



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1995

No. 198—Part II

House of Representatives

DISPOSING OF SENATE AMENDMENT 115 TO H.R. 1868, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

(Continued)

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 296, I call up from the Speaker's table 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 the Senate amendment numbered 115 thereto, and to consider the motion printed in section 2 of the resolution.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment 115:

Page 44, line 19, after "lizations" insert: "Provided, That in determining eligibility for assistance from funds appropriated to carry out section 104 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, nongovernmental and multilateral organizations shall not be subjected to requirements more restrictive than the requirements applicable to foreign governments for such assistance: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this Act may be used to lobby for or against abortion".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CALLAHAN

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. CALLAHAN moves that the House recede from its amendment to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

"Authorization of Population Planning

"Sec. 518A. Section 526 of this Act shall not apply to funds made available in this Act for population planning activities or other popu-

lation assistance pursuant to section 104(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act or any other provision of law, or to funds made available in title IV of this Act as a contribution to the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 296, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and a Member opposed, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

□ 1115

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the disposition of Senate amendment number 115, and that I be permitted to include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take any more time on this matter than what is necessary. We have already had this matter, population assistance and abortion, before the House four times previously this year. I want to be sure, however, that all Members understand what the motion does and does not do.

The motion provided for by the rule does not cut population funding. It freezes obligations under the fiscal 1996 bill for population funding until it has been authorized or a further waiver of the statutory authorization requirement has been enacted. It does not halt the hundreds of millions of dollars of population funding from prior year bills that has not yet been spent.

This motion does not ask the Senate to agree to enact a funding cutoff for foreign private groups that decline to comply with the Mexico City policy restrictions. The Senate does not have the votes to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I want the Members to be aware of another proposal that I offered to the Senate managers of the foreign assistance bill several weeks ago.

Mr. Speaker, as the Members may be aware, we have had various differences with the Senate on this proposition. As a matter of fact, the original bill that was sent to the Senate came back with 193 amendments. We were able to resolve 192 of the differences between the House and Senate. The only one that could not be resolved is the issue on abortion. We have tried, and tried with frustration, to look at a possible way to pass the foreign operations bill for 1996, to satisfy those that are concerned about abortion worldwide, that are concerned about planned parenthood, to no avail. We simply have been unable to get the votes in the Senate to make this reality come true for the 1996 foreign operations bill.

We are in a situation now that we will send another bill to the Senate and ask that they, with their great wisdom, find a way to pass something that can pass through the Senate and that also can be acceptable to the House. I, for example, have offered what I think was a reasonable compromise to the pro-life forces in the House, and that was to cut the funding capability of any organization to 50 percent of its 1995 level until they sign the Mexico City policy language. In my opinion, that is a fair resolve in this House of compromise.

If we do not get something to the Senate and get something from the Senate that we can concur on, that will satisfy us, we are not going to have a 1996 appropriation bill for foreign operations.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H14787

Instead, we are going to be dealing in a continuing resolution, a CR that more than likely will not include any protection for those of us that are concerned about abortion worldwide. A CR may not protect anything that has to do with child survival. We could lose many things, including the prohibition of USAID from moving into a Taj Mahal downtown and paying each month hundreds of thousands of dollars in unnecessary rent. A CR will not reduce funding to USAID. It will not cut the funding that we were successful in passing through this House, unless we get something realistic that both sides can work with.

In a sense, Mr. Speaker, I chastise those Members of Congress who are so hell-bent and determined to have their way that they are interfering, in my opinion, with the due process and with the compromise that this body must occasionally represent.

Mr. Speaker, this measure is another vehicle going back to the Senate. We do not expect the Senate to accept it. I would not think that the President would sign the bill if they Senate passed it, so it is futile, in a sense, to think that we are going to enact this legislation with this language in here, but it is the only opportunity we have to send this train back to the Senate and ask them to look at it and to take into account those of us who are concerned about abortion being funded or encouraged by any American moneys.

I want Members to be aware of another proposal that I offered to the Senate managers of the foreign assistance bill several weeks ago. I suggested that they accept what I call an incentive program for private groups to accept the Mexico City policy language.

