming evidence.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, just let me remind Members that Dr. Sadik and UNFPA has spent over \$150 million. They have people and personnel on the ground. As part of this terrible program they have said, and I quote, "China has every reason to feel proud of and pleased with its remarkable achievements made in its family planning policy and control of its population growth over the past 10 years. Now the country could offer its experiences and special experts to help other countries."

Just what we need, a world of one child per couple where forced abortion and forced sterilization is the rule rather than the exception.

Mr. Chairman, let me also point out that the amendment contains a provision that would essentially reinstate what was known as the Mexico City policy, and that, too, was rescinded by President Clinton in 1993. This policy, and the amendment, would prevent foreign aid from going to nongovernmental organizations unless the organizations certify that it does not and will not during the term for which funds are made available perform abortions as a method of family planning or undermine the laws of other countries with respect to abortion. It clarifies that this does not apply to the treatment of injuries or illnesses caused by legal or illegal abortions or to assistance provided directly to governments. Moreover, the amendment contains a limited exception for attempting to establish universally recognized standards such as opposing forced abortion.

Mr. Chairman, this policy worked for almost a decade, it worked well for the American taxpayer, for unborn children, and for responsible family planning organizations. Most recipients of U.S. aid during the two previous administrations accepted the policy and said, "We will, indeed drive that wall between abortion and family planning and just do family planning and not take the lives of innocent, unborn children by way of abortion."

□ 1600

Mr. Chairman, I hope Members will accept this amendment. They did so just about a month ago. I hope when Mrs. MEYERS offers the amendment on behalf of the abortion rights people, that that will be defeated by this body. I suspect we will get to that momentarily.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Smith amendment. Recently, a woman in my district called my office to let me know that her 12-year-old daughter was in her room crying. My young constituent was upset because she had recently learned about 13 Chinese women

being held in Bakersfield, CA, who had fled the brutal birth quota system imposed by the totalitarian government in the People's Republic of China. My young constituent was shocked to learn that these women were in danger of being sent back to China by the Clinton administration where they would face possible arrest and forced sterilization.

This is a very distressing situation and it is even more distressing when we take into account that our tax dollars are being used by the United Nations Population Fund for so-called family planning activities in China.

The Smith amendment will ensure that none of the moneys will be available to the United Nations Population Fund unless the President certifies that the UNPF has terminated all activities in China or, during the 12 months preceding, there have been no abortions as the result of coercion by government agencies.

The Smith amendment would also ensure that none of the moneys sent to the UNPF may be used to fund any private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organization that directly or through a subcontractor performs abortions in any foreign country, except to save the life of the mother or in cases of rape and incest.

Now some may claim that this is a gag rule on family planning assistance. However, this is not the case, abortion is not considered a family planning method and should not be promoted as one, especially by the United States. Recently, the State Department decided that the promotion of abortion should be a priority in advancing U.S. population-control efforts. This is unacceptable to the millions of Americans who do not view abortion as a legitimate method of family planning and do not support Federal funding of abortion except to save the life of the mother or in cases of rape and incest.

We also need to reinstate what was known as the Mexico City policy which prohibits funds to organizations unless they certify that they do not perform abortions in any foreign country except in the cases cited above. Most recipients of U.S. population assistance readily agreed to these terms from 1984 to 1993 and we are not reducing the funding level for real international population assistance.

In a time when 69 percent of the American public opposes Federal funding for abortion we desperately need to clarify congressional intent so that it cannot be disregarded by those who seek to fund abortion on demand throughout the world. I urge my colleagues to support the Smith amendment as written. Vote "no" on the Meyers amendment, which will strike two of the three subsections of the Smith amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Smith amendment and in

support of the Meyers amendment. Mr. SMITH's amendment is an extreme piece of legislation that aims to end family planning aid overseas.

Mr. SMITH claims that his amendment simply cuts abortion funding. What Mr. SMITH has not told you is that abortion funding overseas has been prohibited since 1973. His amendment would cut abortion funding from its current level of zero to zero.

Therefore, Mr. SMITH's amendment must be after something more. That something is family planning.

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

The world's population is growing at an unprecedented rate. In 40 years our planet's population will more than double. As a responsible world leader, the United States must do more to deter the environmental, political, and health consequences of this explosive growth.

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

Each year, 250,000 women die from unsafe abortions.

Only 20 to 35 percent of women in Africa and Asia receive prenatal care.

Five hundred million married women want contraceptives but cannot obtain them.

Most of these disabilities and deaths could be prevented.

The Smith amendment is extreme in that it would defund family planning organizations that perform legal abortions—even if the abortion services are funded with non-U.S. money.

It would also impose a gag rule on U.S. based organizations and indigenous nongovernmental organizations that provide U.S. family planning aid overseas. The gag rule is written so broadly that it would prohibit the publishing even of factual information about maternal morbidity and mortality related to unsafe abortion.

Finally, the Smith amendment cuts funds to the UNFPA, an organization that provides family planning and population assistance in over 140 countries. The pretext for the Smith amendment is that the UNFPA operates in China, and therefore the funding must be cut. However, the law currently states that no United States funds can be used in UNFPA's China program. Mr. SMITH is clearly using the deplorable situation in China as an excuse to eliminate funding for this highly successful and important family planning organization. The UNFPA is in no way linked to reported family planning abuses in China, and should

not be held hostage to Mr. SMITH's anti-abortion rhetoric.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Smith amendment. It is an extreme piece of legislation that, no matter how Mr. SMITH tries to disguise it, is ultimately intended to end U.S. family planning assistance overseas. A vote for the Smith amendment is a vote against sensible, cost-effective family planning programs.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. MEYERS OF KANSAS TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas to the amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey: In the new section proposed to be inserted in the bill by the amendment—

(1) strike subsection (a) and (b); and

(2) in subsection (c), strike the subsection designation and caption.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, there are three parts to the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. My amendment would not change the gentleman's provision about UNFPA in China. So if you do not want to give family planning money to China, you can safely vote for my amendment. Neither Mr. SMITH nor I would give money to UNFPA unless they totally cease activities in China.

However, the remaining two parts to Mr. SMITH's amendment are terrible in their impact on the poorest of the poor women of the world. The Smith amendment says that no matter how sick or malnourished these women are, no matter that they are carrying a seriously malformed fetus, they cannot have a health service in their poor women's clinic that others could have if they could afford to pay their doctor.

It is not as if these women have any place else to go. In many cases, they could not afford to go to a hospital or another doctor, and in many cases, there is no hospital and there is no other doctor. The door the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] would slam shut in the face of poor, sick women is the only door there is.

There are NGO's and there are health care professionals that will work under these circumstances. But think how hard it is for these health care professionals when they must sentence a woman to life-long health problems, or force a woman to carry a child for months that they know would probably live only a few hours. And they have to do this in order to receive American support.

But those NGO's that are most efficient and that are located in most countries simply cannot and do not operate this way. And that is why the Smith amendment is not an anti-abortion amendment, but an anti-family planning amendment.

I would ask my colleagues to focus on the fact that not one cent of American foreign aid money has been used to pay for an abortion since 1973. Not one cent of foreign aid money has been

used to pay for an abortion. But the Smith amendment is not satisfied with that, and the gentleman's amendment says you cannot provide an abortion for the sickest woman, even if it is paid for with private money.

It is a harsh amendment, denying health services and limiting family planning services to those who need our help the most, those in Bangladesh and Cameroon, where the average number of children for a woman of child bearing age is five, five children; in Malawi, where the average number of children for a woman of child bearing age is seven; in Rwanda, where the average number of children is eight. This is a cruel and a harsh amendment.

The other portion of the Smith amendment is a gag rule, and it would go far beyond what any supporter of free speech and the Democratic process could support. It would prohibit a group of Filipino women in the Philippines who suggest to their senator that abortion should be allowed in cases of rape or incest from helping us provide family planning. We could not give them money.

It could prohibit a group of Indian women who urge the Indian Health Ministry to make legal abortions safer by requiring that they be done in licensed clinics or hospitals. They could not receive American family planning assistance. It could prohibit a Kenyan organization that tries to promote family planning by pointing out the risk of unsafe abortions from getting any family planning assistance from America on the grounds that opposing unsafe abortion could be construed as advocating change in Government policies.

Mr. Chairman, I am leaving out the portion regarding China, because I know many Members feel divided on this issue. But the other two portions of this amendment are so onerous that I beg my colleagues to support my amendment to change the Smith amendment.

I also must comment, Mr. Chairman, that if my amendment does not pass, I am going to be forced to oppose this bill. I do not want to. I have supported foreign aid every single time since I have been here, but I cannot do it in the face of these two terrible affronts to the women of the world.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number or words.

Mr. Chairman, before I do so and speak as to the amendments, this is an issue that we have just previously discussed when we had the authorization bill. We have discussed it in this Congress many times. I do not believe that it would be fair to the House if we took an elongated time to rehash what has already been said many times.

Therefore, I am going to ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment, the Smith amendment and the Meyers amendment to the Smith amendment, end in 1 hour.

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

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], is there a reason why he wants to prolong the debate?

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, there are many Members on our side that want to speak. I would advise the gentleman also that the ranking member of the full committee is at the White House at a meeting, and he has specifically requested that we provide time for him to speak.

□ 1615

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I will just briefly say that if you are in favor of supporting abortions in foreign lands, basically with taxpayer money, then you should vote for the Meyers amendment. I am not. I am going to vote against the Meyers amendment.

If you are not in favor of using taxpayers' money in foreign lands for abortions, then support the Smith amendment, which I plan to do. I am not going to take a lot of time of the House. I think I have previously done that as to my position and why. But I would say that I feel very strongly on the issue. I do believe that the House, I hope, will vote in favor of life and not abortion.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Smith amendment. My friend from New Jersey is offering essentially the same amendment which was adopted in this House on May 24, during consideration of the American Overseas Interests Act. It is a much-needed amendment. I hope this House will continue to support it.

As my colleagues know, the music had barely stopped playing at the inaugural ball when President Clinton kicked off his international abortion campaign. Literally hours after assuming office, the new President sought to overturn long-standing pro-life policies espoused by both the Reagan and the Bush administrations. The Smith amendment seeks to bring that 2½-year campaign to a halt.

It makes it less likely that United States tax dollars will pay for coerced abortions in China and in other countries. Voluntary abortion is bad enough, but forcing a woman to have an abortion is an absolute crime against humanity. It is an abomination.

Mr. Chairman, the Smith amendment will restore some of the well-reasoned pro-life policies that the U.S. Government insisted on before President Clinton was sworn into office. I urge my colleagues to resoundingly support the Smith amendment.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to bring to the attention of the Members that one of the provisions that my good friend from Kansas strikes reads as follows: Funds would not be provided to any private, nongovernmental, multilateral organization until that organization certifies that it does not and will not, during the period for which the funds are made available, violate the laws of any foreign country concerning the circumstances under which abortion is permitted, regulated or prohibited.

I am astounded that my good friend would offer an amendment that tries to protect U.S. taxpayers from providing funds to an organization that would willfully and knowingly violate laws in a sovereign nation vis-a-vis its abortion policy.

There was a working group, a report on the working group that was put out by the IPPF federation, based in London, that had language that went like this in one of their recommendations: Family planning associations and other nongovernmental organizations should not use the absence of law or the existence of an unfavorable law as an excuse for inaction. Action outside of the law, and even in violation of the law, is part of that, is the process for stimulating change.

In other words, IPPF has admonished its affiliates to break the law. The Smith language that would be gutted by the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS] said that if we give money to those organizations that violate the sovereign laws of nations, let me also remind Members, 95 to 100 countries around the world, including the overwhelming majority in our hemisphere, protect the lives of their unborn children from the violence of abortion. All of Central America, virtually, South America have laws or constitutional amendments on the books that protect their unborn children.

IPPF says violate those laws. It is right here in black and white as a recommendation from the IPPF based out of London. Mrs. MEYERS would cut that.

I would like to ask the distinguished gentlewoman, why does she want to cut language that says, let us not violate the law of other nations?

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHABOT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, as I said, no abortions have been performed with American money since 1973, and NGO's follow the laws of the country that they are in. We have not had problems with people breaking laws of the country that they are in. If the country allows abortions, NGO's, some of them will, in order to get American money, will not provide abortions. Some simply cannot operate that way. So they cannot receive our money so they cannot do as effective a

job with family planning, which certainly leads to more abortions.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, that was not an answer. IPPF has said to its own affiliates, action outside of the law and even in violation is part of the process of stimulating change. They are telling their people to violate the law. Again, my amendment simply says, we do not want to contribute to an organization that gets involved in that kind of law breaking.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Smith amendment and in support of the Meyers amendment. I think that it is very important on all issues that we debate in this House that we have some truth in advertising. This issue that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has raised zeros and zero. Since 1973, the taxpayers of this Nation have not funded abortions overseas. Let me repeat that. Since 1973, the U.S. taxpayer has not funded abortions overseas. We are not going to start doing that now.

What Mr. SMITH is proposing is to go after family planning. Any thinking person in this country and around the world recognizes that one of the great environmental issues that faces not only this Nation but around the globe is the issue of overpopulation. If, in fact, if, in fact, we want abortions reduced, then we should recognize that around the world, especially the greatest and the most powerful nation on the face of this earth should give leadership on the issue of family planning.

When family planning takes place, then that begins to resolve so many of the problems that we extend our hand in aid for.

So every Member of this House, regardless of where they are on the issue of abortion or choice, should understand that it is not a debate about public dollars going to fund abortions overseas. That is not what this issue is about.

Mr. SMITH seeks to knock out family planning. And people in this country overwhelmingly understand and appreciate what the issue of family planning can bring about.

So I rise in support of the Meyers amendment. I think it is important. I think that it is straightforward. I think it speaks to the direction that we need to move. I applaud the leadership that she had given on it. I think that every Member of the House should again understand that Mr. SMITH is not going after stopping any U.S. tax dollar for abortions. For my entire 5 minutes I should have repeated one sentence and one sentence only. He is going after family planning. No tax dollar was used since 1973 for abortions overseas.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I do not know how the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] can make it any clearer. These are not difficult ideas. Abortion is not a proper part of family planning. Family planning has to do with getting pregnant or not getting pregnant. But once you are pregnant, it is a different situation. Then if you want to move into abortion, you are killing a life once it has begun.

Now, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], nor myself, nor Members speaking on this side of the issue, are not against family planning. We are against dollars going to organizations that promote abortion, that counsel abortion, but we are the biggest supplier of family planning around the globe. We have been, and we still will be. But we want to help organizations that do not counsel nor perform abortions, whether it is with the money we give directly or whether it is with fungible funds.

We are for family planning, properly understood, which does not include killing an unborn child once it has begun. That ought not to be too complicated. I congratulate the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. I hope his amendment prevails, and I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, the bill provides \$25 million to the UNFPA, but we should not send one penny to an organization that not only condones, but praises China's brutal family planning program. In 1991, the executive director of the UNFPA, Dr. Nafis Sadik, referring to China's population control policies, said that she "was deeply impressed by (China's) efficiency." She wanted to, and I quote, "employ some of these (Chinese) experts to work in other countries and popularize China's experiences in population growth control and family planning."

With that attitude, I do not think the United States should provide any aid to the UNFPA until it quits China policy. The American people do not want to subsidize an organization which not only collaborates with forced abortions and sterilizations, but heartily condones such policies.

Nor do the American people want their tax dollars spent in support of organizations that perform abortions in other countries or engage in activities to alter existing laws on abortion in these countries.

I commend the language adopted in the recently passed authorization bill that restores the restrictions on abortion funding. Now, I urge the support of my colleagues for the Smith amendment to restore consistency between what we say and what we do. The Smith amendment will send a clear message to the UNFPA and other organizations: The United States will not condone coercive family planning policies. This is not an issue of pro-life or

pro-choice—it's an issue of whether American taxpayer dollars should be used for forced abortions. I urge my colleagues to vote for the Smith amendment and against the Myers amendment.

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

Mr. MANZULLO. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding, and I would like to ask the gentleman if it is his understanding, and also the gentleman might want to ask the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS]. It is my understanding that the Meyers amendment to the Smith amendment is identical in its language as far as China is concerned, that in regard to China there is no issue. The gentleman addressed the China issue, but we are talking about the Meyers amendment, which, as I understand it, is identical to the Smith amendment as far as China is concerned.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, it goes to the overall funding of the UNFPA.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, we are actually debating the underlying amendment and the Meyers amendment. The gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS] would cut two-thirds of the amendment out of the underlying amendment.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, as far as China is concerned, it is the same.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It leaves that alone, but it goes after the Mexico City policy and the lobbying policy.

Mr. WILSON. But China is not an issue.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. For some Members there will be no time after the vote on the Meyers amendment where my underlying amendment will be debated. So all the debate has to be now, while both amendments are pending.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANZULLO. I yield to the gentlewoman from Kansas.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. The reason that I did not address UNFPA and China is because I recognized that a number of Members are truly divided on that issue and so I left the Smith provision just as it is. If they vote for my amendment, the Smith provision will remain.

□ 1630

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Smith amendment to H.R. 1868 and to support the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is important that my colleagues truly understand that the goal of the Smith amendment is not to prohibit U.S. funds from being spent on abortion activities. Current law already prohibits U.S. funds from being spent on abortion activities, and this has been the case for over 20 years. The true aim, Mr. Chairman, of the Smith amendment is to totally eliminate family planning aid overseas.

Mr. Chairman, this is an extreme amendment. It is extreme because it would take U.S. funds away from organizations that perform legal abortions or participate in any other abortion-related activities, using their own funds, not using Federal funds, using their own funds.

The implication of this staggering U.S. aid amendments, Mr. Chairman, would be doing away with U.S. aid to organizations for pre- and postnatal care, as well as for programs to reduce unwanted pregnancy, combat childhood diseases, prevent the spread of HIV and AIDS. All of this would be cut off completely if the organizations provide legal abortion-related services, paid for with their own funds, not paid for with Federal funds.

How can proponents of this amendment claim that they are interested in the welfare of children and women when this amendment will harm critical programs that prevent unwanted pregnancy and improve the health of needy children around the world? If anything, this amendment will result in more unwanted pregnancies and sick children, not less.

Mr. Chairman, the American people do not want the U.S. Congress to support extreme amendments which endanger the health of the world's children increase unwanted pregnancies, and force women to resort to unsafe abortions. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against this extreme and dangerous amendment, an amendment that would eliminate family planning aid overseas, and vote in support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Meyers amendment and against the Smith amendment. Discussion has occurred a little earlier about the fact that this bill would not ban the UNFPA money, and as has been explained and I will reiterate, it does retain the ban on the UNFPA, so it is unlike the defense authorization that has been stated earlier.

The amendment that is offered by the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS] does not affect the restrictions the gentlewoman from New Jersey has proposed for the U.N. population fund. I also want my colleagues to be aware that these amendments have nothing to do with abortion funding.

Under the Helms amendment, U.S. law already forbids the use of U.S. funds to perform abortions or to lobby on abortion policy. This has been mentioned earlier. It does need to be reiterated, so we understand what we are discussing and voting on today. The effect of the amendment is to gut U.S. family planning programs. The result will be more abortions, not fewer.

The Smith amendment would deny funds to women's health groups which use their own funds to perform abortions or lobby their governments on abortion policy, but the effect would be to kill family planning programs. As a matter of fact, none of those groups violate the laws of the foreign countries. That has been authenticated. For example, in terms of the effect of killing family planning programs, a university providing contraceptive training to hospitals in the former Soviet Union to counter the high rate of abortion would be ineligible for funding because the hospital provides legal abortions funded from other sources. An Indian women's health clinic lobbying that nation's health ministry with its own funds to provide safer conditions for legal abortion would be funded.

A recent Los Angeles Times article demonstrated how family planning clinics in the Ukraine reduced the number of abortions, reduced the number of abortions. Ukrainian women average two abortions for every live birth. The average woman will have four of five abortions during her lifetime. Some will have as many as 10 or more. By making available safe and reliable family planning information and contraceptives, a Kiev clinic reports that only 25 of pregnant women coming to the clinic had abortions, a high number, of course, but the average for the rest of the country was 60 percent. Sixty percent. This is but one example.

However, there are a number of similar clinics around the world which we are helping to fund, and by giving women the opportunity to regulate their own fertility, we have reduced the number of abortions, while empowering women to manage and space their pregnancies as best suits their needs and the needs of their families. It helps them also to educate their family.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] will say that family planning money will still be available, and that is true, but the effect of his amendment will be that the money will be channeled through foreign government health ministries, with all of the problems of corruption, mismanagement, and bureaucracy which they entail. This approach would also run counter to the philosophy of this Congress, which has been seeking to reduce the intrusion of government into people's lives and families' lives.

The Smith amendment, an international gag rule indeed, endangers women's health and will deny women and couples access to family planning information, and will increase, not decrease, abortions. Mr. Chairman, I urge

Members to join me in support of the Meyers amendment and against the Smith amendment.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this entire discussion of the Meyers amendment is a good one in that it explains to the Congress what family planning is all about. The Meyers amendment I strongly support. I strongly oppose the Smith amendment. Let me tell the Members why, Mr. Chairman.

The Meyers amendment ends U.S. funding for the U.N. Family Planning Agency unless it ends its activities in China or the President certifies there have been no coerced abortions in China in the preceding 12 months. The amendment language on the UNFPA in China is identical to the language in the Smith amendment.

The Congress should be aware of the fact that U.S. law for over 20 years has prohibited U.S. funding for abortions overseas. The Meyers amendment would in no way affect this ironclad policy.