Under my proposal, which is not in this rule, all groups which now receive A.I.D. population money could continue to receive up to 50 percent of current funding. However, there would be no funding limits on foreign private groups which agreed to comply with Mexico City principles. That would be the incentive for many is not most population assistance providers to sign on to the Mexico City principles again, as the did prior to 1993.

I recognize that the gentleman from New Jersey opposes the approach that I just described. Yet another pro-life Members of this body and the Senate continue to express interest in it. I just wanted the House to know that many of us have been working on a compromise that will enable us to send this appropriations bill to the President for his signature.

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

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, again we are here because the committee has still not finished its work. We are here because there are still six appropriation bills which have not yet crossed the finish line and become law. The foreign operations bill which we are discussing today is one of those bills. We are going to be in a big fight over whether or not we should pass the CR come Friday, a continuing resolution to prevent

the Government from closing down. And we are going to be in that fight because we have not yet finished our appropriations work. I would think that under those circumstances what we would be looking for is ways to find compromise between the House and Senate so we can move more of these bills forward.

That is what I very much want to do on this bill, but this language, as the gentleman who just spoke clearly indicated, this language has no chance whatsoever of being accepted by the Senate or becoming law. So my question is, why on earth should we do this?

Mr. Speaker, this proposal meets somebody's strategic idea that what we have to do is send another piece of legislation to the Senate which we know will not pass. I think all that does is to harden each side, rather than make each side more flexible. I would point out, the practical effect of this strategy is to ask 221 Members of this House from both sides of the aisle who voted against this proposition on the Labor-HEW bill to vote for it today.

What this proposition essentially does is to eliminate all international family planning money. This is not an abortion issue. I support efforts, for instance, to shut off funding for the U.N. population program if it continues to operate in China. I agree with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] on that issue. However, I do not agree with, and I do not think most Members of this House do, and I know that many Members on the Republican side of the aisle do not agree with the idea of eliminating all authority for any family planning programs internationally.

The following Members voted against this amendment when it was offered by the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. LIVINGSTON, from the HEW bill. I am going to read everybody's name:

Messrs. ABERCROMBIE, ACKERMAN, BAESLER, BALDACCI, BARRETT of Wisconsin, BASS, BECERRA, BEILENSON, BENTSEN, BEREUTER, BERMAN, BILBRAY, BISHOP, BLUTE, BOEHLERT, BONIOR, BORSKI, BOUCHER, BROWDER, and BROWN TIOF CALIFORNIA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Messrs. BROWN of Ohio, BRYANT of Texas, CARDIN, CASTLE, CHAPMAN, and CLAY, Ms. CLAYTON, Messrs. CLEMENT, CLINGER, CLYBURN, and COLEMAN, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Messrs. CONDIT, CONYERS, COYNE, and CRAMER, Ms. DANNER, Mr. DAVIS, and Mr. DE LA GARZA.

I am reading now the names of all Members of the House who voted against this proposition last time: Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DELAURO, Messrs. DELLUMS, DEUTSCH, DICKS, DINGELL, DIXON, DOGGETT, DOOLEY, and DOYLE, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Messrs. DURBIN, EDWARDS, EHRLICH, and ENGLE, Ms. ESHOO, Messrs. EVANS, FARR, FATTAH, FAWELL, FAZIO of California, FIELDS of Louisiana, FILNER, FLAKE, FOGLIETTA, FOLEY, and FORD, Mrs. FOWLER, Messrs. FRANK of Massachusetts, FRANKS of Connecticut, FRANKS of New Jersey, FRELINGHUYSEN, and FROST.