The Smith amendment goes beyond current law and imposes restrictions on this kind of organization, on the kind of organization that can receive U.S. funds for family planning. What that essentially says, Mr. Chairman, is that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] my dear colleague, he went to Washington and now he wants to go out of the country with the imposition of this rule.

It says that the United States cannot provide any money to any organization that performs legal abortions, even if the organization does not use U.S. funds. The Meyers amendment strikes these restrictions, which go beyond current law.

Let us look at the practical effect of the Smith amendment. The reality is that a lack of adequate access to family planning tragically often leads to abortion. I came up through a day where women went into back rooms and into corners and into alleys and performed illegal abortions. It was a travesty on the health of these women. The Smith amendment would cut off some of the most effective family planning organizations, because they provide legal abortions with their own funds. It would cut off clinics and hospitals that provide family planning if they also provide safe and legal abortions.

Mr. Chairman, this whole approach is shortsighted and counterproductive, particularly in Third World countries and in the poor areas of the world, with only limited medical services of any kind. The law of unintended consequences is alive and well in the Smith amendment. It is unintended, Mr. Chairman, but yet it is there. Therefore, I strongly support the Meyers amendment, and I strongly oppose the Smith amendment, and I am asking of the Congress to please vote against the Smith amendment and for the Meyers amendment.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I stand in strong support of the Smith amendment and against the Meyers amendment. I think that one important thing to look at is that this bill does not cut international family planning, this amendment, by one red cent. I merely goes back to the 1980's, when we had the Mexico City policy. Under that policy, and I want to take a look, because we hear all family planning is going to go away, and I am a strong advocate for family planning. We hear it will all go away.

However, during the 1980's, every budget cycle under the Mexico City plan, every year family planning went up, every year under the Mexico City plan. That did not gut it, and all the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is saying is let us go back to the Mexico City plan.

I listened, and Members would think that both sides of the aisle, all the people speaking, agree that abortion should not be performed with Federal American folks' money in other countries. However, we support family planning. The Mexico City policy, for Members that maybe do not remember, went into effect in 1984 under a plan of action which was adopted by the International Conference on Population that was held in Mexico City. They basically said that in no case should abortion be promoted as a method of family planning. All this does is say that again.

President Clinton took those words out, and made our dollars available for abortion funding. We hear about radical discussions and things being radical and gutting. Let us come back to what is really happening. The American people, and I will tell the Members, in the early 1970's, I supported abortion. I supported Roe versus Wade, because I believed abortion should be rare, and in the case of the mother's life, should be allowed. I was promised it would never be, never be for family planning, never be for convenience, and never replace personal responsibility.

Today, Mr. Chairman, it is now family planning. If Members agree with me that it should not be, no matter where Members are on abortion, should not be family planning, then vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. The amendment just says we all agree in different places on the abortion issue and disagree in other places, but we do not want our money especially sent to foreign countries to pay for abortion.

Let us return to the Mexico City policy, reject, reject the Meyers amendment from a very nice lady who I just do not agree with, and support the final amendment, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

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

Mr. Chairman, let me begin by saying how much I admire the integrity and advocacy that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] brings to all issues, and particularly to matters of human rights. My disagreement with him on his amendment in this case is simply as a matter of policy. I admire him greatly for his strength of character and conviction in matters that he feels very deeply about.

However, Mr. Chairman, this is an appropriations bill. It is designed to determine funding levels for the upcoming fiscal year for various programs authorized elsewhere by the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and others. It is not an authorizing bill, and authorizing language should not be part of it.

Mr. Chairman, unfortunately while the Committee on Rules produced an open rule for this bill, it also specifically carved out protection for this amendment, which is clearly out of order without this extraordinary protection. Everyone in this Chamber has an interest in preserving the integrity of the system, and for procedural reasons, we should oppose the Smith amendment.

Moreover, I oppose the Smith amendment on policy grounds. The United States is presently the largest international family planning donor, providing more than \$600 million last year alone. U.S. voluntary family planning funds are being used to provide millions of couples access to safe, effective contraceptive services worldwide.

The U.S. programs have worked. In Kenya, where the United States has had a very large program, there was a 20-percent reduction in family size in just 4 years. In Bangladesh, the contraceptive prevalence rate went from 5 percent in 1975 to 40 percent in 1993, and there was a decline in fertility from 6.7 births per woman to 4.9 during that time. In Egypt, the average number of children per family has declined from 5.8 to 3.9 between 1960 and 1994.

These family planning services also help decrease the demand for abortion all across the globe and help couples time and space pregnancies to enhance the chance of their baby's survival. And in allowing women to control their bodies, these programs save the lives of many women. Approximately 200,000 women die each year from unsafe abortions. Increased access to information and contraception is the only proven way to decrease unwanted pregnancies and give women control over their own lives and destinies.

For example, in Ukraine, where a small Planned Parenthood clinic is providing scarce contraceptive education and services, there is evidence that the incidence of abortion is decreasing.

The Smith amendment does nothing to help prevent abortion. When the same Mexico City policy was in effect between 1985 and 1993, there was no decrease in the number of abortions

worldwide. Instead, more women resorted to unsafe abortions and hundreds of thousands a year died. The Smith amendment simply interferes with the delivery of effective family planning programs whose purpose is to reduce the incidence of unwanted pregnancy and the need for abortion.

The fact is that none of the funds in this bill may be used for abortion now. With the Smith amendment, none of these funds may be used for abortion, but the Smith amendment goes further. It aims to kill family planning overseas by gutting U.S. participation in multilateral and bilateral population programs.

I urge Members to support the second degree amendment offered by Representative MEYERS. The Meyers amendment strikes the section of the Smith amendment that prohibits NGO's from using their own funds to attempt to influence official policies in other countries or to provide legal, safe abortions in countries where they are legal. It is the equivalent of telling U.S. defense contractors that they may not use their own funds to lobby Congress if they receive any Federal defense contracts.

I oppose the use of U.S. funds to perform abortions and I am a strong and consistent supporter of the Hyde amendment. I would not vote for a bill that allowed the use of any U.S. funding for selective abortions. I support the Meyers amendment because it retains tough safeguards but ensures that essential family planning programs are funded.

I also oppose the Smith amendment whether the Meyers amendment prevails or not. The Smith amendment places restrictions so tough on the UNFPA that U.S. funds will almost certainly not go to it. UNFPA fills in the holes where AID does not work and even in nations like China, plays a constructive role. UNFPA is a multilateral organization. It does not have the discretion to simply pull out of China at will.

The Smith amendment, I believe, is a thinly veiled attempt to stop the United States from working with other developed nations to provide voluntary family services to couples in developing nations because if we do not fund UNFPA, our funds do not go to 140 other nations beyond China that do not have forced abortions.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge the Members to support the Meyers amendment and oppose the Smith amendment.

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

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

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and in support of the amendment of the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS].

Mr. Chairman, contrary to what proponents of this amendment argue, this

is not about curbing abortion. It is about denying millions of women access to family planning services, the very services that help avert abortion. It is about cutting population funding in real terms to its lowest level in 25 years. It is about reinstating a policy that has proven to increase the incidence of abortion.

The fact remains that without this amendment, U.S. funds do not pay for abortions. That has been said a number of times today, but it bears repetition. For over 20 years, Federal law has prohibited any U.S. funds from being used for abortions, or to promote abortion. H.R. 1868 retains that prohibition.

The only real impact of the Smith amendment would be the disruption of the delivery of effective family planning programs that prevent unwanted pregnancies. These are programs which help reduce the incidence of abortion.

The effect of the amendment will be to deny millions of women access to family planning and along with that access to prenatal care, safe delivery services, maternal and infant health programs, treatments for infertility, and STD prevention services.

And it will result in hundreds of thousand of abortions that would have been averted if these women had had access to the basic health services the Smith amendment would deny them.

According to USAID, the funding reductions for population programs in this bill, together with this amendment, will likely result in an estimated 1.6 million unwanted pregnancies per year, resulting in 1.2 million unwanted births, 8,000 maternal deaths, and more than 350,000 abortion per year.

All of us would like to reduce the incidence of abortion as well as the staggering number of maternal deaths due to unsafe abortions. The Smith amendment would do the opposite. During the years the so-called Mexico City policy was in effect, which from 1985 to 1993 prohibited funding to organizations that perform abortions with private funds, there was an increase in the number of abortions worldwide because in the absence of access to family planning services, more women resorted to abortion and in the absence of information about safe abortion, more women resorted to unsafe abortions which cause more maternal deaths.

Proponents of this amendment assert that the only organizations that will be affected by this policy will be the International Planned Parenthood Federation [IPPF] and the Planned Parenthood Federation of America [PPF], two of the most effective and well-respected worldwide providers of family planning and reproductive health services. While both will survive the loss of U.S. funds, the real impact of this amendment will be felt by small local organizations in developing countries that rely on U.S. funds or on private funds from U.S. contributors who are forced to abide by this policy.

When the Mexico City policy was in effect, over 50 grant-receiving affiliates of International Planned Parenthood Federation lost their USAID funding.

In many cases, these family planning associations were the most uniquely important sources of services and information for their countries. For example, in India, which will soon be the most populous country in the world, family planning assistance was significantly curtailed because the most respected and effective Indian family planning organization was unable to comply with that policy.

The Smith amendment would have the same disastrous effect. USAID would be unable to fund the best providers of services in many countries. Under the amendment, any hospital or clinic in the developing world that provides abortions, if they are legal in that country, such as Kenyatta National Hospital in Nairobi, Kenya would be prohibited from receiving United States assistance.

United States assistance would also be denied to organizations that are involved in providing much needed contraceptive training to hospitals in the former Soviet Union in order to decrease the high abortion rate, because these hospitals also provide abortions with non-United States funds.

And local health care providers who urge their governments to assure safer conditions for legal abortions would be denied funds under this amendment.

Finally, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] misstates the role in the involvement of the UNFPA in China. Nobody disagrees that the coercive Chinese population program is abhorrent, and that UNFPA categorically condemns the use of coercion in any form or manner in any population program, including China.

Mr. SMITH has said the UNFPA cannot say enough good things about the Chinese program, and that China could not ask for a better front than the UNFPA. But Mr. SMITH relies on a 1989 quote from UNFPA executive director, Dr. Nafis Sadik, that was taken out of context, at a time when the Chinese seemed to be making progress toward improving the program. No evidence has ever been presented of complicity by international agencies, including the UNFPA, in Chinese human rights abuses and, as confirmed by USAID during the Reagan administration, UNFPA does not fund abortions or support coercive practices in any country, including China.

Mr. SMITH's amendment ignores the benefits of the UNFPA's presence in China and over 140 other countries. One of the reasons the international community knows about the horrors of the Chinese program is because of the presence in China of international organizations such as the UNFPA. Moreover, many countries believe that by providing assistance to China, UNFPA is in a unique position to influence positively China's population policies and to promote human rights. UNFPA is in constant dialog with Chinese officials at every level on matters pertaining to human rights, and exposes Chinese officials to international standards through international training in foreign institutions.

Most importantly, denying funds to the UNFPA would have a drastic effect on the UNFPA's programs in the rest of the world. Out of its annual budget

of \$275 million, only \$4 to \$5 million goes to China. Why deny United States funding to UNFPA to be used in 100 other countries around the world where hundreds of millions of couples want to limit the number of children they have just because we abhor Chinese coercive practices?

Mr. Chairman, family planning prevents abortions. As I stated earlier, the effect of the drastic funding reductions for family planning programs in this bill, together with the Smith amendment, will be an estimated 1.6 million unwanted pregnancies per year, resulting in 1.2 million unwanted births, more than 350,000 abortions, and 8,000 maternal deaths.

Mr. Chairman, this is no time to cripple the ability of the United States to provide help to family planning services around the world. Global population is now nearly 5.7 billion people. It is growing by 100 million a year, by 260,000 every 24 hours. Future prospects are even more staggering. If effective action is not taken in the next few years, the earth's population will double by the year 2040 and could quadruple to 20 billion people by the end of the next century.

In much of the developing world, high birth rates, caused largely by the lack of access of women to basic reproductive health services and information, are contributing to intractable poverty, malnutrition, widespread unemployment, urban overcrowding, and the rapid spread of disease. Population growth is stripping the capacity of many nations to make even modest gains in economic development, leading to political instability and negating other U.S. development efforts.

For almost 30 years, population assistance has been a central component of U.S. development assistance.

While much more remains to be done, population assistance has had a significant positive impact on the health of women and their children and on society as a whole in most countries. In many parts of Asia, Latin America, and Africa, fertility rates have decreased, often dramatically. Couples are succeeding in having the smaller families they want because of the greater availability of contraceptives that our assistance has made possible.

Today, approximately 55 percent of couples worldwide use modern methods of contraception, compared with 10 percent in the 1960's. Despite this impressive increase in contraceptive use, the demand for family planning services is growing, in large measure because populations are growing. Indeed, over the next 20 years, the number of women and men who wish to use contraception will almost double.

Similarly, population assistance has contributed to the significant progress that has been made in reducing infant- and child-mortality rates. Child survival is integrity linked to women's reproductive health, and specifically to a mother's timing, spacing, and number of births. Despite substantial progress, a large proportion of children in the developing world—particularly in sub-Saharan Africa and some Asian countries—still die in infancy.

And, while many countries in the developing world have succeeded in reducing maternal mortality rates, the incidence of maternal death and disability remains unacceptably high, constituting a serious public health problem facing most developing countries. Accord-

ing to the World Health Organization, an estimated 500,000 women die every year as a result of pregnancy and childbirth.

U.S. population assistance is preventive medicine on an international scale. Congress has long recognized this to be the case and over the years has reaffirmed the importance of population assistance in securing U.S. interests abroad. By addressing the basic health and educational needs of women and their families, population assistance provides building blocks for strong democratic government and sets the stage for economic growth. Furthermore, it helps prevent social and political crises, thereby averting the need for costly relief efforts.

At the International Conference on Population and Development [ICPD], held in Cairo last year, the United States was instrumental in building a broad consensus behind a comprehensive program of action, which was signed by almost all of the 180 countries that participated in the conference, and which will help guide the population and development programs of the United Nations and national governments into the next century. Central to this plan is the recognition that with adequate funding this decade for family planning and reproductive health services, as well as educational, economic, and social opportunities necessary to enhance the status of women, we can stabilize world population in the first half of the next century.

Mr. Chairman, under this bill, H.R. 1868, unfortunately funding for our efforts to stabilize global population growth is cut by almost 50 percent.

This amendment would be additionally destructive of our national interest in continuing to play a central and leading role in addressing the most fundamental challenge facing this and future generations, the soaring rate of human population growth which underlies virtually every environmental, developmental, and national security problem facing the world today.

I urge Members to vote against the Smith amendment and for the Meyers amendment.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the Smith amendment.

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

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to give my strong support to the Smith amendment to the bill which prohibits funding Mexico City policy and prohibits funding to the U.N. fund for population activities unless that organization discontinues all activities in China.

During the 1970's and early 1980's, foreign nongovernment organizations were the major source of funding for a number of groups which promoted abortion and the legalization of abortion in developing countries. Adopted in 1984, the Mexico City policy substantially changed the United States' position on funding such organizations by stipulating that the Agency for International Development will not fund any private organization which partici-

pates in performing or promoting abortion as a method of family planning.

A year later, in 1985, the House approved the Kemp-Kasten amendment which denies funds to organizations that support coercive population programs. Funding is denied the UNFPA due to its active participation in China's population control program—its one-child-per-family program.

Today, the Clinton administration is conducting an ideological crusade to expand access to abortion throughout the developing world. The Clinton administration's policy was announced by Under Secretary Tim Wirth in a speech to a U.N. population meeting in 1993. Mr. Wirth stated that the Clinton administration's position was to, "support reproductive choice," including abortion access and to make such "reproductive choice" available to every woman by the year 2000.

During House consideration of the American Overseas Interest Act—a bill which attempts to support basic human rights across the globe—the House adopted the Smith amendment which reaffirmed the most basic human right, Life.

Mr. SMITH's amendment today will prohibit funding for the Mexico City policy and ensure that United States tax dollars do not support China's coercive population control policies. The Smith amendment will simply ensure that the United States will not pay for abortions or impose a pro-abortion doctrine in foreign countries.

I urge my colleagues to support the Smith amendment. The right to life is the most fundamental human right—both here and abroad.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is with the highest regard for the maker of this amendment, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and with the greatest respect for the role that he plays in this Congress and in this country for promoting human rights throughout the world that I reluctantly rise in opposition to his amendment and in support of the Meyers amendment. We all certainly share the goal of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] of decreasing the number of abortions performed in this country and throughout the world. The fact is that the Meyers amendment would keep the current prohibition on U.S. funding for abortions. It would allow the United States to continue to fund organizations that effectively reduce the number of abortions by providing access for family planning. It would cut off U.S. funding for the UNFPA unless they pull out of China or China stops coercive abortions.

I think that the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS] has captured some of the concerns of this body and indeed of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] in her amendment.

I would like to say, though, Mr. Chairman, that existing law already

prevents the use of U.S. funds for abortion activities abroad and has done so under the Foreign Assistance Act since 1973. This amendment, the Smith amendment, would restrict effective women's health and family planning organizations and interfere with efforts to provide safe and legal reproductive health care for women in developing countries. That is why I do not support the Smith amendment and prefer the Meyers amendment.

I understand that a great deal of concern in this debate has centered on China's coercive policies and that that is a reason why many people would support the Smith amendment. Let me say that all that I have heard the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] say about coercive abortions and coercive family planning procedures in China is absolutely well-documented. We stipulate to that, that the family planning practices there are repulsive to us and we do not want to be a partner to them, and indeed we are not and will not under the Meyers amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment is unnecessary in that respect, because no United States funds can be used in the U.N. population fund's China program. Current appropriation law already denies foreign aid funding to any organization or program that supports or participates in the management of a program of coerced abortion or involuntary sterilization in any country under the so-called Kemp-Kasten amendment.

Further, current appropriation law also ensures that none of the United States contribution to UNFPA may be used in its China program. No U.S. funds may be commingled with any other UNFPA funds and numerous penalties exist in law for any violation of this requirement.

UNFPA is in no way linked to reported family planning abuses in China. Anyway, I have not seen any evidence presented of complicity by international agencies, including UNFPA, in China's human rights abuses, and I do follow that issue quite closely.

□ 1700

UNFPA does not condone or cover up coercion in China. At the International Conference on Population and Development last year, the world community strongly condemned the use of coercion in national population programs. UNFPA's current 5-year program in China is ending this year.

In light of the solid, international consensus that has developed in opposition to the use of any form of coercion, the governing council will review any future country program proposed for UNFPA assistance, including any involvement in China, for compliance with the principles adopted at the ICPD.

I think, Mr. Chairman, it would be the cruelest act of all of the Chinese Government, in addition to depriving their own people of access to appro-

priate family planning information, if they were able by their coercive practices to influence decisions that we make here about family planning support throughout the developing world.

According to the World Health Organization, 500,000 women die each year of pregnancy-related causes; 99 percent of them in the developing world. Up to one-third of these deaths can be attributed to septic or incomplete abortion.

Restrictions on family planning organizations proposed in this amendment represent a threat to the health and safety of the women's world. I would think if my colleagues hate and abhor abortion, as I do, they would love family planning. And that is what the Meyers amendment presents.

I would like to also add that Mr. SMITH, the maker of this amendment, is not only a champion for human rights, not only an important and internationally recognized advocate to stop the coercive kinds of programs that exist in China. The gentleman is a man who follows up on his commitment.

He is also a champion for child survival funding and programs throughout the world. I want to make that point of my regard for the gentleman in opposing his amendment and urging my colleagues to support the Meyers amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, this debate is about more than just family planning in China or other countries. This debate is about the United States of America and a consistent policy that has been established from the beginning of this country and has been held forth until now.

But through a weakening of the commitment and the resolve to never, never allow for public funding for abortions, especially overseas, just through the rhetoric, and through a potential treaty, that consistent policy could be seriously, seriously diminished.

Even as late as 1994, the General Conference on Population and Development held in Cairo reiterated that in no case should abortion be promoted as a method of family planning.

Mr. Chairman, we take great pride in the fact we have established a new vision for America and we have begun to establish a new trust for this Congress by laying out promises that were made; promises that were kept. And I think in all cases we ought to be able to say to the American people, "This is a promise that we have made and we will make it into the future; that there shall not be this kind of foreign policy that shall be initiated."

Mr. Chairman, all kinds of fears are being raised in the debate. For instance, the gag rule has been brought up. Well, the prohibition on lobbying activities contained in the Smith amendment, like the virtually identical provision the House passed as an amendment to the authorization bill, is

another application of the wall of separation principle between abortion and the U.S. tax dollars.

Specifically, it makes clear that U.S. funds should not subsidize nongovernmental organizations which violate other country's laws on abortion or which actively work to undermine the laws of a foreign country with respect to abortion.

Mr. Chairman, the pro-abortion forces have once again carted out the tired old slogan that any restriction on U.S. tax dollars for lobbyists is a gag rule. But there is no gag rule. This amendment does not affect counseling. It does not affect medical advice. It merely applies the wall of separation principle to abortion lobbyists.

It says to organizations on both sides of the abortion question that they have choices to make about what businesses they are going to be in, but if they want to provide family planning services, they can receive family planning money, and that happens to the tune of about \$585 million last year.