Continuing reading the names of all Members who voted against this last time:

Ms. FURSE, Messrs. GANSKE, GEJDENSON, GEKAS, GEPHARDT, PETE GEREN of Texas, GIBBONS, GILCHREST, GILMAN, GONZALEZ, GORDON, GENE GREEN of Texas, GREENWOOD, GUNDERSON, GUTIERREZ, and HAMILTON, Ms. HARMAN, Messrs. HASTINGS of Florida, HEFNER, HILLIARD, HINCHEY, HOBSON, HORN, HOUGHTON, and HOYER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, and Mr. KANJORKSI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mrs. KENNELLY, Messrs. KLECZKA, KLINK, KLUG, KOLBE, LANTOS, LAZIO of New York, LEACH, LEVIN, LEWIS of California, and LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. LINCOLN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LONGLEY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LUTHER, Mrs. MALONEY, Messrs. MARKEY, MARTINEZ, MARTINI, and MATSUI, Ms. MCCARTHY, Messrs. MCDERMOTT, MCHALE, and MCINNIS, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Messrs. MFUME, MILLER of California, MINETA, and MINGE, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. MORAN, and Mrs. MORELLA.

Continuing to read the names of all Members who voted against this proposition the last time:

Messrs. NADLER, NEAL, OBEY, OLVER, OWENS, PALLONE, PASTOR, PAYNE of New Jersey, and PAYNE of Virginia, Ms. PELOSI, Messrs. PETERSON of Florida, PICKETT, POMEROY, and PORTER, Ms. PRYCE, Messrs. RAMSTAD, RANGEL, REED, REGULA, RICHARDSON, and RIGGS, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ROSE, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Messrs. RUSH, SABO, SANDERS, SAWYER, and SCHIFF, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Messrs. SCHUMER, SCOTT, SERRANO, SHAW, SHAYS, SISISKY, and SKAGGS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Messrs. SPRATT, STARK, STOKES, STUDDS, TANNER, THOMAS, THOMPSON, THORNTON, TORKILDSEN, TORRES, TORRICELLI, TOWNS, TRAFICANT, and UPTON, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Messrs. VENTO, VISLOSKEY, and WARD, Ms. WATERS, Messrs. WATT of North Carolina, WAXMAN, WHITE, WILLIAMS, WILSON, and WISE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Messrs. WYDEN, WYNN, YATES, ZELIFF, and ZIMMER.

All of those Members voted against this proposition when the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] offered language which in essence cut off funding for all family planning domestically.

Mr. Speaker, I would submit that cutting off all family planning funds for international programs is even worse, because if you do, you know that that will disarm us in our ability to try to do something about uncontrolled population growth in many sectors of the world. If you are for compromise, you ought to be looking for

compromise language. You should not swallow language which the manager of the bill himself indicates has no chance whatsoever of becoming law. All that is going to do is guarantee that we have to have a continuing resolution for this bill. I do not think we ought to be doing that. We ought to be trying to find ways to pass this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I might say that this does not deny funding to Planned Parenthood or to any of the agencies. It just simply says what we have heard over and over again in this House: that the Committee on Appropriations ought not to be authorizing items, so we have appropriated the money in this bill. We just simply say that until such time as the Congress of the United States authorizes it through an authorization bill, that the money cannot be spent.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of our committee.

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

□ 1130

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I was glad to see the chart from the gentleman from Wisconsin once again. In fact, that chart is looking better every day. All those black lines mean that the appropriations bills are working their way through the process.

It may take a little bit longer than we might have hoped, but they are betting there and that chart is going to be complete someday, hopefully within the next week. We will find out at Christmastime, either this Christmas or next Christmas, as to whether or not the chart is complete.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. I would be happy to buy the gentleman the biggest scotch in town if all of those bills are passed by Christmas.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. We will see.

Actually the fact is the administration is negotiating, or course, with the Congress to see whether or not we can come to a package deal and complete business on all of these appropriations bills. I want to ask the gentleman's indulgence and allow me to draw the lines to complete the chart when the package is complete.

The point is, though, that we have indeed passed seven entire appropriations subcommittee bills and they have been signed into law. The eighth, the Commerce-Justice-State bill, goes to the President today for his signature or his veto. The VA-HUD bill, the Foreign Ops bill which is on the floor today and the Interior bill are all working their way through various processes and should be complete by, if not the end of this week, certainly by the end of next week, we hope.

the District of Columbia bill, likewise, has one or two issues in conference that remain to be dealt with. I think that that bill will be on the floor very shortly.

So the only bill that really is far from passage, and that is because the other party as filibustering it in the Senate, is the Labor-HHS bill.

We are working our way through these bills. This bill unfortunately has been to the floor twice before. This is the third time. This is a conference report that has been hung up on the issue of abortion. We have come to an impasse. The Senate does not want to adopt the language that the House has offered. So we have offered some new language which we hope they will consider and which we hope that they will adopt. They may or may not. But we have to move the process forward.

In the spirit of doing exactly that, I would ask all of our Members to join with us, pass this bill one more time, get it to the Senate and let them work their will and hopefully let us get this bill to the President for his signature.

There has been some disagreement on exactly what the language was that disallowed funding for family planning, international family planning. I would say in response to what the gentleman from Wisconsin said that that amendment really had little to do with this provision. This deals with UNFPA, U.N. family planning operations, and all it does is freeze the money in place. It says the money is there but that the money will be frozen until such time as the authorization bill is passed.

Frankly, it would be better if the issue of abortion were handled in the authorization bills. Because it is policy that should be handled by the authorization bills. And so what this does is to remove the issue of abortion and transfer it to the place it belongs, to the authorization committees for them to consider, for them to assess the policy ramifications and for them to ultimately pass the law.

This is an attempt to take abortion out of the appropriations process and say to the authorizers, you do the job, and let us not hang up the appropriations bills in this House and in the Senate up any longer so that we can get the country's business done and so that we can get the functions of government funded and so that we do not have to waste any more time and be here at Christmastime.

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

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

Mr. WILSON. I was just going to ask the chairman if he understands and remembers that it has been 10 years since we had an authorization bill on foreign aid.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman has reminded me that it has been a very long time, but I am very hopeful and optimistic that we are going to pass one this year or certainly within the next 3 months. Certainly before the gentleman retires.

Mr. WILSON. I hope so.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. And we do not want him to retire, we hope he decides to stay around, but if that is his decision, I hope that by the time he retires, he will have confidence and knowledge that the Foreign Affairs authorization bill has been passed by both Houses and enacted into law so he can take that with him back to Texas.

Mr. WILSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment because it will effectively eliminate funding for international family planning. Our colleagues on the far right continue to hold up this bill with their extreme legislative agenda. This has got to stop. Let us pass this bill.

After all, this amendment is just another way to masquerade the issue and stop all family planning funding. Let us stop it and let us get this bill passed today.

Our chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], has crafted an excellent foreign aid bill. This extreme language, I say to the chairman, is preventing this critical bill from being enacted.

Let me tell my colleagues exactly what is happening here. Our anti-choice colleagues have attempted to place restrictions on the international family planning programs in this bill, despite the fact that abortion funding overseas has been prohibited since 1973. Their restrictions have been rejected by the Senate three times. We have heard the message loud and clear.

Now their solution to the Senate's refusal to accept their extreme restrictions is to do something even more extreme, to eliminate the programs altogether.

This bill is already 2½ months late, and rather than offer a true compromise or simply accept that their restrictions have failed 3 times, our colleagues on the right now offer an amendment that they know both the Senate and the administration will reject.

Why do they insist on wasting our time with this? This is the fourth time that we have voted on this appropriations bill. Why do they continue to play politics with a bill that contains funding for so many vital programs throughout the world?

Their amendment will effectively end one of the most important forms of aid that we provide to other countries, family planning assistance. The amendment exempts the family planning program, and only the family planning program, from the waiver in the bill that allows funds to be appropriated even though the foreign aid authorization bill has not passed.

What our colleagues have not told you is that the foreign aid authorization bill has not passed in a dozen

years, and I know the chairman is optimistic. The Senate has already indicated that it will not pass the authorization bill this year.

The reality is, it could be years before an authorization bill is signed into law. We know that. In the meantime, we will have failed to fund vital family planning programs throughout the world.

No one can deny that the need for family planning services in developing countries is urgent. The aid we provide is 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.

Let us not forget what family planning assistance means to women around the world. Complications of pregnancy, childbirth, unsafe abortion are the leading killers of women of reproductive age. 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.