But if they want to be a foreign lobbyist, they must get funding from somebody other than the U.S. taxpayers. The Smith amendment, which I strongly support, recognizes that money is fungible and that U.S. taxpayers do not want their money going to organizations actively engaged in nothing less than cultural imperialism for their own profit.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that my colleagues will agree with me that subverting the laws of another country concerning the legality or illegality of abortion is not one of the United States' foreign policy objectives.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I will not take the whole 5 minutes. It is getting late and I know the hour has gone on.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of the Smith amendment. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and I had the opportunity to visit China together and the stories that we were told with regard to coercive abortion were unbelievable.

I would also urge Members, I have a film that I watched in my office yesterday. I have a copy in my office whereby in China they are getting young girl babies and putting them in what they call the dying rooms. They put them in these rooms and they just allow them to stay there for days, upon days, upon days.

The film ends with a young child called Mei Ming, which means "No Name," and she is left in the room for about 10 days and they go in and they open up the blanket and she dies.

Mr. Chairman, we know what they are doing. We have had women tell us of tracking down to require abortions. UNFPA money does go to China. For that one purpose alone the Smith amendment is the right thing to do.

So, I strongly urge the defeat of the Meyers amendment and strong support of the Smith amendment.

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

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, as a matter of principle, when I disagree with a colleague I make it a point not to always talk about what great affection I have for them and all of that. In this case I do want to make an exception to my rule and say that I respect the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] very much. The gentleman has never, ever, in the times we have served together, ever misled me in any way.

But this is an important point. The gentleman is talking about China. Is the gentleman opposing the Meyers amendment?

Mr. WOLF. Yes, I am opposing the Meyers amendment.

Mr. WILSON. Does the gentleman understand that the Meyers amendment is not any different than the Smith amendment on China?

Mr. WOLF. I do. I am very, very strong pro-life. And also let me say that I strongly support family planning. I strongly support birth control. But I supported the Mexico policy and I think with regard to China it would be absolutely wrong, any time we would have an opportunity to shut down giving any aid to them in any way, it would be the appropriate thing.

Mr. WILSON. But the gentleman would agree that China is not an issue here?

Mr. WOLF. China is an issue. It is a major issue. They are tried together. There will be the vote on the Meyers amendment and then the vote on the Smith amendment.

Mr. WILSON. Either way, China is not in the picture.

Mr. WOLF. But Mexico City policy is. And I will bring the film around to the gentleman's office today.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the Meyers amendment is about promoting abortion. It is not about family planning. Members have said over and over again on the other side, and I do not know how they can say this with a straight face, that we want to kill family planning with this amendment.

That same argument was made in the mid-1980's, and during the 1980's and into the 1990's population control funding doubled. Just look at the numbers that are provided by AID. I will make them a part of the record. It doubled under the Mexico City policy.

As a matter of fact, in 1980, for example, over 350 family planning organizations signed the Mexico City clauses, including 57 international Planned Parenthood Federation affiliates.

The problem that this gentleman has, and that I think the American people have, is that groups like IPPF based in London have in their vision

statements—even though most of the countries in the world protect their unborn children—they have as their objectives 1, 2, and 4, to increase the right of access to abortion, and to remove barriers, political, legal, and administrative.

So, Mr. Chairman, the point is by providing money to these organizations, we are effectively empowering this lobby organization with U.S. funds to go out there and bring down these very important protective statutes that provide basic protections for unborn children.

Mr. Chairman, let me also ask the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS], my good friend, if she might respond to this. That working paper that I talked about earlier by IPPF has this point: The right of everyone to have full access to fertility regulation services applies equally to young people, including those in the adolescent group, age 10 to 19.

As we all know, the World Health Organization defines fertility regulation in four ways, one of which includes abortion. This was a big issue in Cairo. When people realized that is what it meant, they wanted that word taken out. But here we have, under the rubric of the rights of young people, IPPF promoting abortion on demand as a matter of birth control for 10-year-olds. How would the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS] respond to that in terms of IPPF?

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentlewoman from Kansas.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I have no idea what the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is reading from.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] has expired.

(On request of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and by unanimous consent, Mr. WOLF was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I do know that the other working paper that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] was reading from was something that was drafted 15 years ago, was considered and specifically rejected by the Planned Parenthood board. I don't know what the gentleman is reading from now; if it is the same kind of thing.

Mr. Chairman, I must mention also that money for family planning decreased during the Mexico City policy; reference 1986 through 1992, and I would just mention several people have said that it doubled and it went up. It went down.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. These are AID's own figures. In 1984, \$264 million; in 1986, it was \$295 million; by 1992, it had jumped to \$325; by 1993, it was up to \$447 million. On a graph this would show a steady growth. And, again, this was under the Mexico City policy.

So again it is a red herring that my good friends are floating here today that we want to kill family planning. We want to separate abortion from family planning.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Meyers amendment. With all this gray hair, I am probably one of the few people who attended the Mexico City conference in this body. I was there when the Mexico City policy was adopted and I am listening to this debate wondering what in the world is going on.

It is a little ironic. Let me just remind people of what really happened. First of all, one of the strongest international supporters of family planning was Richard Nixon. You know, if Richard Nixon could come back here today, he would be considered, I guess, way to the left on that side of the aisle. It is positively amazing.

Richard Nixon understood how critical family planning was internationally, because no one can be an environmentalist if we are going to keep doubling the world population every 20 years. At some point the world collapses.

So having international family planning was very critical. Therefore, it was indeed a great shock to many of us when the Reagan administration, at the U.N. family planning meeting in Mexico City, rolled back the Nixon doctrine and put in the Mexico City doctrine.

Mr. Chairman, here we are going to say to the most vulnerable women in the world, the women in Bangladesh and other such places, we are shutting off access to real family planning. When we listen to all these words, there are a lot of words flying around here. But what I consider family planning and what most reasonably prudent people consider family planning, some people call abortifacient.

I consider the pill family planning. I consider IUD's family planning. I consider all sorts of other such things that are out there in the mainstream and the mainstream considers family planning."

But what really happened is in Mexico City, people said we will just do natural family planning, which is really the rhythm system. And in my State in Colorado, we call people who use that "parents."

□ 1715

And that is not really family planning, and what we had was a period of time when we were spending taxpayer money on something that was called family planning, but when you go around and find out what it really was, taxpayers got really mad, and they just said, "Don't spend money on that stuff, or spend it on the real stuff. If you are going to do family planning, do real family planning."

Because we had an awful lot of people around the world very angry that they

could not get access to the real information, and as one of the senior women on this floor, I must tell you that I meet all sorts of visiting delegations from parliamentarians from Third World countries, and woman after woman in those things would come to me and say, "American women have let us down by not standing firmly for our right to the same kind of family information, family planning information you get."

So the gentlewoman from Kansas is trying very hard to basically reinstate the Nixon doctrine. That is really all this is about.

The gentlewoman from Kansas is trying to go back to what the Nixon doctrine was. I never thought I would be standing on the floor and saying let us go back to the Nixon doctrine; that would be a breath of fresh air. That is basically what I am saying. We ought to support her amendment because it is a sane amendment, an amendment that all of us sharing this globe together realize how important it is and let us be very clear about the words being thrown around here.

If you go to a family planning clinic funded with U.S. dollars or funded by international agency dollars, you assume you are going to get real information, the same information people get at those clinics in western developed countries, and to remove that and to go back to where we were after Mexico City would be a great embarrassment.

I must tell you, even when I was in Mexico City, the Ambassador who was there at the time was so embarrassed by what our country did, as were many other people, so I think it is time we closed that chapter and that we stay with the Nixon policy and that we realize that all the dreams we have for this next century are not going to work, and that we allow women internationally, and we will be doing this if we pass the gentlewoman's amendment, to choose. They get to choose between whether they get to be productive and reproductive rather than have it be mandated that they only get to be reproductive over and over and over and over again, that that is our real only other role for them, and that is where it goes.

But we phony it up under the name of family planning. Natural family planning and the rhythm system is not family planning.

Vote for the gentlewoman from Kansas. She is telling it like it is.

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

As one of the junior fathers on the floor of the House right now, I am still trying to recover from the gentlewoman from Colorado wrapping herself with Richard Nixon. I was not quite prepared for that in the debate here.

We cannot lose track that the fact is that this is an amendment by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and an amendment to modify his amendment that really relates to the

abortion issue. It has been confused as we have gone through this. The principle is the same.

Very few people, whether pro-life or pro-choice, want their tax dollars to be used to fund a procedure that is so objectionable and controversial.

If anything, the American public has even less tolerance for U.S. taxpayer-funded abortions carried out in other countries. After all, Americans, particularly those in Indiana, do not care much for foreign aid spending, to begin with. When this foreign aid is used to pay for abortion, support falls through the floor.

A commonsense position of not paying for abortions overseas was official U.S. policy throughout most of the last decade and a half, but it came to a screeching halt the third day of the Clinton presidency when he nullified the Mexico City policy with a stroke of pen.

There has been debate on the floor whether or not, in fact, we do abortions. Listen to some folks we heard earlier, Tim Wirth, Undersecretary for Global Affairs, May 11, 1993, said, "Our position is to support reproductive choice, including access to safe abortion." On March 16, 1994, the State Department action cable was sent to overseas diplomatic and consular posts. It called for "senior-level diplomatic interventions," in support of U.S. population control priorities. "The priority issues for the U.S. include assuring access to safe abortions. The United States believes access to safe, legal and voluntary abortion is a fundamental right of all women."

Since rescinding the Mexico City policy, the Clinton administration has committed \$75 million to International Planned Parenthood Federation [IPPF], which performs and actively promotes abortion as a method of family planning around the world.

During the time the Mexico City policy was in effect, International Planned Parenthood Federation was one of only two organizations that refused to sign an agreement stating they would not perform or actively support abortion as a method of family planning. The other organization was Planned Parenthood Federation of America, by far the largest abortion provider in the United States. Of course, there is the U.N. Population Fund, which, as a matter of course, supports and collaborates with countries that use abortions as birth control.

Opponents of the Smith amendment would have you think the Mexico City policy hurts family planning efforts worldwide. This is not true. In 1990, over 350 foreign family planning organizations signed the agreement, unlike Planned Parenthood. So what we are talking about here is whether or not to fund three organizations that countenance abortions, out of the hundreds of others that carry out successful planning, family planning, without supporting abortion.

Now, there is a question whether Planned Parenthood directly uses their funds for abortion. For those of you who do not understand basic accounting and the ability to move money around, all you need to do is look at the U.S. Government. For those who think one division of Planned Parenthood cannot fund abortion and another division can fund abortion, I want to show you the Social Security trust fund. We do that all the time here in Congress where we claim it is set aside and is not. Money that goes to a company merely can be shifted between divisions. It is a cost accounting question.

I believe it is somewhat a little bit of a sleight of hand to claim Planned Parenthood does not fund abortions in those countries, because they are merely playing games with their funds.

Now, as to the China question, I want to point out that the amendment offered by my friend from Kansas only addresses UNFPA funds, not the International Planned Parenthood funds which are addressed in the first and third clauses. While the first and third clauses alone in the Smith amendment would not solely address the China policy, for example, it would require ceasing abortion funding in all countries, not just China, it nevertheless guarantees that the money will not go to China, whereas the International Planned Parenthood funding for China is not affected by the Meyers amendment.

At best, the Meyers amendment, substitute, assumes a very rosy scenario. International Planned Parenthood would not fund the reprehensible policies in China or China will change their policies. In other words, it is not inappropriate for us to raise the China policy, because it does matter, because the Meyers amendment, while it takes clause 2 from the Smith amendment, it does not cover International Planned Parenthood in clauses 1 and 3.

I would like to make a point or two on China even though that is not the primary reason I oppose the Meyers amendment and support the Smith amendment, and what I would like to make sure gets in the record is not only have we heard about the forced abortions and a lot of what traditionally we conservatives have criticized about China, but the new development of what has concerned us, the unborn babies that are being sold for human consumption. According to United Press International, a Hong Kong magazine, and this is quoting UPI, recently revealed the latest health fad in the southern boom town of Shenzhen to be the consumption of human fetuses, which are believed to improve complexions and general health. Unlike the serving of endangered reptiles, a human embryo as food trade is not illegal or underground in China.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is anything that can be said that has not already been said, but I will say one more time that we are not talking about China.

I rise in support of the Meyers amendment. We are not talking about China. It is simply not an issue.

The Smith amendment, without the Meyers amendment, would freeze in place a situation in developing countries where somewhere in the range of 100,000 to 200,000 women die due to abortions performed under unsafe conditions. We all know, the Smith amendment strikes at the very heart of international family planning programs.

It is far worse than previous or existing policies. It is an intrusion on the free speech and legal action of organizations, both those in the United States and those operating within the laws and policies of their own countries.

Implementation of the amendment would actually, in many cases, be an impediment to the prevention of abortion. Apart from its efforts to preclude funding for a number of affected providers of family planning services, the amendment would make it impossible to assist or work with organizations providing or improving contraceptive service for women who have had abortions in order to prevent future or repeat abortions.

I would voice strong support for the Meyers amendment and opposition to the Smith amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will not take my whole 5 minutes. I just want to come down to the well to support the Smith amendment and oppose the Meyers amendment.

As I watched this debate, I saw that there is a lot of misinformation about this amendment. Let us not be deceived.

The Smith language does nothing to reduce U.S. funding of international family planning programs. It merely prevents taxpayer money from going to fund promotion or funding of abortion, a principle that the majority of the American people support. The American people have risen time and time again against Federal funding for abortion.

Let us not be deceived about what this amendment does.

Now, I heard earlier said on this floor that we have too many people in this world. How elitist can you be to make a statement like that?

We have too many people in this world? Ladies and gentlemen of the House, if you took every person in the world, you could put them in the State of Connecticut, and they would still have 5 square feet to stand on. It is not that we have too many people in this world. It is that we have governments that oppress people and destroy the free market system, that does not allow the system to feed the people.

That is what is the problem in the world, not that we have too many people.

If you all remember the book "The Population Bomb," by Paul Erlich, that has been disputed, ridiculed and thrown out years ago. Yet some people, as I saw today, still quote from that ridiculous book. "the Population Bomb." This is not the problem.

As the gentleman from Indiana has said, what the fight is here is to allow Planned Parenthood to use these funds to perform abortions, whether they are through fungible funds or not. We know what the Planned Parenthood is and what it is all about. They do it here in the United States as well as overseas. That is what this is all about.

I just ask that you vote "no" on the Meyers amendment and keep the Government and the American taxpayer out of the business of abortion and restore the Reagan-Bush policy.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I just want to remind Members, too, the International Planned Parenthood Federation out of London, not only supports abortion globally, but considers it their goal to lobby to bring down pro-life statutes throughout the world.

But this is from the Chinese news agency:

Dr. Halfdan Mahler, a top official of the International Planned Parenthood Federation, today praised China as a model for all countries, particularly developing countries in family planning. "China has set a good example for developing countries to follow in controlling the population growth," he said.

The date of that quote is August 27, 1994.

These are the kind of organizations that, if they decide to put up that wall of separation, yes, we will provide money to them, as we have in the past. Again, that money has gone up during the Reagan-Bush years under the Mexico City policy.

But that kind of statement about the Chinese policy is contemptible, where women are being exploited, where forced abortion is the rule, not the exception, and where now we see such egregious practices as infanticide, where children are killed right at birth, primarily because they are girls, and where just recently, as Members know, a nationwide policy went into effect that is absolutely reminiscent of the Nazis: a eugenics policy where if even the one child is found to be defective in some way, that woman is forcibly aborted because they want to have a master race. That is absolutely sick.

I ask for a "no" vote on the Meyers amendment and a "yes" vote on the underlying Smith amendment.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELAY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. I would just like to make it clear that no American

funds are provided for abortion. What my amendment says is that NGOs who see very sick women or women who have serious problems of some sort with the fetus would be able to provide abortions with private money; no American money is provided for abortions.

Mr. DELAY. Reclaiming my time, I understand the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Small Business and her approach, and I am sure she is sincere in it. We all know how these organizations shift funds around.

We feel very strongly that they are taking our taxpayers' money, or they are either taking it or they could very well take taxpayers' money, and put it in one account while they are using their private funds to perform abortions.

I do not want my taxpayer money, and most Americans understand, to be used in any way.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Meyers amendment and in strong support of our country's commitment to give men and women the option of family planning as well as the right to free speech.

□ 1730

I think this issue clearly has no place in this debate. Right now the law of the land is that Federal taxpayer dollars cannot be used for abortion. I support that. I voted for the Hyde amendment in the last Congress. But this issue goes far beyond this. This would tell organizations around the world that, if a woman comes to them seeking an abortion, and if that woman seeks to pay for it with her own money, or if a private entity seeks to pay for it, the United States will not allow any funding of that organization to go on.

Mr. Chairman, for me this is a very cynical and mean-spirited attempt to undermine family planning around the world. Without the United States' assistance—

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It is absolutely not mean-spirited in its attempt. This is to build that wall between abortion and family planning because I happen to believe, and I believe the majority of Americans believe, that the killing of an unborn child is a very, very serious act. We do not want to provide money to those groups that do it.

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Reclaiming my time, there is a separation now for U.S. funds which cannot be used for abortion either here at home or abroad. I think everyone has to agree to that.

Now some people may say organizations will use money for family planning and for educational purposes. That is the way the law is now. I think

that is the way the law should be in the future. Without the United States assistance, many of these facilities could not exist, and I think that underscores perhaps what is an unspoken attempt by some supporters of this amendment.

I think women deserve the right to make the choice about their own personal bodies. It should not be left up to the taxpayers. I would hope the U.S. Government could get out of this very personal decision. I would hope that all Members would vote for the Meyers amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS]. I will not take my full 5 minutes, but I simply want to state three reasons why I am supporting the Smith amendment and why I am opposing the amendment.

I think what the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has done makes eminent sense. It restores a policy that worked, the Mexico City policy. That is all it is doing. It is going back to a policy from 1984 to 1993 that worked. We saw family planning funds increase during that time. It was a policy that was very much mainstream. Hundreds of organizations signed onto that. The 150 family planning organizations signed the Mexico City clauses, and so it is quite mainstream, it is quite common sense, to return to that policy.

It was on June 22 in 1993 that President Clinton gave the green light to renewed funding for international organizations that perform and promote abortions. It is time that we return to that policy in the 1980's/early 1990's that was so successful.

The second reason I am supporting the Smith amendment and opposing the Meyers amendment is that I believe what the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is attempting to do in this legislation, and this attempt is supported by the American people. While the American people are strongly, and very forcefully and emotionally divided on the abortion issue, they are overwhelmingly opposed to public financing, and what we have, and we have tried to kind of smoke the issue, cloud the issue; it is simply a matter of shifting funding, and so to talk about private funds being used and no taxpayers dollars being used is really quite disingenuous, I think. If I take taxpayer dollars with my left hand, and I perform abortions with my right hand, it does not really fool anybody. It is a shell game being played by these organizations, and the American people do not want their taxpayer dollars being used to promote, and to perform and to support abortion policies around the world.

I think finally I would just say that it defends, it defunds, only the most

radical pro-abortion organizations. Under the Mexico City policy, 350 family planning organizations signed it while only the most radical, pro-abortion organizations refused to sign that policy.

It makes eminent good sense for us to return to a policy that worked. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support the Smith amendment and oppose the Meyers amendment.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Kansas.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Just in the interest of accuracy, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that the Mexico City policy was in 1984 and in 1985, the amount of money was \$290 million. It dropped immediately to \$239, to \$234, to \$197, to \$197, and then went back up to \$216, but still not up to—

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Reclaiming my time, I do not know where the gentlewoman is getting these figures. I heard the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] just a moment ago cite very exact figures on where that funding has increased during those years in which the Mexico City policy—

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. These are the population line items from our appropriations bills.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Once again I would say that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] just a few moments ago cited specific funds on how those funds increased under the Mexico City policy and that in fact there was not any decrease in family planning programs.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. To get an accurate picture of how population funds are used one has to know they come from a variety of spigots, including the African fund, including some ESF funds, including the actual population account, and only a reading which says, "You're looking at all these accounts, what is the aggregate" can tell you whether or not that funding is going up or down. Since 1984 that figure has gone up dramatically, and I cite those figures for the record. They were produced by the Agency for International Development.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. So, in the interests, Mr. SMITH, of accuracy, funding for family planning actually increased during the—

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The United States remained, like it or not, during the 1980's and into the 1990's, the No. 1 provider internationally for population assistance, and I remember so well in 1984, if the gentleman would continue yielding, when Members stood up on the floor and said that there is no way that any family planning organization would accept the Mexico City clauses. How wrong they were. One after another said they wanted to do family planning, and they got out of

the abortion business, and that wall of separation was intact. That is what this is all about.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Reclaiming my time, I think everybody is ready to vote, and I just wanted to thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] as many on both sides have expressed their admiration for him. I want to express my appreciation for his leadership on this issue, and I think we are going to take a very good step in the passage of the Smith amendment today in defunding these organizations that are doing so much wrong in the promotion of abortion policies around the world.

I urge support for the Smith amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 2, rule XXIII, the Chair may reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the underlying Smith amendment. This is a 17-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 201, noes 229, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No 432]

AYES—201

| | | |
|--------------|---------------|----------------|
| Abercrombie | Dooley | Hoyer |
| Ackerman | Dunn | Jackson-Lee |
| Andrews | Durbin | Jacobs |
| Baesler | Edwards | Jefferson |
| Baldacci | Ehrlich | Johnson (CT) |
| Barrett (WI) | Engel | Johnson (SD) |
| Bass | Eshoo | Johnson, E. B. |
| Becerra | Evans | Johnston |
| Beilenson | Farr | Kaptur |
| Bentsen | Fattah | Kelly |
| Berman | Fawell | Kennedy (MA) |
| Bilbray | Fazio | Kennedy (RI) |
| Bishop | Fields (LA) | Kennelly |
| Boehlert | Filner | Kleczyka |
| Bono | Flake | Klug |
| Boucher | Foglietta | Kolbe |
| Brown (CA) | Foley | Lantos |
| Brown (FL) | Ford | Lazio |
| Brown (OH) | Fowler | Leach |
| Bryant (TX) | Frank (MA) | Levin |
| Cardin | Franks (CT) | Lewis (GA) |
| Castle | Franks (NJ) | Lincoln |
| Chapman | Frelinghuysen | Lofgren |
| Clay | Frost | Longley |
| Clayton | Furse | Lowey |
| Clement | Gejdenson | Luther |
| Clyburn | Gephardt | Maloney |
| Coleman | Gibbons | Markey |
| Collins (IL) | Gilchrest | Martinez |
| Collins (MI) | Gilman | Martini |
| Condit | Gonzalez | Matsui |
| Conyers | Gordon | McCarthy |
| Coyne | Green | McDermott |
| Cramer | Greenwood | McHale |
| Danner | Gutierrez | McKinney |
| Davis | Hamilton | Meehan |
| DeFazio | Harman | Meek |
| DeLauro | Hastings (FL) | Menendez |
| Dellums | Hefner | Meyers |
| Deutsch | Hilliard | Mfume |
| Dicks | Hinchesy | Miller (CA) |
| Dingell | Hobson | Mineta |
| Dixon | Horn | Minge |
| Doggett | Houghton | Mink |

Molinari
Moran
Morella
Nadler
Neal
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Pryce
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers

NOES—229

Allard
Archer
Army
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Brewster
Browder
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Creameans
Cubin
Cunningham
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Forbes
Fox
Frisa

Rose
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Studds
Tanner
Thomas
Thompson
Thornton

Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Portman
Poshard
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Seastrand
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Creameans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle

Weller
Whitfield
Wicker

Moakley
Reynolds

Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Stokes
Tauzin

□ 1800

Mr. ZELIFF changed his vote for "aye" to "no."

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 243, noes 187, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 433]

AYES—243

Allard
Archer
Army
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Brewster
Browder
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Creameans
Cubin
Cunningham
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Forbes
Fox
Frisa
Gallagher
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gillmor
Graham
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hillery
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
LaFalce
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manton
Manzullo
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead

Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallagher
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gillmor
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hillery
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klecza
Klink

Zeliff
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Skeen

Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda

NOES—187

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop
Boehlert
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Castle
Chapman
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Coyne
Davis
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards
Ehrlich
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse

Moakley
Reynolds

Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrist
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchee
Hobson
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Klug
Kolbe
Lantos
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Martinez
Martini
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moran
Morella
Nadler
Olver

NOT VOTING—4

Stokes
Tauzin

□ 1808

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Moakley for, with Mr. Stokes against.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MENENDEZ

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MENENDEZ: Page 78, after line 6, add the following:

WITHHOLDING OF ASSISTANCE TO COUNTRIES SUPPORTING NUCLEAR PLANT IN CUBA

SEC. 564. The President shall withhold from assistance made available with funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act an amount equal to the sum of assistance and credits, if any, provided on or after the date of the enactment of this Act by that country, or any entity in that country, in support of the completion of the Cuban nuclear facility at Juragua, near Cienfuegos, Cuba.

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

Mr. Chairman, we have another 50 pending amendments. At the rate we are going, we will finish this bill about August 25, unless we do something about curtailing the debate. We do not want to deny anybody the opportunity to speak on any of the issues that are so important to them, but we are going to have to start putting some time limit on some of these amendments or else we will never get through with this bill.

I would like to know if the gentleman would agree to a time limitation, a reasonable time limitation on this amendment with the gentleman controlling his side of the argument.

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

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's predicament. However, this is an issue that I and others have been working on for 2½ years. To be very honest with you, I do not want to curtail anybody's ability to speak. I cannot gauge that. I do not anticipate that it will be as long as some of the other debates that we have had, but I do believe that it will take a decent hour or so. But I do not want to limit it to that.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, there is a certain urgency to this amendment. Russia and Cuba have announced a joint stock company to finish construction of a dangerous nuclear plant located in the southern coast of Cuba. I am offering this amendment with several of my colleagues, the gentlewoman from Florida [Mr. ROSLEHTINEN], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH], and others, to reduce dollar for dollar U.S. aid to any country which financially helps the Castro dictatorship prospectively build a nuclear plant.

The Castro dictatorship has decided that a dangerous and mothballed Soviet-era nuclear plant in Juragua near Cienfuegos, Cuba should be completed and operated. We believe that it should not. Let me explain why not in some detail.

In a letter to me, dated April 12, 1993, President Clinton stated:

The United States opposes the construction of the Juragua nuclear power plant because of our concerns about Cuba's ability to ensure the safe operation of the facility and because of Cuba's refusal to sign the nuclear nonproliferation treaty or ratify the treaty of Guadalupe.

In fact, Cuba has yet to ratify either treaty, the letter of which establishes Latin America and the Caribbean as a nuclear weapons free zone. The State Department, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Department of Energy have also expressed concerns about the construction and operation of Cuba's proposed nuclear reactors.

Recently, Dr. Edward Purvis, who headed the Department of Energy's investigation about Cuba's reactor stated, "an accident in this reactor is probable. It is just a question of when. I do not know if they are the most dangerous reactors in the world, but they are the most dangerous reactors anywhere close to the United States."

In a September 1992 report to Congress, the General Accounting Office outlined concerns among nuclear energy experts about deficiencies in the Cienfuegos nuclear plant. They included lack in Cuba both of a nuclear regulatory scheme and inadequate infrastructure to ensure the plant's safe operation and maintenance.

□ 1815

Reports by a former technician from Cuba, who by examining with X-rays weld sites believed to be part of the auxiliary plumbing system for the plant, which is what would have operated to stop Chernobyl from where it was going, found that 10 to 15 percent of those were defective, and this technician was quoted as saying "The operation of this reactor will be criminal." The construction was being performed in a completely negligent manner.

Since September 5 of 1992 the construction was halted. There has been prolonged exposure to the elements of the primary reactor components, including corrosive salt water vapor. The possible inadequacy of the upper portion of the reactor's dome retention capability, the one that is supposed to withstand, in case of a nuclear accident, to withstand only 7 pounds of pressure per square inch, given that normal atmospheric pressure is 32 pounds per square inch, and that the United States reactors that we are designing accommodate 50 pounds per square inch, 50 pounds versus 7 pounds per square inch, and according to the U.S. Geological Survey, the Caribbean plate, a geological formation near the south coast of Cuba, poses seismic risks to Cuba and the reactor site, and may produce large to moderate earthquakes. In fact, on May 25 of 1992 the Caribbean plate produced an earthquake measuring 7 on the Richter scale.

Mr. Chairman, I want Members who may be listening in their offices to lis-

ten carefully. It is a result of this map by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and if Members are from Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Tennessee, South Carolina, North Carolina, Maryland, Virginia, and the Nation's capital, please be warned, we are talking about 80 million Americans here, Mr. Chairman, almost 1 in 3 Americans who, according to a study by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, said that summer winds could carry radioactive pollutants from a nuclear accident at the power plant throughout all of Florida and parts of the States on the gulf coast as far as Texas, and northern winds could carry the pollutants as far northeast as Virginia and Washington, DC, and more States would be affected in time.

Mr. Chairman, finally, Fidel Castro has over the years issued threats against the United States government. In 1962 he advocated the Soviets' launching of nuclear missiles to the United States, and brought the world to the brink of a nuclear conflict. We are talking about perhaps the most anti-American dictator in the world. Can we trust him with nuclear power? Can we trust him with an unsafe nuclear plant? Do we need another Chernobyl type incident 90 miles away from the United States?

I strongly suggest that we do not, as do 130 of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle, who signed the letter to the President saying "Do everything possible to stop the nuclear plant that is being proposed in Cuba." We should not permit any dollars to be used directly or indirectly to help those who would put our country at risk and our fellow citizens at risk at the same time.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members, in the interests of the national security of the United States, and on behalf of those 80 million people in those States that I have suggested, that this amendment needs to be passed and it needs to be passed now.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise reluctantly to oppose the gentleman's amendment, but certainly not his intent. I our conference on our side of the aisle this morning, and on this floor this entire week, all we have been hearing is that the Committee on Appropriations is violating the House procedures because we are authorizing in an appropriation bill. We have strived long and hard not to violate that rule.

Now the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] has an amendment that is an authorization within an appropriation bill. All these people that have been coming to the floor, like the two gentlemen from Indiana, who have raised so much ruckus over the fact that we are violating some of the procedures, will come here and recognize that what we are doing in opposition to this bill is in no way against the mission that the gentleman from New Jersey wants to carry out.

Mr. Chairman, I live in one of those States, in the beautiful and great State of Alabama, on the beautiful Gulf of Mexico, as a matter of fact, so I am pretty close to Cuba. I am not going to do anything or permit anything that would injure our environment or the environment of Florida or any other place in the world.

I am just saying that the gentleman's message is good, his intent is good. I think he ought to rush over to the Senate, where the authorization bill is, he ought to tell the Members of the Senate how crucial this is, he ought to insist that the Members of the Senate put this in the authorization bill. It does not belong in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope the gentleman would accept a perfecting amendment, which I understand is going to be offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON]. If indeed the gentleman does, then we can support it. Mr. Chairman, we should send the message we want to send.

I am not one for giving Russia money anyway, much less giving them money that might ultimately be channeled to Cuba, or even if they are not channeling that money, if they are going to help Cuba, we ought to cut off all aid to Russia, the gentleman is absolutely right. He is just on the wrong bus. He ought to get on the bus that is going down that road to stop Russia from doing this, and to deny the administration the authority to permit Russia to do that. I would support that with the gentleman 100 percent.

However, I cannot support it and go back tomorrow and listen to all of these people on the authorizing committee saying "You violated the committee once again. You violated the rules of the House. You are having authorizing language in an appropriation bill." So we support what the gentleman is trying to do. I commend the gentleman. I share his concerns. However, he is in the wrong bill at the wrong time.

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

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

In anticipation of this, having heard these objections made during the rules debate, I asked the IRS to look at the whole question of what the gentleman suggests is happening in this bill. In fact, they have shown me that for over a long period of time, and I have a whole host of citations, including changes in the application of existing law in this bill that we are considering right now, where there are approximately between 30 and 70 different changes in existing law that would be considered the same exact effect as what I am proposing.

Therefore, that is why I think the Committee on Rules, seeing that in fact there are so many changes in the application of existing law that would

be considered legislating in an appropriation bill instead of in an authorizing bill, that in fact they saw it in their wisdom to permit the amendment to go forth, to make it in order, to waive points of order against it, as well as understanding the urgency of the timing.

Mr. Chairman, I think that when we see so many other things being considered in the bill, and the other amendments for which we just voted on that equally have the same impact, I would hope that the application would be made across the board. I do not believe necessarily that it is being made across the board.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I would say that I support 100 percent the gentleman's mission; we just feel this is not quite the right vehicle in which to carry forth the gentleman's mission.

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

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

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say how, as a member of the committee, I appreciate the gentleman's concern with the process of legislating in an appropriation bill. It is indeed a long-standing problem and a regular complaint of those of us on the committee. It is, of course, the world's most violated rule. Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, it does not mean it should always happen.

Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the chairman that both the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] and the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN], as members of the committee, are for this amendment, in spite of that fact, and our appreciation for your concern about jurisdiction.

We do so in part, as the gentleman from New Jersey suggested, because there is a problem of timing. The Cuban and Russian Governments have announced this construction only 2 weeks ago. We would like the administration to act before construction actually begins and the Russians become committed.

Mr. Chairman, it is our feeling that this vote on this day can send that message. Therefore, I think it may be a worthwhile exception to what is a good rule and the gentleman's own commitment to uphold it.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WILSON AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MENENDEZ

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILSON as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. MENENDEZ: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert:

SEC. 564. The President shall withhold from assistance made available with funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act an amount equal to the sum of assistance and credits, if any, provided to the gov-

ernment of a country under this Act that, on or after the date of enactment of this Act, is used by that country, or any entity in that country, in support of the completion of the Cuban nuclear facility at Juragua, near Cienfuegos, Cuba.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MENENDEZ. I reserve the right of a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right of a point of order, I would ask the parliamentarian if the substitute as proposed is within the purview permissible to be applied within the purview of the rules by the Committee on Rules.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman making the point of order?

Mr. MENENDEZ. That is the point of order that I am making, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas, Mr. WILSON, wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment narrows, it does not expand, the pending amendment. It requires the funds withheld relate only to U.S. assistance. The amendment, therefore, is within the House rules.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Continuing on my point of order, Mr. Chairman, my point of order to the parliamentarian is that the amendment as is proposed and promulgated by the Committee on Rules, Mr. Chairman, is to say that any monies used by a country in investing in the nuclear power plan in Cuba would trigger a reaction of a reduction dollar for dollar of U.S. funds to that country.

My point of order is, is this within the ambit of the rule. Is it permissible under the rule?

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order, if I may.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART].

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, the substitute amendment varies substantially and significantly the amendment that was ruled in order by the Committee on Rules.

The Committee on Rules made in order the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. MENENDEZ, which, as he has stated, calls for a dollar for dollar reduction in aid if Russia gives credits or assistance for the completion of a power plant.

What the substitute says is totally different. It says that the actual dollar, the actual dollar that we give to Russia, this dollar, if we give it to Russia, Mr. Chairman, we have to trace it and find that it goes to Cuba in order for us to ask for it to bet back to us. That is a totally different amendment, Mr. Chairman. This is not the amendment

that was made in order by the Committee on Rules, and I would submit to the Chair that it would violate the rules.

They did not go to the Committee on Rules with this amendment. It is a totally different amendment. The one we made in order in the Committee on Rules is the Menendez amendment, which is totally different. This one is out of order, therefore.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HANSEN). The Chair is prepared to rule.

Under the precedents, legislation permitted to remain by a waiver of points of order may be perfected by an amendment which does not add further legislation. This amendment is a narrowing of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ], to restructure the prohibition of funding only to assistance provided to the government of a country which uses that assistance to support the Cuban facility, rather than use any sum to assist Cuba, and is merely perfecting the Menendez amendment, and it does not add additional legislation to that permitted to remain. The Chair overrules the point of order.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] still has time remaining.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult for me to be in opposition to the four most active proponents of this amendment, because I have been on their side in these matters ever since all of them got here. I take a back seat to nobody in my opposition to Castro, in my opposition to everything that he has done since he has been in power.

However, Mr. Chairman, if we do not adopt the substitute, and the amendment passes as presented, and it becomes part of the final bill. Members have to think these things through a little bit. What we are really doing if we tell Russia that we are going to withhold our foreign assistance to them, which we grant to them because we think it is in our own interest, we are forcing them to go forward with this reactor. It is just forcing them to do it. It is forcing them to do it, because of their dignity and their self-respect.

Nobody in this Chamber, nobody that I know of in the United States, wants a nuclear reactor built in Cuba. We have to think about the best way we can stop it. And we certainly have to consider that we do not want to do anything that will cause it to go forward.

□ 1830

The action that we can take that would be most likely to cause this to go forward is the passage of this amendment, that my good friend from New Jersey has introduced.

The political situation in Russia is very fragile. It is very difficult. The Democrats are not in an extremely strong position. For the United States to try to dictate to Russia this sort of policy is not the way to accomplish the policy. The way to accomplish the policy is through diplomacy and through persuasion.

I submit to the House that my substitute should be adopted. I submit that it is the most likely way to stop the construction of a nuclear reactor that nobody wants to see built. I do not want to push the Government of Russia against the wall, or take away their dignity and make them think they have to do this. This amendment would only encourage the nationalistic trends in Russia and would not add to East-West stability.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Wilson amendment and in strong support of the Menendez amendment.

The Menendez amendment would cut aid to Russia by the same amount of money that it provides to the Castro regime for the construction and operation of the unsafe and dangerous Juragua nuclear plant in Cienfuegos, Cuba. This amendment is an important step to serve notice to Russia that the United States Congress will not tolerate its helping the tyrannical Castro regime introduce a national security threat of this magnitude just a few hundred miles from our shores.

Mr. Chairman, on May 4 of this year, Russia and the tyrannical Castro regime announced that they were in the process of forming a multinational consortium that would finance the estimated \$800 million needed to complete the Juragua plant. The completion of this plant would constitute the introduction of a grave threat to the national security of our United States.

A 1992 GAO report detailed the numerous faults in the infrastructure and the serious equipment problems which former plant technicians and experts state that the plant suffers from. Among the most glaring deficiencies are the statements by former technician Vladimir Cervera, who states that up to 15 percent of the pipe welding in the Juragua plant's cooling system is deficient. Furthermore, the small resistance capability of the nuclear plant's containment dome can only resist pressure of up to 7 pounds per square inch, while U.S. reactors must sustain pressure of up to 50 pounds per square inch.

These and other technicians as well as experts have denounced the lack of appropriate training of those Cubans who will monitor the plant, and the serious lack of infrastructure inside the island to operate the Juragua plant.

Mr. Chairman, this type of VVER plant has already been banned in countries like Germany, where four similar plants were shut down after reunification and which environmental groups have called to be closed. When asked about the plant, Dr. Edward Purvis of the Department of Energy states,

An accident in the reactor is probable. It's just a question of when . . . I don't know if they are the most dangerous reactors in the world, but they are the most dangerous reactors anywhere close to the United States.

Although the technology is different from the infamous Chernobyl plant, the Cuban nuclear plant poses similar

dangerous and indeed horrific risks and grave consequences. Do we want a Chernobyl in our backyard, subsidized with U.S. taxpayer dollars? I think not.

Mr. Chairman, the Clinton administration has remained quiet and indeed deadly silent about the Juragua nuclear plant because it presents a roadblock on their path of normalization of relations with Castro. It is inconceivable that the administration has remained dangerously silent while this national security threat is constructed just 180 miles from our shores, a threat that would affect a large part of the United States with radiation if an accident or a provoked accident would take place.

Indeed, studies by NOAA concluded that depending on the direction of the wind, radiation from the plant could affect Central America, the Caribbean, the United States, as far as Washington, DC, and Virginia, and, of course, Cuba itself.

The threat of the Juragua plant is indeed further increased when we consider that it would be at the hands of a tyrant who has no respect for human life and who has not hesitated in the past to destroy human life to achieve his evil purposes. Already Castro has entered into an agreement with another pariah and terrorist state, Iran, to exchange information about these reactors.

Yet, while the Clinton administration denounces Russia for transferring nuclear technology to that Middle Eastern country, it has not raised a finger to help stop construction of Juragua. The inaction of the administration raises the ante on us in Congress to take action and warn Russia that we will not stand idly by while Moscow helps Castro and his Communist thugs introduce a new threat to our hemisphere.

Passage of this Menendez amendment will signal Moscow that American taxpayers will not be suckered into having their hard-earned money help in the completion of this national security threat.

Castro once called the Juragua project Cuba's greatest accomplishment of this century. However, this plant could also become Castro's greatest security threat to our hemisphere unless we in the Congress take action to stop Russia from aiding and abetting the Cuban tyrant. I urge my colleagues to defeat the Wilson substitute and adopt the Menendez amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Menendez amendment and rise in opposition to the Wilson substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I support foreign aid to Russia. I think foreign aid to Russia is very important. I think that the relationship between the United States and Russia is a very, very important relationship.

But, Mr. Chairman, one cannot turn a blind eye to the conduct of Russia.

One cannot turn a blind eye to what we have seen come out of Russia during the past several months. One cannot turn a blind eye to Chechnya, one cannot turn a blind eye to the selling of nuclear reactors or nuclear technology to Iran, and one cannot turn a blind eye to Russian help in terms of Cuba completing this nuclear powerplant.

Mr. Chairman, the issue here is not merely the Cuban dictatorship, although it has been a brutal dictatorship and has been a dictatorship that I have never supported, and certainly I think that the Cuban people would be much better off with democracy and political pluralism and look forward to the day when Cuba does have democracy. The issue here is also about the safety of American citizens.

I have in front of me the GAO report, the U.S. General Accounting Office report to the chairman, Subcommittee on Nuclear Regulation, Committee on Environmental and Public Works of the U.S. Senate. They express tremendous reservations about this nuclear powerplant. There are subdivisions, I would like to read some of them:

Safety concerns raised by former Cuban nuclear power officials; allegations of problems and defects in construction; allegations of inadequate simulator training; assertions of adherence to safety rules; United States prefers that reactors not be completed; United States policy and concerns of United States officials about the safe construction and operation of Cuba's nuclear reactors; NRC officials concerned about allegations of safety deficiencies; Department of Energy official concern about quality of reactor's construction and components; assessment of risks from earthquakes and radioactive pollutants.

It goes on and on and on. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] mentioned all the States, one-third of the American population, that could be put in jeopardy for this.

I think it is very, very important that we support the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ]. My worry about my good friend from Texas, his substitute, is what this would simply allow is, it would allow Russia to take our money, manipulate the funds through the back door, continue to build the powerplant and continue to have our money. I do not think that is what we want.

We talk about the dignity and self-respect of Russia, and I am sensitive to that. What about our own dignity and self-respect, that we could have a calamity 90 miles from our shore and it could be built with the help of American money? That is adding insult to injury.

I support the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ]. I think this is something we ought to put into this bill. We ought to stand up and take notice.