This amendment will stop us from continuing our fight against these tragedies. Simply put, this amendment will end our family planning programs. Period. that is what it would do.

I urge my colleagues, once again, oppose this amendment. We cannot let them eliminate international family planning. There is too much at stake. Let us pass this excellent appropriations bill. Let us take off this extreme amendment. Let us not vote on this again. We need this bill.

I again salute the chairman on this outstanding bill. Let us pass it here today. Let us not bow to the right that continues to tack on the extreme amendments. Let us not do it. Let us join and pass this bill today.

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

Responding to the kind gentlewoman from New York, let me thank her for her help during this past year or so, too, and to tell her that I am optimistic that the Senate is going to bring up the authorization bill either today or tomorrow under a unanimous-consent agreement.

I think for the first time in the 10 years that they have not been able to pass a bill, they are finally going to have a bill that passes the House and the Senate and goes to conference. This is the argument that we always hear, those of us who are appropriators: Do not authorize, do not authorize, you are appropriators.

In this bill, we appropriate the money. What we simply say is it cannot be spent until it is authorized by the proper committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. If the gentleman will yield, let me just say that I am happy the holidays are coming and we all have wishes. I do wish the authorization bill would pass as well as you do but it has not passed in 12 years and I would rather deal with fact rather than fiction, although I wish you and the authorization bill well.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time and appreciate his leadership on this issue.

Incidentally, and this is not so incidentally, I rise in strong support for this conference report and for its passage. But I do want to refer to, first of all, the chart that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] brought out. I do like the looks of that chart. It is getting better.

It is because we are working a lot harder to get to a point of success. None of this is very easy. The chairman referred to the fact that we had 193 amendments in the conference committee. We completed and agreed upon 192. The one remaining, of course, is the one we are dealing with today.

This language, I think, ensures that any expenditure of funds for population planning or the UNFPA must be, as has been pointed out here, specifically authorized by this body, which has not been done.

Somebody on the other side made the comment about it has not been done in 10 years. Well, that is not to say it should not be done. I think it should be. We have an opportunity perhaps where that will take place.

We have to be able to debate these things or we will not get anywhere. So maybe this is, in the eyes of the gentlewoman from New York, an extraneous matter, should be done away with, forgotten about, so we can pass this beautiful bill. Well, it is important to a lot of us. It is worth debate. It is something that we want to carry on and come to some conclusion, a successful conclusion.

I would not suggest to you that it is guaranteed, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] stated, that the Senate will just let this thing float and die. We do not know that yet entirely. There is some idea here that may be beginning to impress them, that there is perhaps more to this and we can come to a conclusion that will satisfy everybody.

As I have said many times before, I strongly support this conference report. It balances fiscal restraint and the needs of foreign policy, and it reflects the reasoned compromise and considerable cooperation that did take place between all of the Members from both sides in committee and also in the conference committee. It deserves bipartisan support.

I think we are at a point now where we can get to a position of passing a

bill that is in dire need of being passed. I agree with the sense of urgency but I do not agree that this is an unimportant matter. It is very important to many of us, and it does allow for the continuation of funding at the appropriate time for the specific family planning ideas. It just has to be authorized.

H.R. 1868 allows us to continue to remain active in world events while it reflects our budgetary constraints, and you all know that. This conference report reflects, I believe, what is best for this body. We will send it to the Senate. They will make their decision. I support this conference report and urge all of my colleagues to vote for it.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I just want to reassure the gentleman from Michigan that I respect your views on the issues of abortion, just as I respect the views of every one of my colleagues. I just think it is so unfortunate that every appropriations bill is tied up in abortion. I do wish we could isolate that issue, have a real debate, and move this appropriations bill now.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

Ms. FURSE. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should be very clear. This amendment is simply a way to freeze the family planning funds. This amendment targets only family planning, that portion of the legislation.

Family planning works. No one wants abortion to be the only way to control pregnancy. Family planning gets us beyond abortion. It allows people to control the size of their families and thereby control their economies. Family planning is absolutely profamily.