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

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WILSON. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. Everything the gentleman says about the undesirability of the Cuban nuclear powerplant is true, but I believe that the gentleman mentioned the two nuclear powerplants that Russia has contracted to build for Iran. Is that right? Did you mention that?

Mr. ENGEL. I mentioned Russia helping Iran in building nuclear technology and I know that our administration, our Government has made a plea with them not to continue. I know that they have said that they would look at it again, but they have not unequivocally stated that they will not help Iran in attaining nuclear power.

Mr. WILSON. Assuming that an announcement was made that Russian was going to assist Iran in building two powerplants, would the gentleman then want to cut off funds as a result of that?

Mr. ENGEL. Well, I think that would be a step in the right direction, but I would like them to couple that with an announcement that they will not help Cuba build this nuclear powerplant. If they did that, then I would certainly be opposed to cutting off funds.

Mr. WILSON. Is the gentleman basically saying that if Russia builds a nuclear powerplant for anybody, then we ought to reduce the amount of aid to them?

Mr. ENGEL. No, I think that when Russia is active in helping countries that are our adversaries, like Iran and like Cuba, increase their nuclear technology, I think it is very appropriate that we in turn pull out dollar-for-dollar that they are putting into building those powerplants.

Mr. WILSON. So the gentleman would favor reducing assistance to Russia by the amount of funding they spend on the Iranian plants?

Mr. ENGEL. That is not the amendment that is being done here. If I could just say, I pointed out Iran as showing that this is a behavioral pattern on the part of Russia with Iran and with Cuba.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. Chairman, I want to preface my remarks by saying that I respect extraordinarily the patriotism of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], who has also expressed here his support of this substitute, but I think that they are extremely incorrect by supporting this substitute.

Let's be clear with regard to what we are talking about. The Menendez amendment, Mr. Chairman, simply states that there will be a deduction, a dollar-for-dollar deduction of our aid to Russia if Russia—if and when, if and when, it conditions that—if and when Russia gives aid for the completion of

this powerplant that, as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] has pointed out, is extraordinarily dangerous; as the gentleman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN] pointed out, the same kind of powerplant, that same model, it was called VVER, they were the export powerplants that the Soviets used to build throughout Eastern Europe, those same model powerplants were closed in Germany immediately after reunification because of their inherent danger.

Now, last month Castro and the Russians announced that they have come up with a formula to get the money to complete the first of those two plants, that same model that was closed down in Germany because there was an explosion of protest by the environmental movement in Europe and they closed down those plants. By the way, the remaining plants in Eastern Europe, the environmental movement in Europe has mobilized to close them down because they are ticking time bombs for explosions, for accidents, those plants. Castro announces, as I say, Mr. Chairman, that he has found the formula with the Russians to complete the first of these plants.

The Menendez amendment says if they do that, if they provide assistance, we will then deduct dollar-for-dollar our assistance, our taxpayer money, for the completion of that powerplant which is a risk, as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] pointed out, to half of the United States, just about. If you look at the map, you see that just about all the southern States, all the way, and especially up the eastern coast, all the way to the Nation's capital are directly threatened if there is an accident or an incident at the nuclear powerplant.

Then my dear friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], gets up and he says his amendment is so as to not insult the dignity of the Russian democrats. Wait a minute. How do we get the message across to the Russians? Do we vote for the amendment that says we do not want the plant built with our money? Or do we vote for the amendment that says we do not want to insult the sensitivities of the Russian democrats?

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], my good friend, great American patriot, I know he is a ranking member. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] is the chairman of the subcommittee, and they have to fulfill a roll. I understand that. I respect that.

But their amendment, the Russian democrats' sensitivity amendment, is not the way to convey the message that we cannot be more concerned about the completion of this powerplant than we are. The Menendez amendment, the reason we have to defeat the substitute and vote for the Menendez amendment is because this is not an issue of Russian sensitivity.

This is an issue, the Clinton administration has got to understand, it has got to be at the top of our agenda in

our dealings with Russia and we have got to tell them they cannot build the plants that were closed down in Germany, that we are closing down, that are being closed throughout eastern Europe and yet Castro wants to complete them in Cuba.

□ 1845

That is not acceptable to the national security of the United States of America.

So, let us keep in mind what the Wilson-Obey substitute is, the Russian sensitivity amendment. That is what it is, the Russian sensitivity amendment. That we do not want to disturb their sensitivity on balance the Democrats versus the whatever.

Mr. Chairman, the bottom line is if we vote in favor of the sensitivity amendment, what we are saying is that we are not concerned about that power-plant; that we will deal with it, like the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] said, diplomatically.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard enough of diplomatically. Let Warren Christopher convince, with sensitivity, the Russians that we are concerned about this plant, even if we vote against the Menendez amendment. Let us see if that makes sense. If we vote for the substitute, the sensitivity substitute, then we are putting our faith in Mr. Warren Christopher that he will say: The Congress did not support the amendment to cut, dollar for dollar, Russian aid if you go ahead and build. They were more concerned about sensitivity. That is why they sent me here, to sensitively tell you Russians that even though the Congress did not support the Menendez amendment, we are, I think, concerned about the plant. I guess that is what the sensitivity amendment means.

What the Menendez amendment is, and we have to vote down the Wilson-Obey sensitivity amendment, is very clear. It is on the highest priority for our national security. That plant cannot threaten the people of the United States, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not think I have heard any more demagoguery on this floor today than I have in most days, but let me try to set the facts straight. I think the worst thing that a politician can do in public life is to try to mislead the voting public about serious issues. And so what I would like to try to do is to separate fact from fiction. Russian aid for this plant began in 1983 when Russia was still a communist country. It stopped in 1992, when the Russians demanded hard currency payment from Cuba. The only subsidy from Russia since that time was a \$30 million credit to mothball the plant that so many Members suggest that they want to see mothballed and stopped.

The only thing the Russians have done recently is to spend their own money to put this plant in mothballs,

not to run it. Now, the Cuban Government says they want to conduct a feasibility study. Nothing is feasible under Castro. Nothing rational will happen under Castro. So I think we have had a lot of rhetoric about a plant that nobody wants to see built.

What Mr. WILSON was trying to say is that the best way to see to it that Russia does not reverse its position and to begin funding this plant once again is to see to it that we do not damage reformers in the Soviet Union who are trying to keep the old horses at bay. What Mr. WILSON is trying to say is that Russian society is rampant with paranoia; not the only place I have seen paranoia recently, I would say. But they are certainly rampant with paranoia. That has been the history of Russia.

And rejectionist and reactionary forces routinely in that country use innocent actions of the West in order to feed the paranoia in that society in order to do in Russia what Hitler did when he came to power in Germany, which is to feed on fears and feed on resentment against outsiders, against being dictated from the outside in order to build your own political power. Again, not the only politicians have I seen do that recently, but they do it very well.

And so what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] is trying to say is that if you want to be most effective in preventing Russia from taking a course that we do not want them to take, then do not take an action which through inadvertence would weaken the hand of the reformers in Russia.

That is what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] is trying to say. Mr. Chairman, I am going to suggest something to my colleague, Mr. WILSON. I am going to suggest that because this amendment is chasing a ghost, I would suggest that the gentleman withdraw his amendment and that the committee accept the amendment being offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] because it is stopping something that is not happening.

Mr. Chairman, if we make more of it than it is, what will happen today is we will feed that very paranoia in Russia which we do not want to feed. So what I would suggest is that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] withdraw his amendment to the amendment, and we accept this amendment, which is justifiably aimed at something that we do not want to occur, but which I think has generated a debate which will leave the American people thinking that black is white and vice versa.

The facts remain that the only thing that has been happening so far is that the Cubans want to do a feasibility study. No money has been provided. The Russians have indicated no intention of providing any. And I want to make quite clear that if the day ever come when the Russians would provide it, I would be the first one in this well

offering an amendment to eliminate the same amount of funds.

However, Mr. Chairman, I do not think that this debate has really added an awful lot to the public's understanding of this issue. It has, in fact, wound up condemning Russia because they provided \$30 million to mothball a plant we want mothballed. But I know how politics works and how often issues get misconstrued. And, so, I think to do the least damage possible, that what we ought to do is to withdraw the Wilson amendment.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Wilson substitute and in support of the Menendez amendment. My aim is to send a strong signal that completion of the nuclear reactor in Cuba, just 180 miles from Key West, is not acceptable to the American people.

There is no doubt that the United States has a strong interest in promoting positive relations with Russia. We should continue to support that forward momentum.

However, as a Representative from Florida I am particularly concerned about plans to proceed with the Cienfuegos plant. Aside from my objections to providing support to the repressive Castro regime, I am deeply worried about safety issues that could impact the people of Florida, as well as the citizens of Cuba and the rest of the Caribbean. The safety standards established for the plant are simply insufficient. According to one Cuban engineer who worked on the plant, fully 15 percent of the pipes he inspected were flawed.

This project could not proceed without Russian technical assistance, training, and capital. Accordingly, we must send the strongest possible message. I urge my colleagues to support the Menendez amendment.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Menendez amendment. The President has not acted and time is short.

Let me be brief: The last thing we need is a Chernobyl in the Caribbean. Cuba is a mere stone's throw from the shores of my home State of Florida. If, God forbid, the inconceivable happens, it is certain Americans would suffer the devastating effects of nuclear exposure. We do not want this on our conscience.

It is amazing that even as the news reports show that Russia's Chernobyl plant is now leaking deadly radiation, that same substandard Russian technology is being used to build a nuclear plant in our backyard.

Completion of this plant would constitute a real and permanent threat to the health and safety of our country. The Menendez amendment needs to be passed. It is imperative that we take the proper steps to ensure that this type of security and safety threat is not brought to fruition.

Mr. Chairman, it is wrong that we give any money to Russia. It is horrendous that we should even consider giving money to Russia for the purpose of building of a nuclear power plant in Cuba. Simply put, Mr. Chairman, we cannot let this happen.

We cannot let this happen. I urge my colleagues to vote for the Menendez amendment and to oppose any weakening amendments.

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

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

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

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, with the withdrawal of the substitute, and with the importance that we know the Florida delegation and others sense with respect to this, we will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOSS: Page 78, after line 6, insert the following new section:

LIMITATION ON FUNDS FOR HAITI

SEC. 564. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be made available to the Government of Haiti when it is made known to the President that such Government is controlled by a regime holding power through means other than the democratic elections scheduled for calendar year 1995 and held pursuant to the requirements of the 1987 Constitution of Haiti.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSS

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified in the new form at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

The Clerk read as follows:

amendment, as modified, offered by Mr. GOSS: Page 78, after line 6, insert the following new section:

LIMITATION ON FUNDS FOR HAITI

SEC. 564. Effective March 1, 1996, none of the funds appropriated in this Act may be made available to the Government of Haiti when it is made known to the President that such Government is controlled by a regime holding power through means other than the democratic elections scheduled for calendar year 1995 and held in substantial compliance with the requirements of the 1987 Constitution of Haiti.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the modification to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS]?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. It is about Haiti and it says, "No democracy, no taxpayer money."

The intent is to encourage both the Clinton administration and the Haitians in Haiti to ensure that this year's parliamentary and Presidential elections are as free, open, and democratic as possible.

Simply put, the Goss amendment says that in the event of a new regime assuming power in this fiscal year in Haiti through means other than an election in substantial compliance with the Haitian Constitution of 1987, the United States would halt aid to Haiti.

I believe this amendment is of significant value, if not necessary, because I believe the American people would draw the line at funding a regime in Haiti that gained power through a nondemocratic or an anti-democratic process.

We saw some serious problems with the electoral process in this past weekend's parliamentary elections. Today, we have new reports of trouble, including the assassination of a mayoral candidate in the coastal town of Anse d'Hainault.

Others have noted that the electoral council we have there is provisional, not permanent as required by the Constitution. The international community has looked at that and the international community and Haiti have accepted that a necessary compromise for this past weekend's election. It was necessary to do it that way because we had to have the elections and I think that makes sense.

The natural follow-on question is whether or not building a more permanent electoral administrative mechanism will be a priority once the new parliament is in place. There are, arguably, more important Haitian issues than the electoral council.

The Haitian Constitution also prohibits President Aristide from running again and prohibits the new parliament from changing the laws to allow him to do so. Whether or not that standards holds should be of particular interest to this House, to the Clinton administration, and to the Haitian people themselves.

Ultimately, this amendment is, in part, about adding incentives to keep the evolution of democracy in Haiti on track by holding elections in a manner as consistent with the Haitian Constitution as possible, despite the realities of holding elections from scratch in what is a poverty-stricken, infrastructure-challenged Third World country.

The larger issue for us is deciding what our job as Members of Congress is all about. Members of Congress are the keepers of a trust for the American taxpayers. We are responsible for knowing whether our tax dollars are used for priority spending and whether there is value in return.

Let us be clear about this. No one knows exactly how much the Clinton administration has spent on operations in Haiti. What we do know is that before American soldiers leave, the cost of this effort is projected to be well over the \$2 billion mark. That is a tremendous amount of money.

Why have we committed this level of resource of Haiti? Because the White House has placed a priority of building

democracy there. And this is an admirable goal I think all of us support in principle.

But if at end of the election cycle this year we find that the process has drifted or been jolted far from democratic standards, then we should stop pouring money into that small Caribbean nation. When I say pouring money, it is about \$300 per capita, which is about \$50 per capita per year more than the average income.

This amendment says "No" to United States assistance for any new regime in Haiti that comes to power via an antidemocratic process. If building democracy is not about that kind of commitment, then what is it about? This amendment is good for a democratic Haiti; it is good for the American taxpayers.

Also I would like to point out that we have checked it out with the Committee on International Relations and we have made it in modified form today, after checking with the Department of State, to try and relieve some problems they were concerned about.

I have added the words "substantial compliance" with regard to observing the Haitian Constitution, because obviously they are not going to be able to cross every T or dot every I.

We have also tried to make this effective as of March 1996, well into the fiscal year, to allow plenty of opportunity for adjustment in case there are technical glitches with the election process.

We have tried to accommodate in every way possible the concerns of the administration. I think we have done that. I think we have a very clear, simple amendment that says as long as Haiti stays on the track, they are eligible for foreign assistance. If they get off that track, then we better take another look.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. MEEK OF FLORIDA TO THE AMENDMENT, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. GOSS

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment, as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. MEEK of Florida to the amendment offered by Mr. GOSS, as modified: In the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment, strike "when it is made known" and all that follows and insert the following: "except when it is made known to the President that such government is making continued progress in implementing democratic elections."

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

□ 1900

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

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleagues Mr.

OWENS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Mr. ALCEE HASTINGS of Florida in offering this amendment to the amendment offered by my friend, Mr. GOSS.

Our amendment is simple and concise. For Haiti to continue to get U.S. aid, the President has to be sure that Haiti is making progress in implementing democratic elections.

The United States has fostered and nurtured democracy in Russia and in Central America and in Eastern Europe. We should do no less for Haiti.

Our amendment provides a strong, clear incentive to the leaders of Haiti to continue on the path to democracy.

Mr. GOSS says that he wants to hold Haitians to the standards they set for themselves in the 1987 Constitution. So do we.

But we must also recognize that Haiti has had very little experience in governing itself. Let us move them in the right direction. Let us encourage them in the right direction, but let us not threaten them with disaster if they cannot immediately meet the lofty standards they have set for themselves. Mr. Chairman, in the world of international diplomacy, words are extremely important. Our amendment encourages democracy in Haiti without presupposing its failure.

Every person in this body today has a strong—and, I hope, unshakable—commitment to democracy as a form of government. Democracy is a truly great form of government, but it is also one of the most, if not the most, difficult forms of government on the face of the earth.

There is a line in the new movie, "Apollo 13," when Tom Hanks says, "There's nothing routine about going to the moon." Well, there's nothing routine about making democracy work, either.

Here in the United States, we have had over 200 years of experience with it. We have well-established democratic traditions. We probably make democracy work as well as anybody in the world.

And yet democracy works imperfectly in our own country. If you want proof, just look at the contested Maryland governor's election. Or the contested California Senatorial election. Just look at how many elections have been challenged right here in our own House of Representatives.

This should be a vote to insure that our tax dollars help support democracy, and that is why I ask for your support for our amendment.

Our amendment makes further funding for Haiti contingent on the progress of Democracy in Haiti.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a vote on whether or not last weekend's election in Haiti was without problems.

The fact is that the vote on Sunday in Haiti was far from perfect. There were organizational problems and confusion. Polls opened late, or not at all. There were untrained poll workers, and lapses in voter secrecy.

Was the baby's first step shaky? Absolutely.

But as yesterday's Miami Herald reports, quote:

Although the election was organizationally flawed, there was little indication of an effort to tilt the vote. And it was certainly the most peaceful of any since the Feb. 7, 1986, fall of the Duvalier family dictatorship.

The Canadian election specialist in charge of the 300 observers from the Organization of American States said, quote: "The overall picture was much more positive than reflected by some." He also noted that, as the day wore on, "the conduct of the voting process significantly improved."

Keep in mind that this election was in Haiti, the very poorest nation in the entire Western Hemisphere, a nation that until last fall was under the control of a military dictator. In fact, for most of its existence, Haiti has struggled under the rule of dictators.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mrs. MEEK of Florida was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, democracy, like everything else in life, takes practice. And this election in Haiti was a very clear and positive step in the right direction—toward democracy.

Would America's allies in the Revolutionary War have forced the Goss amendment upon the struggling little United States? Did our allies, in the difficult days after our liberation from our own colonial masters, make their assistance contingent on our implementing the Articles of Confederation? Of course not.

Why, then, should we so burden Haiti, which is struggling mightily to meet the high standards of self government that we have set for the world?

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of our amendment to the Goss Amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me just say that we do have occasionally here in the United States voting irregularities, but they are not really widespread.

I was one of the monitors sent by President Bush to monitor the elections in Namibia, and that was a very, very big election on independence and freedom and democracy over there, and there was a lot of opportunity for vote fraud, but very, very little of it occurred in Namibia.

In South Africa, likewise, there were some irregularities, but it was very minimal. I think in many, many of the developing countries, there have been some minor voting irregularities.

But the problem we saw in Haiti last week was there were widespread voter irregularities. Ballots were lost. People could not vote. Polls were closed. And as a result, the entire election was tainted.

For that reason, I rise in support of the Goss amendment and in opposition to the gentlewoman's substitute.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Indiana for yielding to me.

The problem with the amendment offered by my colleague from Florida is that it simply bases the question of how we judge democracy on some unknown. There is no particular standard for it. It is sort of in the eye of the beholder.

We are very particular about how we do that in our amendment, by design. We measure democracy by the Haitian Constitution. That is the way we measure democracy in this country, and we believe specific reference to the Haitian Constitution is also extremely critical because that is the path they have announced they are taking and that is the path that the dollars of our tax support are committed to pursuing, in helping them pursue.

If we get that off that path and create some new direction, we open the door for a lot of mischief, and I am sad to say that there was some mischief in Haiti this past weekend, and I am sorry that my colleague from Florida has felt it necessary to shoot the messenger for reporting that.

But in the words of the mayor of Port-au-Prince, who called the election, and incidentally the mayor of Port-au-Prince is a member of the former coalition of elected President Aristide, called the election a massive fraud. The minister of culture said he was ashamed. Quoting from the New York Times on this, he said, "As a member of the Government, I am not proud of this at all." These are serious challenges.

The political parties are calling for a re-vote. They are calling for re-elections.

This is not PORTER GOSS saying this, this is PORTER GOSS bringing the message. I am sorry, it is the Haitians who have said this, who participated in this. It is not PORTER GOSS who has created this.

The fact that we have brought it to your attention may be distressing, but it is important that when we represent first and foremost the United States taxpayers, we have a higher obligation to make sure their money is properly and wisely spent than any other obligation in a foreign country. I think that is an extremely important point.

I would say that one of the problems I have with the Meek amendment is that it clearly weakens accountability to the American taxpayers.

I think that not specifying that we stick to the Constitution in Haiti is a serious flaw in the Meek amendment, and I am afraid that leaving it up to somebody, presumably the spokespersons for the liberal left, as who have

been speaking widely on this, to define what democracy is and how well it is doing in Haiti is a dangerous mistake and would not pass muster with the United States taxpayers.

Having said all of this, I urge definitely a "no" vote on the Meek amendment, and I urge support for the Goss amendment.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I say to the gentleman from Florida, to restate what he said, his amendment is consistent with the Constitution of Haiti and leaves no room for doubt, and for that reason I think we should support his amendment and vote down the substitute.

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

I have read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida, and I really do not understand what his objective is here except to try to embarrass President Aristide and especially the people of Haiti.

I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. I do so because it represents a slap in the face to the millions of people who voted in Haiti on Sunday.

I have investigated; I have gotten reports from people who were there. The reports that I have received were that there was practically no violence; there was practically no intimidation, no fraud. These things were practically nonexistent.

Yes, there were lost ballots. It was the first election allowed in that country in many, many years. There were some irregularities, but there are irregularities in almost every free election.

What really we should have to look to find out is what was really Haiti's government before our forces returned democracy to Haiti? It was a gang of military thugs and criminals who controlled that nation. They took control, and President Aristide, who was elected by almost 70 percent of the people of that nation, was forced to leave his office and his country under threat of death.

Politically motivated violence and murder reigned. Two elections were rigged by the gang in power, Cedras, Biambe, Francois. Do you want them back in power? Terror was the form of government in Haiti.