□ 1145

It is truly the most pro-family thing we can do, because it allows families to make the decisions. It is so ridiculous. You know, if I asked my constituents, many, many of them say to me, "You know the greatest problem in this world is over population," over population because of use of resources, because of the stress it puts on communities, overpopulation is a great threat.

Family planning allows us to move beyond. Family planning is one of the greatest parts of getting us to peace and prosperity internationally, because it allows families to decide on how many children they are having. So we really need to defeat this anti-family amendment.

I urge my colleagues to do that.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr.

Speaker, the House has voted four times to support the pro-life provisions which would ensure that international family planning assistance will be abortion neutral. The first provision prohibits tax dollars from being used by the United Nations Population Fund—which currently helps manage China's brutal one-child-per-one-family policy unless it ceases family planning activities in the People's Republic of China or unless China's family planning activities in China cease to be coercive.

The second provision would ensure that none of the moneys sent to the UNPF may be used to fund any private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organizations that directly or through a subcontractor perform abortions in any foreign country—except to save the life of the mother or in cases of rape or 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 or incest.

The Callahan motion does not eliminate or even reduce the appropriations for population assistance but will leave the appropriations levels in H.R. 1868 intact. However it will delay the use of these appropriated funds until these expenditures are authorized. It will also delink pro-life issues from other important provisions such as aid to Israel, child survival programs and other foreign aid programs.

I urge my colleagues Mr. Speaker to support this motion and allow this important legislation to move forward and fund vital foreign aid programs.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, in the 19th century at the height of the Industrial Revolution, there arose a political group which frankly was opposed to the change and progress of the Industrial Revolution. They were known as the Luddites. The Luddites would try to wreck the machinery of the Industrial Revolution to stop the change that was taking place. They objected to it, and they used violence and terrorism for that purpose. There was a mindless opposition to the reality of change, a resistance to accepting the world as it existed.

What we hear on the floor today is the same mentality when it comes to family planning, a mindless opposition to family planning from groups which characterize themselves as pro-life. Anyone who has taken the time to

study the issue understands that the greatest world threats to our children are nuclear proliferation and overpopulation.

Take a look at the expanding population in continents around the world, whether in Asia, Africa, South America. You will find that those expanding populations not only create human suffering for the people living there, but they, in fact, lead to environmental disasters which visit themselves on the entire world as well as to military confrontations which ultimately drag the United States and other civilized nations into the vortex of the conflict. Overpopulation is a major problem.

What we are doing with this motion today is literally shutting down America's commitment to family planning around the world. We are not talking about abortion. I hold in my hand a penny, one penny; not one penny is being spent of Federal money to fund abortions in any country of the world. You would never know that from this debate. You would think we were setting out to fund abortions and the pro-life people wanted to stop it. It has nothing to do with it. Not a penny of Federal funds are being used for that purpose. What we are doing, in closing down this \$450 million of family planning is adding to degradation and personal disaster around the world and, sadly, adding to the likelihood that move abortion will result.

Several years ago I traveled with Congressman Mike Synar to Bangladesh, one of the poorest countries in the world. Far away in a distant, dusty village we met a 19-year-old woman holding a baby. It was her third child. Through an interpreter she told us with great pride it would be her last child. Because of world health efforts which the United States supported, her children were healthy, and she did not have to bear any more children and through family planning efforts, that we spend pennies on, she was able to control the size of her family.

She and so many other women around the world, given a chance for their own personal dignity, will be denied that chance because of this terrible motion. I urge my colleagues, do not give in to this extremism. Oppose this motion.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Callahan motion, which represents yet another sincere attempt by Chairman CALLAHAN to seek a compromise approach to this issue on which so many of us feel so very strongly.

As most of my colleagues know, I have been a very strong supporter of the pro-life Mexico City policy which is designed to protect innocent unborn children around the world by barring United States family planning funds to foreign organizations that perform or promote abortion overseas. The House has voted four times, four times, in

favor of that legislation this year. It should be clear by now, Mr. Speaker, that one way or the other pro-lifers will not stand by. We will not allow the abortion industry to get an infusion of literally hundreds of millions of dollars in foreign aid for the promotion of the killing of unborn children in other lands or by lobbying to bring down their statutes.