But that changed when President Aristide returned last October. Democracy has replaced terror. Democracy has replaced terror in Haiti, and that was demonstrated on Sunday.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have harped on the logistical difficulties surrounding Sunday's election in Haiti. There was not an extraordinary multitude of problems or widespread disturbances. There were problems, admittedly. President Aristide has publicly acknowledged that there were problems.

In the United States elections, which is the bedrock of a 200-year-old system, there are problems. Coming from the city of Philadelphia, I can assure you

that we still have elections in this Nation tainted with controversy, irregularities, and problems. But this was only Haiti's second free election ever.

Furthermore, most of the 3.5 million Haitians who were registered to vote in Sunday's election are illiterate and require special attention.

Despite these difficulties, people were able to participate in a free and fair election. According to the report issued by the election observers with the Organization of American States, problems related to the election were attributed to Haitian inexperience, not widespread fraud, not abuse or not violence.

The seed of democracy has been planted in Haiti. While it will take time and hard work for democracy to establish firm roots, we witnessed positive, tangible progress toward this goal on Sunday.

Can the people on the other side not accept success? We have created a democracy in Haiti. Now is not the time to send this negative message. Now is not the time to hold critical development funds which could further guarantee the success of Haitian democracy.

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

Mr. FOGLIETTA. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. I would want to comment particularly with the gentleman's reference to Philadelphia elections because in Detroit we lost a city clerk as a result of problems, and we have been holding pretty good elections the whole time.

May I just say that I agree with you. The Meek amendment to Goss is absolutely essential, and I am hoping that our Republican friends will understand what we are trying to do is give Haiti a chance. Let us not put them under an increasing burden. Their difficulties are much, much graver than some people think, and I want to give them a chance.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in enthusiastic support of the amendment by the gentlelady from Florida. It is a much needed modification to the amendment by the gentleman from Florida. That amendment is deeply flawed in content and intent. Despite its seemingly harmless wording, it will curtail democracy in Haiti, where peaceful governance can ill afford such a setback.

The gentlelady's amendment offers some simple but critical changes. Her amendment in its entirety reads:

None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be made available to the Government of Haiti except when it is made known to the President that such Government is making continued progress in implementing democratic elections.

Rather than tearing the carpet out from under Haiti's painful steps toward democracy, this amendment allows aid to that country as long as it is continuing those steps toward democracy. I have traveled to Haiti several times, and have witnessed myself the pain that this country had to bear in anticipation of peaceful enfranchisement and they are closer now than ever before.

The absence of systemic fraud and organized violence in Haiti's elections this week showed that this nation is working diligently for democracy, even without an adequate transportation network to get people to the polls and extremely limited resources. Nevertheless, those who disagree with the results in favor of the ruling party such as the International Republican Institute have sought to impose the same standards on this infant democracy as they would in the United States.

The truth of the matter about IRI is that it received nearly half a million United States taxpayer dollars to observe the elections in Haiti this spring. Have no illusions about IRI so-called non-partisanship. One IRI document for the electoral study states: "IRI will conduct local leadership training exclusively for non-Lavalas centrist political party representatives from all 83 electoral districts." Lavalas is the opposition party. That's not observing democracy that's interfering with it. IRI is supporting political parties they happen to agree with. This organization also apparently has a crystal ball that allowed them to state in a fancy report the day before the elections that the elections were unfair. We should give democracy in Haiti a chance and not be in such a hurry to pass judgment, but instead continue to encourage this young democracy's growth.

For the first time this week, voters could let their political voice be heard out of freedom and not out of fear. Democracy is a process and not a standing status. We have to maintain our commitment to Haiti at the early stages of its process now that it is on course.

America's commitment to Haiti is an integral part of America's pledge to democracy and peace worldwide. Other nations of the world, who are still struggling under the bloody boot of oppression, have to see that peace and freedom can and must coexist. Without the gentlelady's modifications, the amendment is a vote of no confidence to this blossoming democracy and an endorsement of the IRI's delusions.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for the amendment by the gentlelady from Florida in the name of a stable democracy and a real democracy.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. I thank the gentleman.

I just want to say there are 6 million people in Haiti. They have suffered tremendously over the years by dictatorial government. They have suffered from people who have indiscriminately killed, maimed and injured people to keep control of that nation.

They are finally achieving democracy. They are finally achieving freedom. Give them a chance. Do not hamstring them. Do not threaten to take the funds back.

I urge my colleagues to understand the problems of the people of Haiti. They want democracy. Let us help them achieve that goal.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the Meek amendment and against the Goss amendment.

□ 1915

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Meek amendment. I think the amendment that Meek seeks to amend, Mr.

Goss, places the process of Haitian democratization under a vague and mischievous standard. The question is how do we define a democratically constituted government, how do we define a democratic election process? The Meek amendment makes it pretty clear that the responsibility would be fixed upon the President. It must be made known to the President. Otherwise the President will certify whether the democratic process took place and whether the regime in power is a result of a democratic process.

Yes, I agree with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Goss]. We should say no. We should not support any regime that is in power as a result of a process that is not democratic. But what is the definition of the process, what is the definition of staying on track? As the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Goss] said, they must stay on track. I agree they must stay on track toward democracy and maintain the democracy. Let the President determine what staying on track means. The President, the executive branch, is in charge of foreign policy. Let us make it clear the Meek amendment makes it clear that they will determine that. Instead we have in the Goss amendment a rather vague situation where it is not clear who will determine whether or not they are on course.

We should bear in mind that the liberation of Haiti marks a high point in United States foreign policy. The liberation of Haiti sends a message to all of the nations in the Caribbean area and this hemisphere, all throughout the world, that we stand well on the side of democracy, and when it is clear that a democratic government has been deposed, we will have the strength and the resources of the American Government on the side of the democratic government. We have, step by step, supported a process which the Haitian people themselves began in 1987.

Let us understand the context in which the presidential election has just taken place. First of all, the election was an election which involved 11,000 candidates running for everything from village council up to the national legislature. That is very difficult for anybody to run. They have no machines, no election machines. They do not have boards of elections that have existed for decades. Their constitution only came into existence less than 10 years ago. So they are carrying out a process under the worst of circumstances in an economy that does not even have the infrastructure to support electricity on a 24-hour basis. All of this is taking place within less than 10 years in the Haitian society.

They said they can never write a constitution, but they wrote a constitution. They went out and voted for that constitution. They said they can never have free elections, and it looked for a while as if they can never have free elections because people were gunned down at the polls in the first two elections.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, they had an election where they elected Jean-Bertrand Aristide as President. After the election was certified as being a fair and free election, he was deposed by the army, and that situation lasted for over 3 years. Now some of the people who supported the criminals who deposed the democratically-elected President are trying to set a very high standard that they were never concerned about while Haiti was under the domination of criminal dictators.

We have broken through; we have liberated Haiti. The process is moving in a very swift way.

Mr. Chairman, they have had an election less than a year after the president was returned. The president who is there now has agreed to step down. He has made no claim to the fact that he was out of office for 3 years and, therefore, he ought to be continued. Some other people are making that claim, but Jean-Bertrand Aristide will step down. Jean-Bertrand Aristide will play the role of George Washington and see to it that there is an orderly, peaceful transition of government.

All of these things are moving on track, and they are moving in ways that most cynics said they can never move. Why do we want to introduce a vague standard here? Why do we want to place Haiti under scrutiny, which will not help the situation at all? Why not let the process go forward and let the State Department and the President, the executive branch of government, determine whether or not they are meeting the requirements of a movement toward democratization that is acceptable for the United States to continue to support?

I hope that the gentleman will accept the amendment to his amendment because the difference is not so great. We only clarify and pinpoint the responsibility for defining what democratization is in Haiti.

I urge that we support, all people to support, the Meek amendment.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by our colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Goss], and in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's first-hand account of what transpired in the Haitian elections on Sunday offers compelling evidence that, despite our extraordinary investment and best intentions, much remains to be done to strengthen the democratic institutions there.

Laboring in extreme heat, without food, water, or pay, Haitians made their best effort to cast and count ballots—in some cases by candlelight into the next day. However, Haiti's Provisional Electoral Council fell down on

the job, failing to provide logistical support, training, and funds.

Frankly, there is much ground to be covered if the Presidential elections in December are to be judged as free and fair. Also, the statement yesterday by a key Haitian politician that President Aristide should stay in power after his constitutional term expires on February 7, 1996, casts further doubt on the democratic transition.

President Clinton defended his extraordinary investment in Haiti as a move to restore constitutional order. It would be profoundly difficult to make the case to the American people and Congress that our assistance should continue to flow to an unconstitutional government in Haiti. That is the basis of the Goss amendment, which I hope my colleagues will support.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Goss] who authored this original amendment had indicated that support for the Government of Haiti seemed to be coming from liberals or something that would denote that there was a different type of thinking with liberals, and conservatives, and people of different backgrounds, as related to a poor country that has really suffered tremendously over the last decades.

It seems to me that the amendment is a political statement:

I did not like Aristide when he first was elected. I did not like Aristide when he came to the United States. I did not like Aristide when we went in to restore the government, and, notwithstanding the fact that he has done each and every thing that everyone expected him to do, they could not find one thing to say except, "Something must be wrong. I don't know what it is, but, if anyone finds out what it is, then we cut off aid."

As my colleagues know, I am more concerned about the politics of when it is made known to the President of the United States than anything in this statement because, as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Goss] knows better than most Members of this body, everything that was made known to the Presidents of the United States was made known by the Central Intelligence Agency, and it really surprises me, with the type of information that was gathered out of the sewers of the intelligence community, that was made and proven to be false to misguide the President of the United States, that we would have this vague type of language as to the President would cut off any assistance to the Government of Haiti when it is made known to the President.

I really would not want to start laughing here by asking the distinguished gentleman from Florida just who would he think, or what agency would it be, that would be mandated to make information known to the President of the United States as would be

in Haiti sometime. If we take a look at the history of the CIA in condemning our country, in condemning a man, and continuously condemning someone that has been elected by the people, we will run down the line and say the man was psychotic based on what? Information collected. The man was addicted to drugs. The man was responsible for murder. There is no support for the man on the island of Haiti. It is the army, it is institutions, it is the people that were paid, the people that were on the payroll. Everyone that opposed the man when he was in this country was paid for by the CIA and other people that just could not tolerate the idea that they did not have a puppet controlled by the United States of America.

And so I know, I know, that certain people are just born in this world that is going to have to carry a heavy burden, and I do not mind carrying it at all. I think it was our distinguished Speaker who said, "You just got to worker harder." So that goes for the gentleman that comes to become president of Haiti. But the question has to remain how much does a country have to suffer, how much does a man have to do, in order to get certain people off of his back?

Now, until there is reason to believe that something was wrong, that the election was fraudulent, do my colleagues not think this body and the President has the power to move forward? The reason I support the Meek amendment is because it is done the way the United States of America should do business, and that is we are going to assume that things are done legally, we are going to assume that the Congress and the people have good intent, and if anyone, anyone, misuses that, then this Congress would respond.

Well, what the gentleman is saying and what the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK] is not saying is that we make it a negative thinking that it is going to happen, and she is the American that has hope that, when our troops went over there, got rid of the tyrants, got rid of the CIA people that were on the payroll, that was actually stopping the United States ship from coming into it when they were chased out of the country because of the spirit of fine young American boys, we are going to send a message to them, "Yes, you did a good job, but wait until you see what happens because we got an amendment that will take it all back."

This is not the U.S. Congress that I am proud to be a Member of. This is not the United States of America. We should laud our esteem for doing what the international community asked him to do, and I, for one, was proud that I supported him before, and I do now.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

Mr. Chairman, I was prepared to let this go unanswered, but it has gotten a

little out of control here in the rhetoric. The gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL] has just said when it is made known. He objects to that language, and that is the language in Mrs. MEEK's amendment as well, so I guess he is opposed to Mrs. MEEK's amendment as well.

The question was raised by the gentleman: Who will make it known? Any number of people will make it known to the President. As I recall, the last person who made it known to the President that there was a problem in Haiti was the gentleman named Randall Robinson. Randall Robinson actually made it known by a protest in front of the White House, a starvation diet type of thing, a publicity stunt as it were. Well, I would suggest a very great way the president will know.

Mrs. Robinson now works for the government of Haiti, as I understand is on the payroll of the Government of Haiti. Presumably she will tell Randall Robinson and Randall Robinson will tell the president again. So I am not concerned that we are not going to get the word to the President that the folks who are taking the Rangel position want to know. It is going to happen; there is no question there.

I am a little bit offended by the statement that I did not support President Aristide. I was in Haiti for the election in 1990; I was in Haiti for the election in 1995, as an observer. As an observer in 1990 I came back and signed on and said President Aristide is a duly popular, enthusiastically elected President of the country of Haiti, and I have stuck to that position the whole way through. When former President Carter, and General Powell and Senator NUNN negotiated the settlement that avoided the armed hostile conflict of war between the U.S. Armed Forces, and the Haitian army, and people, and the innocent bystanders that would have been hurt, I was the first Member in the well the next day to congratulate President Clinton for a negotiated settlement.

□ 1930

I think he was fortunate to get it at the last minute. He had good people working for him and made that come out. I met with President Aristide this Monday. We had a very nice discussion after this election. We agreed there are some very hopeful signs that we need to focus on. It was a courteous call, a pleasant call, there was no disagreement.

There is no question that we have a challenge ahead. President Aristide said so and has been saying so publicly, frankly, in the past 2 days. I do not think we have any disagreement about that. This is not about the election last weekend. Sure, there were tremendous logistical difficulties. Everybody knows that. Sure, there were some disturbances. Some were severe, some were not. In some areas there were no disturbances at all. I think everybody

who was there understands that. Nobody would mischaracterize that.

My problem is, what is going to be the standard? The gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] said what is the standard. He said a vague and mischievous standard was my game. It is not. I am saying the standard of measuring democracy in Haiti is the Haitian Constitution. Is there anybody who would deny that that is about a bad idea? That is what we are measuring democracy by in Haiti, is their democratic Constitution. Can we get real here? What is wrong with that?

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

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

Mr. RANGEL. I would like to withdraw some harsh statements I made about the gentleman, because I am reminded by your statement that unlike so many others that are positioned in that side of the aisle, that you constantly have talked about the restoration of democracy in Haiti, even to the point that you had a place where you thought the new government should be.

But I guess my point to you, sir, is that why would this little island government need your direction with its constitution as to when our great Nation cuts assistance?

Mr. GOSS. Reclaiming my time, the answer is very simple: Because I am first and foremost accountable to the American taxpayers for the wise use of their tax dollars, and I do not stand still for the proposition that we are going to put any money in any country, no matter what, unless they are proceeding in a properly democratic way.

Mr. RANGEL. Is the gentleman saying he would hope that his amendment would apply to any country that is not abiding by the constitutional principles that is in their Constitution, and that this little island country was not singled out for this kind of treatment?

Mr. GOSS. I have picked Haiti for two reasons: The substantial compliance question I think accommodates most of your concern. But the other reason is because we have \$2 billion, B, billion, invested in Haiti in this 2-year frame, probably going to be more before we are through, and that is my foremost responsibility to the United States of America as a Representative here, is to make sure in the House of revenue, the people's House, we use dollars wisely.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me address my colleague most immediately with reference to the fact that we have \$2 billion invested in Haiti, and put the question rhetorically: How much of that was used in the structuring of an election that would satisfy the so-called requirements of the Haitian Constitution?

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I do not know. I certainly hope we are all going to have that answer.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Let me suggest it was minuscule by comparison. I am fond of quoting my mother, and I choose at this time to do so. My mom says "Give the prize to the one who tries," and she says that often. Haiti has tried over and over again to satisfy every single requirement that our government has put forward to require them to go forward in a meaningful manner. There has been but a year in the process of restoration of democracy, and I am fascinated by the little amount of resources that were devoted toward trying to help an 80 percent illiterate country to understand the basic dynamics of voting. The 1,000-plus candidates that were on the ballot alone required an immense amount of resources in order for the various persons to be widely known. We spend in some of our districts \$1 million, and that is about how much money we spent during that period of time in trying to assist in the election.

Do you know what I am going to ask the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is what is the real agenda here? I mean, the election was just held Sunday and Monday, and I hear my chairman of the Committee on International Relations saying that some of the votes were counted by candlelight. Absolutely, Mr. GILMAN, they were counted by candlelight, for the reason that the people do not have electricity.

Give me a break. They do not have computers. They do not have the knowledge that we have with reference to how to conduct an election. And many of us sat on the sidelines and waited until Sunday to go down there and find out precisely what was going on before we would say anything.

What has the international community done with reference to the donors that said they were going to come forward and help this country? The money has been slow in coming. There is no infrastructure. People stood in long lines waiting to have an opportunity to vote. They voted probably as good as we do in this country, in many of our areas, rich and poor. Therefore, it is unwise of us to thrust on them at this time such a nebulous, vague, and uncertain mandate from this country as to how it is to conduct itself as a national government.

Let me make it very clear: You do not have any more concern than anybody else. The so-called liberal left you said, PORTER. That is the language he used, CHARLIE, liberal left. Then I am a proud member of that liberal left, and I gather then that you must be something other than liberal left.

You do not have any more reason to support the taxpayers of this country than do I. You cannot wrap yourself around a flag or hide under the rug of the CIA and expect that from somewhere on earth is going to come this rumination that is going to give you

greater say about something that every Member of the liberal left struggled for these people to have, the opportunity to have a democratic election.

Every Member of the liberal left stood by them and said, "We do not want you dying out in the ocean." Every Member of the liberal left said that it was wrong to hold them in Guantanamo. Every Member of the liberal left said that we had dual America standards, and everybody on earth knows that we had dual standards.

Who, other than a handful of you, have complained about this election? Were there problems? Yes. And there were problems in Fort Lauderdale, and there were problems in Immokalee in your district. So do not commence to tell me that problems now are going to be reported arbitrarily by somebody unknown to the President of the United States, and that is going to be pursuant to the Constitution of 1987.

Who, other than you, have complained? Did Brian Atwood complain? I did not hear him say that the election was a fraud, and it is his agency that was involved. Did the military complain? Six thousand of our troops are still there, and they shepherded as best they could an election of a fledgling country.

I am tired of standing in this well and in this body and hearing people refer to the people of the liberal left. One day I will come forward and tell you all the things that the liberal left has done. My concern is what the conservative right has done to us all.

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

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Immokalee, the distinguished gentleman from Sanibel [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Ohio for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to my colleague and friend from Florida, who has spoken with great passion and articulation on an issue that we all care very much about, I have been involved with Haitian affairs for 30 years now, from many perspectives, all aimed toward building democracy and a better quality of life for Haiti, which is demonstrably the poorest, most impoverished, most backward part of the western hemisphere, a tragedy in history of many ways, of 200 years as the second oldest sovereign republic, free sovereign republic, in this hemisphere. They just have not been able to get it together down there. I think we all as good neighbors in this hemisphere want to do our best for them.

I suspect that my colleague from Florida's impassioned speech was in part from the sense of frustration and disappointment that he feels and that I feel, that we all feel, that things are not going better more quickly. I suspect a little bit perhaps of his feeling

comes from the same feeling that I have as an American, a little bit of the shame I feel that some of the poverty in Haiti today is a direct result of the embargo that we have advocated against, this economic embargo that has simply made Haiti, I hate to say this, but it is close, a place where there is too much garbage with too many pigs in the city streets going around. It is very hard to think that this is a civilized capital city of a great sovereign nation. Things have gotten so bad economically down there for anybody to come in and see. It is pathetic, and I feel badly about it.

But that was our embargo, and as an American I feel very badly. That was unwise policy by President Clinton and his advisers, and I stood on this floor and many times said that. So that does not mean I am not sympathetic to Haiti. It means I am very sympathetic to the people of Haiti and to the country of Haiti. I do not think starving Haitians into democracy is a very smart way to go, and I have said so repeatedly.

Now, apparently my colleague from Florida has some type of obsession with the CIA. I do not know what it is about, but, just to make the record clear, I will say I would presume that all of the President's horses and all of the President's men are the people and ways that he is going to get the message about what is going on in Haiti. That is how our government works, and how it should be.

The final point I would like to make is that the question of constitutionality that I have raised, using the Haitian Constitution as the measure by which we judge, is not a new subject. It is, in fact, the way the OAS judges its own member states, and has been since June of 1991 per resolution 1080 of Santiago. The test is a sudden or irregular interruption of democracy creates an abrogation. And where was that ever tested? The first place, Haiti. It served Haiti already, and it can serve Haiti again. That is the standard I am asking us to adopt.

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

Mr. Chairman, last week when I heard about the Goss amendment I went to him to discuss with him that amendment and to try and determine what he was trying to do. I am surprised today when I hear the gentleman, because my discussion with him last week, well, he sounded a lot different.

The gentleman said to me, "Let me assure you, I do not want to do anything to harm Haiti. I would like to encourage them. I am with you all the way." He said, "I was there, and I think they did a pretty good job." He said, "I think there were a few problems."

So, having had that conversation with him one-on-one, I am surprised when I hear him on the floor today, because he sounds like a different person.

He even said to me, "I want to amend my amendment to put in substantial compliance, because I in no way believe that we should hold them to the strict standard of the 1987 Constitution." Because, he implied, "I know what had to be done for the election. With Aristide only returning in October, to say that they had to put everything in place to comply with the Constitution was literally impossible, and we wanted these elections to be held. And yes, Ms. WATERS, I agree, that ever since everybody, but everybody, signed off on the way that they should proceed. And recognizing that everything demanded by the Constitution could not be put in place, I think it has worked out well."

Well, you know, maybe I need to ask the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] to revisit this conversation, because when he gets on the floor today, then he starts to go back and say some things that really do surprise me.

Let me just say, this amendment should not be about refighting and getting involved in a struggle where there were some who did not believe we had any place in Haiti, that did not want us to assist Haiti, who made statements that pained us all, "We are not going to and we do not wish to lose one good American soldier on their soil." We do not want to go back to talk about that.

□ 1945

Let us put that behind us. Let us at least conclude, as reasonable people can do, that we have helped Haiti, and they are grateful. Do they say to us over and over again how grateful they are? We must have had 200 CODELS to Haiti. Everybody has been to Haiti. Everybody from both sides of the aisle that has wanted to go. Those who did not want to go have been to Haiti. They have been received with warmth. They have been embraced. The president has thanked us profusely, and we know that they are grateful for what we have done.

Having done all of that, the President has said over and over again, What else do you want me to do? How else can I make you believe that all that I want for my beloved country is freedom and democracy for its people? Everything that we have asked him to do he has done.

I am pleased and proud, as I look at what took place with these elections. Now, if you recall what happened in South Africa, people stood in lines for hours. If you will recall, it took them a long time to count the ballots. If you will recall, there were some skirmishes. It will happen.

Let us not talk about what happens in America but certainly in a third world country, where they do not have the computerization, they do not have the electricity and other things, certainly you expect there are going to be some problems. But why are you putting on them the kind of restrictions to box them in to say that if you do not comply with the 1987 Constitution for

the 1995 elections coming up and somebody, God knows who, tells the president that they have not done it, then we are to withhold money. I do not think you mean that.

Mr. GOSS, I say to you now, I think that you are the man that I talked to last Thursday. I really do not think whatever has influenced you today is the real you. I want you to do what you told me you wanted to do. I want you to join with me in helping Haiti.

Let me tell you how you can do it. We do not mind working with you to structure something that would encourage them, but, Mr. GOSS, you need to pull this amendment back from the floor. You should not disrespect your colleagues from Florida. You work pretty well with them from time to time. CARRIE MEEK is here. She is pained by what you are doing. Mr. HASTINGS is also.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] has expired.

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

Ms. WATERS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] to pull this back from the floor. Walk over here with your colleagues and friends from Florida, get together an amendment that will encourage Haiti that we can agree on and let us move forward as friends on this one because we are winning all the way.

Would you please do that, Mr. GOSS? Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. WATERS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I first of all want to say that I filed this amendment way at the beginning of last week, way before the elections. It actually had very little to do with the elections. Second thing, I did confer with you, as you point out. Third, I want to assure you, it is the real me. I am definitely here. I am standing here and it is me.

The third thing I want to say is this is not about the elections. The fourth thing I want to say is I have not made any allegations or charges that we should stop aid because it was not a democratic election. That would be a very foolish thing to do, I do not think you or anybody else over there would say right now that we have supported a nondemocratic election because they did not have their electoral council in place. I, at your request and others' requests, put in the words "substantial compliance" so we would know we are not talking about trickery or anything like that. I do not expect all the T's to be crossed or the I's to be dotted. I expect substantial compliance. I have said publicly, these elections are OK, on to the next ones.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for this opportunity to say a few words. Let me

say that I stand in strong support of the Meek amendment. I had the opportunity to travel to Haiti this time, about the seventh time in the last few years, to be a member of the interorganizational observer mission. We went there to try to get an opportunity to see what was going on.

The first thing that was very surprising to me though was the day before we arrived on Saturday that a report had been concluded already by the IRI, the International Republican Institute, very colorfully done, very well done, very thorough. And a press conference was held the day before we got there, two days before the election, which already said, for all intents and purposes, that this is flawed, that this was going to be an election that did not work, that this is something—this was a press conference given two days before the election was even held.

So, therefore, people going into the election were suspect because of an American organization. And it is the first time I have ever seen an American organization in a foreign country give a press conference of something that is not very easily made. This is a pretty fancy-looking agenda item here, to say for all intents and purposes it is a failure. To me, it makes me suspicious.

Let us talk about the election very briefly. They said there was confusion. Let me tell you something. I would be the first to admit that there was some confusion. But let us take a look at the ballot.

There were eight months since President Aristide had been back. What was on the ballot? You had their Senators, 177 running on a ballot with pictures, with symbols, with names. There were deputies, 859 Senate Congress types running on another ballot. You had 855 mayors running; not only themselves but on each mayor's slate there is a deputy mayor and a third assistance mayor on the same ballot.

What else did you have? You had 2,688 council people who had three people on the site. There were close to 5,000 candidates. There were over 25 political parties. There were over 10,000 polling places. There were people who had to walk from 3 in the morning to 6 in the morning when the polls opened to get to the polling place.

Ninety-two percent of the people were registered. And guess what? The representative giving the report for the International Republican Institute said that 92 percent registration was a step in the right direction; 92 percent of the people in this country registered. Sure there were flaws. There were flaws because when I went back with President Aristide on October 30, 1994, when we went to the presidential palace, the water was not running, the electricity was not running. They did paint the house the day before so it could look presentable.

When I went down to Haiti on my other trips and met with those murderous General Cedras and Biambly and

Francois Michel, you saw people running and hiding. People were hiding in the bush. I went there six different times.

When I went there this time, I could walk the streets. There was no—I went to Cap Haitien, supposed to be the area that flew a one-engine plane all the way over the mountains to see what was happening over there. People were in line. They were waiting patiently. People were discussing the elections.

This was one of the greatest democratic exercises that I have ever seen. I cannot believe that people of good will could go down, and we would look at the same thing and that these people would come back with a report saying that a polling place or so opened late.

There were some people who seemed to be confused because of the fact that on every ballot you had about 30 or 40 or 50 different candidates. They looked at a glass being half empty. That glass was not only half full, it was bubbling over, because people were peaceful.

The new police were up there in Cap Haitien, not the Army that used to control that country with 7,000 men with a gun, pointing the barrel down at people. These were policemen who were applauded by the people in Haiti. When they dispersed, the police group in Cap Haitien, they had a party. There was a celebration. People brought flowers and plants to the police.

This is something that is unbelievable. I urge the support of the Meek amendment.

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

The gentleman from New Jersey, I want to ask the gentleman a question. I want to ask a question about the group that was down there, because I received today a call from Bishop Cousin who is the presiding bishop of the African Methodist Church in the State of Florida and the Bahamas. He indicated that he was intimidated by some group, the International Republican Institute. In fact, he indicated to them that he did not work for the Government and he would not be intimidated.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

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

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. I did meet the bishop and did have an opportunity to see him before I went up to Cap Haitien but did not see him after my return.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I had the good fortune and pleasure of meeting the bishop while we were there. We had a very pleasant conversation. If somebody who was one of my observers on the IRI team intimidated him, I would certainly like to know that person's name and know the circumstances. I have had no such report.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I will provide that for the gentleman.

I am looking at the Washington Post story, and they indicated that this particular group was a very partisan group.

I just want to close by saying this: I support my colleagues from Florida and other Members today that have spoken for the Haitian people. I, from Florida, have lived through what has gone on in Haiti for a number of years, the double standards. I support what President Clinton has done, what President Aristide has done, working with the Haitian people.

Yes, Haiti is not what we want. I have been over there several times. But I am a part of what we can do to make that country work and work for the people. They are very grateful for everything that we have done; but they, as I told you earlier, are not a colony of the United States of America. They appreciate everything that we have done for them, but they need to govern themselves.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will continue to yield, that in fact was what I said in my remarks to the press on Monday morning.

What paper said this was a partisan group?

Ms. BROWN of Florida. The Washington Post.

Mr. GOSS. The Washington Post reported that the IRI was partisan?

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. GOSS, you have specifically identified in your amendment that there would be substantial compliance with the 1987 Constitution for the 1995 elections. What does that mean? As you know, there was an agreement for this election, to oversee and operate this election. Everything was not in place. So they had to put the electoral council in place, not as the Constitution identified.

Would you agree that that agreement is sufficient?

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, the answer to the question is, by substantial compliance, I certainly think that if we have said that this election this weekend involves substantial compliance, that that gives us a pretty good idea of how far away we can get from the specific words and technical requirements because we were quite far away from them. And I do not believe anybody is—certainly I am not—saying that this last election was not in substantial compliance.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, so you believe that this election was in substantial compliance?

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, yes.

Ms. WATERS. That the agreement that operated and oversaw this election was fine?

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I will not say it was fine. I will say it was sub-

stantial compliance for the purposes of this amendment.

Ms. WATERS. And you are not asking for a higher standard than that?

Mr. GOSS. I am not asking for a higher standard.

Ms. WATERS. If they reach it, that is fine?

Mr. GOSS. I am not asking for a higher standard than substantial compliance.

Ms. WATERS. Let the record reflect, if I may, that this amendment is not asking for a higher standard than that standard which oversaw this election in Haiti, that the gentleman is not asking that they are in some absolute or letter perfect compliance with the 1987 Constitution, but, rather, what just took place is all right. That is what the gentleman just said.

□ 2000

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I hope we are going to do better.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Meek amendment. The Meek language is a tremendous improvement over the badly crafted Goss language. The parliamentary elections that just took place in Haiti are a real accomplishment for the people of Haiti as they build a stable democracy. The Washington Post said that Haiti's elections, "by any reasonable standard, were a success." The Washington Post acknowledges that Representative GOSS observed the elections not as an impartial observer, but as a partisan participant of the Republican Party's International Republican Institute. This group's criticism of the elections, according to the Washington Post, was not constructive and was misinformed. I, personally, was informed by Bishop Cummings who is bishop for Florida and the Bahamas for the African-Methodist Episcopal Church, that the Republican Party's International Republican Institute participants were rude and threatening to him as he tried to explain that he was an impartial observer and not from the Federal Government. Bishop Cummings was outraged by the comments made about him, but refused to be intimidated.

This should be one of America's proudest moments—our country did the right thing, we did not shirk our responsibilities to strengthen democracy as some would have had us do. We should be proud that we reached out to our close neighbor in their time of need to help them fulfill the promise of democracy and hope.

I congratulate President Clinton and the brave young men and women of our armed services who have worked hard to create the safe and secure environment necessary for real democracy to take root in Haiti so that these elections could take place.

I congratulate President Aristide for having the wisdom to lead his people into this era of healing, hope and redevelopment. He put together a government of inclusion and continues to reach out to other groups including the business sector and the political opposition—including giving air time to opposition candidates.

These elections faced challenges, especially many logistical challenges, but they occurred without bloodshed. Improvements will be made, especially in the area of civil justice and

stronger democratic institutions. The international community must honor its commitments and ensure that donor nations' assistance reinforces Haitian electoral institutions in a nonpartisan manner. The elections this past weekend were a testament to the Haitian people's strong desire for a new beginning in Haiti. They were a testament of the international community's commitment, and Americans, especially those of us in Florida who are so close to Haiti, to support democracy for our neighbors.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of things that have been said today, but there are still a lot of questions existing. No. 1, there is no one in this Congress, all 435 of them, that know doodley-squat about the Haitian Constitution. They know absolutely nothing about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. BROWN] has expired.

(On request of Mr. BONIOR and by unanimous consent, Ms. BROWN of Florida was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman I would like to ask a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. I have a Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman, I am trying to get recognized so I can move to strike the last work on the underlying amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. BROWN] requested 2 additional minutes. The time is hers now. That was granted without objection. She has now yielded to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK] in the well, so the chair would say to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK] the time is hers as long as the gentlewoman yields to her.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. I have a further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will state her inquiry.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, after I have expended the 2 minutes that she gives me, may I request 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman may, under that circumstance.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. With unanimous consent, I can?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will tell the gentlewoman, after the 2 minutes, yes.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, first of all, no one here knows doodley-squat about the Haitian Con-

stitution. I have it in my hand. None of the Members know what it says. However, Members are in here doing a lot of rhetorical meandering around, saying that they know this and they know the other. My good friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] if he has his way. Aristide would be on some far distant island from where he is now, trying to govern Haiti.

Mr. Chairman, I want to know, what does substantial compliance mean? If there is a hurricane on election day in Haiti, what do you do? Does that fit the standard of substantial compliance?

Who decides what it means? It is my brother, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] who decides what it means?

These are rhetorical questions.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. I will not yield Mr. Chairman, because I am asking the gentleman rhetorical questions. I do not expect an answer.

All of this is a disincentive for a democracy, a budding democracy. All day long all of you have been wrapping yourselves in the flag, and I am beginning to think you do not know doodley-squat about democracy. Democracy means that you want to see other countries see the American dream and realize what it means to have fair and free elections. I want to appeal, like my sister MAXINE did, to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. BROWN] has again expired.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FOGLIETTA. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. I believe I heard the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK] say that she moved to strike the requisite number of words on the underlying amendment. She has spoken on her own amendment. Now she has asked for 5 minutes on the underlying amendment. I think she is entitled to that 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct, and the chair would recognize the gentlewoman for 5 minutes to strike the last word on the Goss amendment.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], to realize that we all live on a peninsula called Florida. We are all being impacted by all the things the gentleman has said. I take umbrage to the fact that the gentleman has singled out Haiti and used a standard just for Haiti.

I have never heard on the floor that any funds were limited because of an election in any country since I have been here. I want to hear more of that from those of the Members who are not flaming liberals. I want to hear them

speaking out for democracy. I want to hear them say that a small country like Haiti, regardless of what happens during the election, as long as it is free, and as long as it is fair, and that they do not have people poking guns in their ribs, that that is the time for a free election.

When the Goss amendment says "None of the funds appropriated in this act may be made available to the Government of Haiti when it is made known to the President that such Government is controlled by a regime holding power through means other than the democratic elections scheduled for calendar year 1995 and held in substantial compliance with requirements of the Constitution," I repeat again to the gentleman, what does the gentleman mean by "substantial," rhetorical statement, "compliance?" What does the gentleman mean by saying that the people in Haiti are not ready? That is the inference the gentleman is making, that they are not ready for a free election.

I say to the gentleman that they are. They fought for their freedom years ago, before any of us got free, before any of us came over here on the slave ships, they fought for freedom. What the gentleman is saying about Haiti upsets me. The gentleman is wrong.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentlewoman, is that a rhetorical question?

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I am asking the gentleman only rhetorical questions, and I am trying to keep my intellectual composure as I speak to the gentleman. It is very difficult, because I have seen the gentleman go on a path since we got here of intimidation of this small republic. I have seen it.

I ask the gentleman, forget about any kind of predisposing conditions he may have that causes him to want to attack this small nation. I speak to the Congress, not to the gentleman, but to the entire Congress. I do not believe you have one, you do not have one majority in this Congress who would want any small nation to have democracy threatened by saying to them we are going to hold back your funds if you do not do this election the way we want you to do it. You cannot do it.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentlewoman may be alluding to some things. As I reminisce over the last year or so, when we have had legislation pertaining to Haiti, I remember other amendments that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] had offered at previous times that appeared to me that he did not want democracy in Haiti; that when the junta was in control in Haiti, that there was language introduced by the gentleman from Florida that would have required that no U.S. troops ever go to Haiti, and we would still have the junta in

Haiti, and there would be no democracy in Haiti; that the one amendment even said that the people who were fleeing Haiti to get away from the killers, the murderers that were there, that they should not come to the United States, they should not go to Guantanamo, they should not go on board ships, they should go to a little island off in the Caribbean, away from Haiti. That is where we should take them.

These are amendments that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] has introduced previously. I also understand from the gentleman's own statements during this debate, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman has been active to some extent in Haiti endeavors for the last 20, 30 years. That means that the gentleman was present and knew something about Haiti back when we had the juntas, back when we had the killers, so, Mr. Chairman, that makes me suspicious of what is being offered here today, because we do have a fledgling democracy.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to close by saying one thing. I was one of those who did say, and many of us did, and I think a majority of this House did, before the troops, before the agreement was reached with President Carter, before the troops went to Haiti, we all said no, we should do something.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, before it expires, I would like to ask this House to vote for democracy, vote for justice. Do not worry about what party the gentleman from Florida, PORTER GOSS, is in, vote for democracy and vote for freedom.

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

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding to me.

It seems a lot of folks from Florida are interested in this, Mr. Chairman, and indeed, we are. We represent Haitians who are Haitian Americans. We represent Americans who are not Haitian Americans.

I thank the gentleman for yielding, because there are a couple of points I feel I have to add to here, some things made that are getting a little bit on the edge of being ad hominem attacks.

I am truly sorry for the distress of my colleague and friend, the gentleman from south Florida. We share the same goals. It is just a question that we are not sure we do. We do share the same goals. Mr. Chairman, in previous resolutions and pieces of business before this floor, I have taken a very, very strong position about not wanting to send our armed troops to make war on Haiti. I consider it a friendly neighboring country, and have said that almost every time I have referred to it. I do not believe in making war on friendly neighbors.

As I have said before, I applauded very loudly, I applauded President Clinton for the negotiated settlement after President Carter, former President Carter, General Powell, went down there.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the embargo, I opposed the embargo because I felt it would bring suffering to the people of Haiti, innocent victims. It did. It did. There is no question about it. This tiny island in some far remote part of the Caribbean that the distinguished gentleman referred to, I do not remember who made the statement, apparently has not got much of an understanding of where Haiti is or what it looks like.

This tiny island is a rather large island. It is in the central mass of sovereign Haiti, it is Haitian soil, it is bigger, bigger than Manhattan, and it has thousands of Haitian citizens living on it, and they voted on Sunday.

To say that we were trying to create a problem in some tiny remote non-Haitian territory, I have only said the way to solve the problem in Haiti is by Haitians on Haitian soil with U.S. aid, appropriately expended and properly justified. That is what this is about.

Mr. Chairman, this is the foreign appropriations bill we are talking about. We are talking about are we using American taxpayers dollars wisely. I think we are. We are trying to do the right thing. I am asking that we always keep asking ourselves that question, because Haiti has had a difficult history, as we all know.

It is not more than that. It is not complicated. There is nothing sinister, there is nothing Machiavellian, there are no tricks. We have had this out in the open in this wonderful democracy. I do not know what more I could say.

I think perhaps more is being read into this amendment than is there.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman said two or three times that America did not want to make war on Haiti. I want him to know that the American people did a rescue. They saved the Haitian people. We are very grateful, the people in Florida.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the Goss amendment is needed. I do not think the Meek amendment to the amendment is needed. I spoke to my colleague, and I asked him, I said to him, we do not need either one of these amendments. I do not need to tell the Members what his answer was to me, because it is not relevant to what we are talking about here.

However, I am willing, given the permission of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], if he withdraws his amendment, I will be more than happy to

withdraw my objection to his amendment, my amendment to the amendment, because neither one of them does anything.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I will answer that very briefly. As I said before, the reason to this amendment is on my responsibility, our first responsibility on the foreign aid bill to provide proper oversight that the funds are spent in the proper priority areas with the proper governance and oversight and accountability back to the American taxpayers.

Haiti we have put an awful lot of money in, pretty near \$2 billion. It has come in different places and forms. That is a ton of money. I think we owe an accountability to the American people, and a statement to them that we are checking. I will not withdraw my amendment, but there is nothing more sinister to my amendment than what I have said.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BONIOR

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his motion.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BONIOR moves that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count for a quorum. Does the gentleman from Michigan withdraw his point of order?

Mr. BONIOR. No, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the pending question following the quorum call. Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following members responded to their names:

| [Roll No. 434] | | |
|----------------|--------------|-----------|
| Abercrombie | Ballenger | Beilenson |
| Ackerman | Barcia | Bentsen |
| Allard | Barr | Bereuter |
| Andrews | Barrett (NE) | Berman |
| Armey | Barrett (WI) | Bevill |
| Bachus | Bartlett | Bilbray |
| Baesler | Barton | Bilirakis |
| Baker (CA) | Bass | Bishop |
| Baker (LA) | Bateman | Billey |
| Baldacci | Becerra | Blute |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Boehlert | Ford | Lofgren | Salmon | Spratt | Visclosky | Pelosi | Schroeder | Towns |
| Boehner | Fox | Longley | Sanders | Stearns | Volkmer | Peterson (FL) | Schumer | Trafficant |
| Bonilla | Franks (CT) | Lowey | Sanford | Stenholm | Vucanovich | Peterson (MN) | Scott | Tucker |
| Bonior | Franks (NJ) | Lucas | Sawyer | Stockman | Waldholtz | Pickett | Serrano | Velazquez |
| Bono | Frelinghuysen | Luther | Saxton | Studds | Walker | Pomeroy | Sisisky | Vento |
| Borski | Frisa | Maloney | Scarborough | Stump | Walsh | Poshard | Skaggs | Visclosky |
| Boucher | Frost | Manton | Schaefer | Stupak | Wamp | Rahall | Skelton | Volkmer |
| Brewster | Funderburk | Manzullo | Schiff | Talent | Ward | Rangel | Slaughter | Ward |
| Browder | Furse | Markey | Schroeder | Tanner | Waters | Reed | Spratt | Waters |
| Brown (CA) | Gallely | Martinez | Schumer | Tate | Watts (OK) | Richardson | Stenholm | Watt (NC) |
| Brown (FL) | Ganske | Martini | Scott | Tauzin | Waxman | Rivers | Studds | Waxman |
| Brown (OH) | Gejdenson | Mascara | Seastrand | Taylor (MS) | Weldon (FL) | Roemer | Stupak | Williams |
| Brownback | Gephardt | Matsui | Sensenbrenner | Taylor (NC) | Weldon (PA) | Rose | Tejeda | Wilson |
| Bryant (TN) | Geren | McCarthy | Serrano | Tejeda | Weller | Roybal-Allard | Thompson | Wise |
| Bryant (TX) | Gibbons | McCollum | Shadegg | Thomas | White | Rush | Thornton | Woolsey |
| Bunn | Gilchrest | McCrery | Shaw | Thompson | Whitfield | Sabo | Thurman | Wyden |
| Bunning | Gillmor | McDade | Shays | Thornberry | Wicker | Sanders | Torres | Wynn |
| Burr | Gilman | McDermott | Shuster | Thurman | Williams | Sawyer | Torricelli | |
| Burton | Gonzalez | McHale | Sisisky | Tiahrt | Wilson | | | |
| Buyer | Goodlatte | McHugh | Skaggs | Torkildsen | Wise | | | |
| Callahan | Gordon | McInnis | Skeen | Torricelli | Wolf | Allard | Frise | Myrick |
| Calvert | Goss | McIntosh | Skelton | Towns | Woolsey | Archer | Funderburk | Nethercutt |
| Camp | Graham | McKeon | Slaughter | Traficant | Wyden | Armey | Gallely | Neumann |
| Canady | Green | McKinney | Smith (MI) | Tucker | Wynn | Bachus | Ganske | Ney |
| Cardin | Greenwood | Meehan | Smith (NJ) | Upton | Yates | Baker (CA) | Gekas | Norwood |
| Castle | Gutierrez | Meek | Smith (TX) | Velazquez | Young (FL) | Baker (LA) | Gilchrest | Nussle |
| Chabot | Gutknecht | Menendez | Smith (WA) | Vento | Zeliff | Ballenger | Gillmor | Oxley |
| Chambliss | Hall (OH) | Metcalf | Solomon | | Zimmer | Barr | Gilman | Packard |
| Chapman | Hall (TX) | Meyers | Souder | | | Barrett (NE) | Goodlatte | Parker |
| Chenoweth | Hamilton | Mfume | | | | Bartlett | Goss | Paxon |
| Christensen | Hancock | Mica | | | | Barton | Graham | Petri |
| Chryslers | Hansen | Miller (CA) | | | | Bass | Greenwood | Pombo |
| Clay | Hastert | Miller (FL) | | | | Bateman | Gutknecht | Porter |
| Clayton | Hastings (FL) | Mineta | | | | Bereuter | Hall (TX) | Portman |
| Clement | Hastings (WA) | Minge | | | | Bilbray | Hancock | Pryce |
| Clinger | Hayes | Mink | | | | Bilirakis | Hansen | Quillen |
| Coble | Hayworth | Molinari | | | | Bliley | Hastert | Quinn |
| Coburn | Hefley | Mollohan | | | | Blute | Hastings (WA) | Radanovich |
| Coleman | Hefner | Montgomery | | | | Boehlert | Hayworth | Ramstad |
| Collins (GA) | Heineman | Moorhead | | | | Boehner | Hefley | Regula |
| Collins (IL) | Herger | Moran | | | | Bonilla | Heineman | Riggs |
| Collins (MI) | Hilleary | Morella | | | | Bono | Heger | Roberts |
| Combest | Hilliard | Murtha | | | | Brownback | Hilleary | Rogers |
| Condit | Hinchev | Myers | | | | Bryant (TN) | Hobson | Rohrabacher |
| Conyers | Hobson | Myrick | | | | Bunn | Hoekstra | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Cooley | Hoekstra | Nadler | | | | Bunning | Hoke | Roth |
| Costello | Hoke | Neal | | | | Burr | Horn | Roukema |
| Coyne | Holden | Nethercutt | | | | Burton | Hostettler | Royce |
| Cramer | Horn | Neumann | | | | Buyer | Houghton | Sanford |
| Crane | Hostettler | Ney | | | | Callahan | Hunter | Saxton |
| Crapo | Houghton | Norwood | | | | Calvert | Hutchinson | Scarborough |
| Cremeans | Hoyer | Nussle | | | | Camp | Hyde | Schaefer |
| Cubin | Hunter | Oberstar | | | | Canady | Inglis | Schiff |
| Cunningham | Hutchinson | Obey | | | | Castle | Istook | Seastrand |
| Danner | Hyde | Olver | Abercrombie | Dooley | Klecza | Chabot | Jacobs | Sensenbrenner |
| Davis | Inglis | Ortiz | Ackerman | Doyle | Klink | Chambliss | Johnson (CT) | Shadegg |
| de la Garza | Jackson-Lee | Orton | Andrews | Edwards | LaFalce | Chenoweth | Johnson, Sam | Shaw |
| Deal | Jacobs | Owens | Baessler | Engel | Lantos | Christensen | Jones | Shays |
| DeFazio | Jefferson | Oxley | Baldacci | Eshoo | Levin | Chryslers | Kasich | Shuster |
| DeLauro | Johnson (CT) | Packard | Barcia | Evans | Lewis (GA) | Clinger | Kelly | Skeen |
| DeLay | Johnson (SD) | Pallone | Barrett (WI) | Farr | Lincoln | Coble | Kim | Smith (MI) |
| Dellums | Johnson, E. B. | Parker | Becerra | Fattah | Lipinski | Coburn | King | Smith (NJ) |
| Deutsch | Johnson, Sam | Pastor | Beilenson | Fazio | Lofgren | Collins (GA) | Kingston | Smith (TX) |
| Diaz-Balart | Johnston | Paxon | Bentsen | Fields (LA) | Lowey | Combest | Klug | Smith (WA) |
| Dickey | Jones | Payne (NJ) | Berman | Filner | Luther | Cooley | Knollenberg | Solomon |
| Dicks | Kanjorski | Payne (VA) | Beverly | Flake | Maloney | Cox | Kolbe | Souder |
| Dingell | Kaptur | Pelosi | Bishop | Foglietta | Manton | Crane | LaHood | Spence |
| Dixon | Kasich | Peterson (FL) | Bonior | Ford | Markey | Crapo | Latham | Stearns |
| Doggett | Kelly | Peterson (MN) | Borski | Frank (MA) | Martinez | Cubin | LaTourette | Stockman |
| Dooley | Kennedy (MA) | Petri | Boucher | Frost | Mascara | Cunningham | Laughlin | Stump |
| Doolittle | Kennedy (RI) | Pickett | Brewster | Furse | Matsui | Davis | Lazio | Talent |
| Dornan | Kennelly | Pombo | Browder | Gejdenson | McCarthy | Deal | Leach | Tanner |
| Doyle | Kildee | Pomeroy | Brown (CA) | Gephardt | McDermott | DeLay | Lewis (CA) | Tate |
| Dreier | Kim | Porter | Brown (FL) | Geren | McHale | Diaz-Balart | Lewis (KY) | Tauzin |
| Duncan | King | Portman | Brown (OH) | Gibbons | McKinney | Dickey | Lightfoot | Taylor (MS) |
| Dunn | Kingston | Poshard | Bryant (TX) | Gonzalez | Meehan | Doolittle | Linder | Taylor (NC) |
| Edwards | Klecza | Pryce | Cardin | Gordon | Menendez | Dornan | Livingston | Thomas |
| Ehlers | Klink | Quillen | Chapman | Green | Mfume | Dreier | LoBiondo | Thornberry |
| Ehrlich | Klug | Quinn | Clay | Gutierrez | Miller (CA) | Duncan | Longley | Tiahrt |
| Emerson | Knollenberg | Radanovich | Clement | Hall (OH) | Mineta | Dunn | Lucas | Torkildsen |
| Engel | Kolbe | Rahall | Coleman | Hamilton | Minge | Ehlers | Manzullo | Upton |
| English | LaFalce | Ramstad | Coleman | Hastings (FL) | Mink | Ehrlich | Martini | Vucanovich |
| Ensign | LaHood | Rangel | Coleman | Hayes | Mollohan | Emerson | McCollum | Waldholtz |
| Eshoo | Lantos | Reed | Collins (IL) | Hefner | Montgomery | English | McCrery | Walker |
| Evans | Latham | Regula | Collins (MI) | Hilliard | Moran | Ensign | McDade | Walsh |
| Everett | LaTourette | Richardson | Condit | Hinchev | Murtha | Everett | McHugh | Wamp |
| Ewing | Laughlin | Riggs | Coyne | Holden | Nadler | Ewing | McInnis | Watts (OK) |
| Farr | Lazio | Rivers | Cramer | Hoyer | Neal | Fawell | McIntosh | Weldon (FL) |
| Fattah | Leach | Roberts | de la Garza | Johnson (SD) | Oberstar | Fields (TX) | McKeon | Weldon (PA) |
| Fawell | Levin | Roemer | DeFazio | Johnson, E. B. | Obey | Flanagan | Metcalf | Weller |
| Fazio | Lewis (CA) | Rogers | DeLauro | Johnston | Olver | Foley | Meyers | White |
| Fields (LA) | Lewis (GA) | Rohrabacher | Dellums | Kanjorski | Ortiz | Forbes | Miller (FL) | Whitfield |
| Fields (TX) | Lewis (KY) | Ros-Lehtinen | Deutsch | Kaput | Owens | Fowler | Molinari | Wicker |
| Filner | Lightfoot | Rose | Dicks | Kennedy (MA) | Pallone | Fox | Moorhead | Wolf |
| Flake | Lincoln | Roukema | Doggett | Kennedy (RI) | Pastor | Franks (CT) | Morella | Young (FL) |
| Flanagan | Linder | Roybal-Allard | | Kildee | Payne (NJ) | Franks (NJ) | Myers | Zeliff |
| Foglietta | Lipinski | Royce | | | Payne (VA) | Frelinghuysen | | Zimmer |
| Foley | Livingston | Rush | | | | | | |
| Forbes | LoBiondo | Sabo | | | | | | |

□ 2032

The CHAIRMAN. Four hundred thirteen Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present and the Committee will resume its business.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 231, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 435]

AYES—188

| | | |
|--------------|----------------|-------------|
| Abercrombie | Dooley | Klecza |
| Ackerman | Doyle | Klink |
| Andrews | Edwards | LaFalce |
| Baessler | Engel | Lantos |
| Baldacci | Eshoo | Levin |
| Barcia | Evans | Lewis (GA) |
| Barrett (WI) | Farr | Lincoln |
| Becerra | Fattah | Lipinski |
| Beilenson | Fazio | Lofgren |
| Bentsen | Fields (LA) | Lowey |
| Berman | Filner | Luther |
| Beverly | Flake | Maloney |
| Bishop | Foglietta | Manton |
| Bonior | Ford | Markey |
| Borski | Frank (MA) | Martinez |
| Boucher | Frost | Mascara |
| Brewster | Furse | Matsui |
| Browder | Gejdenson | McCarthy |
| Brown (CA) | Gephardt | McDermott |
| Brown (FL) | Geren | McHale |
| Brown (OH) | Gibbons | McKinney |
| Bryant (TX) | Gonzalez | Meehan |
| Cardin | Gordon | Meek |
| Chapman | Green | Menendez |
| Clay | Gutierrez | Mfume |
| Clayton | Hall (OH) | Miller (CA) |
| Clement | Hamilton | Mineta |
| Coleman | Hastings (FL) | Minge |
| Coleman | Hayes | Mink |
| Collins (IL) | Hefner | Mollohan |
| Collins (MI) | Hilliard | Montgomery |
| Condit | Hinchev | Moran |
| Conyers | Holden | Murtha |
| Costello | Hoyer | Nadler |
| Coyne | Cramer | Neal |
| Cramer | Danner | Oberstar |
| de la Garza | Johnson (SD) | Obey |
| DeFazio | Johnson, E. B. | Olver |
| DeLauro | Johnston | Ortiz |
| Dellums | Kanjorski | Orton |
| Deutsch | Kaput | Owens |
| Dicks | Kennedy (MA) | Pallone |
| Dingell | Kennedy (RI) | Pastor |
| Dixon | Kennelly | Payne (NJ) |
| Doggett | Kildee | Payne (VA) |

NOT VOTING—15

| | | |
|-----------|----------|------------|
| Clyburn | Harman | Salmon |
| Cremeans | Largent | Stark |
| Durbin | McNulty | Stokes |
| Goodling | Moakley | Yates |
| Gunderson | Reynolds | Young (AK) |

□ 2041

So the preferential motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague, the distinguished majority leader, Mr. ARMEY.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, we have very carefully worked out a work schedule for this week; work that we believe is important to the people of this country.

We knew when we planned the week that we had ample opportunity to complete that work, including finishing this bill between 10 o'clock and 11 o'clock this evening, assuming everything would go within the context of normal legislative process.

Mr. Chairman, let me begin by making the point, in order to maintain the work schedule we have for this week, we will not adjourn this evening until we complete this bill.

□ 2045

Mr. Chairman, I will encourage the floor managers of this bill to use whatever options are available to them within the context of a unanimous-consent request in conjunction with that cooperative effort between themselves and those offering amendments to expedite every amendment under consideration during the remainder of this time under consideration.

Following the completion of this bill, Mr. Chairman, we will complete a budget conference report, a rescission and supplemental assistance report, a Medicare select conference report, and an additional appropriations bill, the energy and water appropriations bill.

It is my intention, Mr. Chairman, for us to complete this work, and it is perfectly within the realm of reasonable work hours for us to complete this work, and to be out of here and on our planes home by 3 o'clock on Friday.

I am so committed to our making our 3 o'clock departure on Friday that I am prepared to remain here all through tonight, all through tomorrow, all through tomorrow night, until 3 o'clock on Friday, and should we not have completed the work that I have enumerated at 3 o'clock on Friday, I am prepared for us to remain in session until that is done.

Mr. Chairman, in the interests of moving this along, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Reclaiming the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman, I just want to address the House seriously just for 1 minute.

As my colleagues know, I think that this foreign operations bill is something that we in a bipartisan manner

are working toward in conjunction with and in cooperation with the administration. I think that President Clinton and Secretary Christopher are going to need some foreign operation moneys next year, and I recognize that the leaderships may have some differences of opinion about some other activities that do not relate to this bill in any way. But I would like very much for the leadership on this side to continue to dispute some things with the leadership on our side, but to let us continue to address this bill in a respectable manner tonight. Let us receive, in an open rule, which all of my colleagues wanted, let us receive these amendments, debate them tonight in a responsible, limited time, and get on with this bill tonight. Tomorrow we can go back to all the shenanigans. We can have all of the motions to rise, we can have all of the motions to adjourn, but let us get this out of the way for the sake of the leadership of this administration so they can have a foreign operations bill next year.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would say to my distinguished friend from Texas, the majority leader, that we are prepared to make the coffee and provide the No-Doz tablets for him this evening, and tomorrow evening, and the evening after that, and let us be clear that it is not this side of the aisle that is delaying the proceedings with respect to this bill.

I say to my colleagues, If you would have done your bill correctly in committee, we wouldn't have 90 percent of the amendments being offered on the floor to this bill being Republican amendments.

But let me further clarify for my friends on the other side of the aisle what the issue is here. The issue is that we want, will demand, our fair representations on the committees that govern this institution.

Now, if the majority thinks that they are going to get away with putting an extra member on the Committee on Ways and Means, and skewing the ratios even further, and denying us our ability to fight for senior citizens against these Medicare cuts, they are wrong.

This issue is about our ability to speak on that committee, defend seniors, and fight these egregious tax cuts for the wealthiest people in our society, make no mistake about it, and we will stay here until we get justice, and fair representations and ratios in that committee.

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

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, we have before us a substitute amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK] that will not harm the democracy movement in Haiti. We also have the underlying amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] that would probably undermine that movement of democracy in Haiti.

Now I was one of those like the majority that was here back a year ago when we said, no, we should not send troops into Haiti.

We should not be doing that. But the American public did not support it, and our President went ahead and did it anyway, and guess what, my colleague? HAROLD VOLKMER, the gentleman from Florida, and others who were in opposition to that, we are wrong. The President so far has been right, and I say, "so far."

And what I see happening in this small area in the Caribbean is a movement of democracy that is taking place. I am willing to admit I was wrong, I am willing to say, "Let's help it now that it is ongoing," but I am afraid that the amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] could possibly put a stranglehold on that democracy movement in that small Caribbean nation, that very poor Caribbean nation.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLKMER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, it appears to me when there is a certain interim here some of my colleagues go out and get a little drink of water, and they do not make any sense when they come back. I say to my colleagues, Now you're back in this House now. You have got to recognize that this is a syndrome that goes on in some of these bodies. You go out and get a little drink of water, and then you come back in here and—and all of that. Well, there is no time for that.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very serious matter. I am asking my colleagues to please vote for the Meek amendment.

Mr. Chairman, all I ask this House to do is forget about party, forget about any affiliation, but think about the fact that the Meek amendment softens a Goss amendment, what the Goss amendment did. It had an inference in it that the elections in Haiti were not fairly conducted, so he put an amendment together which said that there will be a limitation on the funds if the elections were not held and were not in substantial compliance, whatever that means.

Now I have had some, some experience, with the nomenclature, but that is a part of the nomenclature no one understands. I do not know whether the Member understands it himself, substantial compliance with the Haiti constitution.

I am asking my colleagues, When you vote tonight, vote for the Meek amendment because the Goss amendment isn't needed. Neither is the Meek amendment. The reason why I have to amend his, it was so wrong morally that I had to do something to soften it because the Goss amendment inferred that because the elections were a little bit—has a few problems, we should put some limitations.

Mr. Chairman, we should not put limitations on any other country. We have

not put any limitations on funds of any other country because of the elections.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS]?

Mr. VOLKMER. If I have any time remaining.

Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS].

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding this time to me.

We have a notorious tendency of not wanting to listen to certain people. I demand that the House be made in order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, 9 years ago outside Lake Worth, FL, I walked over the bodies of Haitians who had washed up on the shore. One of them was a pregnant, nude woman, and that has stayed with me all of my life.

All this little nation is asking of us is a little opportunity to restore democracy. That is all they are asking, and here we come with a superimposed notion, dictating our form of democracy within the framework of a year. It is absurd that we find ourselves in this position where democracy has to be according to our dictates in order for us to do business with even the most feeble of us.

Mr. Chairman, we have had a habit in this body of addressing on the domestic front the most vulnerable among us, and now we move to the international front and continue that pattern. I say to my colleagues, "Shame on you."

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

Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues know, it is astounding to watch us trying to micromanage, a word I heard from my Republican colleagues for years, a policy that has been successful beyond anybody's imagination. When the President of the United States singlehandedly decided to bring down the generals because there was not a lot of

support on our side of the aisle or the Republican side of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans were fearful of American casualties, as rightly we were.

I think the President understood with his national responsibility that both for the United States, and particularly the State of Florida—that was dealing with refugees and crises on a regular basis on their social service network, the kind of scenes that my colleague from Florida just referenced in watching what had happened on that small island time and time again where the hope of the people of Haiti was dashed—that he understood how important it was for our hemisphere, for the United States, and for Haiti.

The President's policy not only succeeded; it succeeded more than any of us dared dream. As that policy succeeded to remove the generals, to restore the rightfully elected president, the naysayers immediately began that there would be no election in Haiti. The president, freely elected, did not believe in democratic institutions.

NOTICE

Incomplete record of House proceedings. Except for concluding business which follows, today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1112. A letter from the Director, Standards of Conduct Office, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of individuals who filed DD Form 1787, Report of DOD and Defense Related Employment for fiscal year 1994, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2397(e); to the Committee on National Security.

1113. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, to provide for alternative means of acquiring and improving housing and supporting facilities for unaccompanied members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on National Security.

1114. A letter from the Vice-Chair, Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, transmitting a request to the U.S. House of Representatives to appoint an individual to the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

1115. A letter from the Administrator, Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting the Administration's report entitled, "Profiles of Foreign Direct Investment in U.S. Energy 1993," pursuant to section 657(8) of the Department of Energy Organization Act; to the Committee on Commerce.

1116. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Double Jeopardy: Persons with Mental Illnesses in the Criminal Justice System," pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 290bb-31; to the Committee on Commerce.

1117. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a Memorandum of Justification

for Presidential Determination regarding the drawdown of defense articles and services for the Rapid Reaction Force [RRF], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2348a; to the Committee on International Relations.

1118. A letter from the Chief of Staff, International Affairs, Federal Election Institute, transmitting a communication regarding the Second Trilateral Conference on Electoral Systems (volume I, II, including the executive report, index and program) by the Canadian, American, and Mexican delegations held May 10 through May 12, 1995, in Ottawa, Canada; to the Committee on International Relations.

1119. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general for the period October 1, 1994, through March 31, 1995, and management report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1120. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1994, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1121. A letter from the President, Federal Financing Bank, transmitting the management report of the Federal Financing Bank for fiscal year 1994, including audited financial statements and the independent auditor's report on the statements, pursuant to Public Law 101-576, section 306(a) (104 Stat. 2854); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1122. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Department's inspector general for the period October 1, 1994, through March 31, 1995, and the management report for the same period, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp.

Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1123. A letter from the Counsel, National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, transmitting the 1994 annual report of independent auditors who have audited the records of the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, pursuant to Public Law 88-376, section 14(b) (78 Stat. 323); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1124. A letter from the Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1125. A letter from the General Counsel, National Tropical Botanical Garden, transmitting the annual audit report of the National Tropical Botanical Garden, calendar year 1994, pursuant to Public Law 88-449, section 10(b) (78 Stat. 498); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1126. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend provisions of the Bankruptcy Code governing the powers of a bankruptcy court and the effect of automatic stays as they relate to certain multifamily liens insured or held by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development or the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (for himself, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. MAS-CARA, and Mr. EVANS):