More than 95, closer to 100, countries of the world have pro-life statutes, and these nongovernmental organizations, some, not all, get into these countries, begin networking, and they have been working aggressively to bring down those pro-life statutes.

I do not think the U.S. taxpayer should be making these organizations the dominant force in these capitals around the world. Family planning, yes; abortion promotion, and abortion performance except in the cases of rape, incest, and life of the mother, which is what the original language had in it, they are the exception; but family planning, yes; abortion, no.

I would also remind Members that I have been a very strong supporter of linking UNFPA funding, U.N. Population Fund, to withdrawal of UNFPA from the program in China where forced abortion is commonplace and prevalent and where the UNFPA has been the dominant cheerleader for the population program in Beijing, in the People's Republic of China. Again, if the Senate or the White House will not budge on this at this time, pro-lifers are not going to cave.

We will allow the money, we will push the money for family planning, but will not allow it to be used in any way, shape, or form for the promotion of abortion or for promoting this coercion in the People's Republic of China. The pro-life Members are willing to support this motion which deletes these two provisions, but says we have got the wait until the authorizers take it up and then the bill will pass, I believe, and will be signed. Otherwise, we go back. We put the language back into the appropriations bill. That is fine with me.

If the Senate will not budge, we stay here until hell freezes over, because unborn children are precious and the women in the People's Republic of China, who have been victimized by the brutality of that program are precious as well.

I absolutely and categorically reject those who stand on the floor and say we are stopping all family planning funding. During the many years that the Mexico City program was in effect, 350 plus nongovernmental organizations, more NGO's than we had the money to fund, accepted the Mexico City clauses of no abortion promotion and got their money for family planning in Bangladesh, in Africa, in Central America. Planned Parenthood, Western Hemisphere, got, if I remember correctly, about \$10 million when they agreed they would no longer be promoting abortion. They got their

money to stay on point, and that is family planning, not abortion.

We are insisting on very modest language that says we are not going to be in the business of promoting abortion or performing it except in those very rare cases. We are not going to allow these organizations to be lobbying to bring down these anti-abortion statutes around the globe.

The family planning money will then flow. Nobody will object to it, and condoms and some of the other things that are disseminated will go out without any impediment, but we will not be in the business of empowering the abortion industry.

Vote for the Callahan motion.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

This amendment is a gross misuse of the political process to thwart the will of the American people who overwhelmingly support family planning in this country and around the world.

Once again, the new majority is attempting to put the radical right's agenda ahead of good government and global responsibility. It is clear that their actions show little concern for women's health, pre and postnatal care, health and nutrition for children, families, and stabilizing global population, and the problems that flow from it, including the massive increases recently in refugees.

The Callahan measure would make it illegal to appropriate funds for international family planning programs unless they are authorized. We need to vote to save international family planning programs. We need to vote to protect families, children, and women around the world. We need to defeat this politically motivated action by anti-family, anti-women Members here. It goes against everything this country agreed upon, and I might add, 187 other countries agreed upon at the International Conference for Women in Beijing.

Supporting international family planning programs is socially responsible, fiscally sound, and it serves our national purposes.

Vote to support women and families around the world. Defeat the Callahan motion.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, so eloquent is the gentleman from Illinois and so knowledgeable of this subject is the gentleman from Illinois, it would be immoral to deny him any restriction on time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], but remind him that we are down to about 5 minutes.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I suggest the gentleman correct the RECORD when it comes around for his extravagance in introducing me.

You know, when you get in this debate, you have to expect to be called

names, and I have been called some wonderful names, some colorful names. Today it was mindless Luddite, and, you know, you can play that game. I would call people who think abortion is a good idea or an acceptable idea, or something the American taxpayer ought to pay for, I would not call them mindless, but I might call them heartless. I might call them unthinking. But I do not want to get into that game.

I want to just try to talk a little reality here. Family planning is not abortion, and abortion is not family planning, and when you link the two together you have got real problems, because many of us do not want to have American tax dollars go to pay for killing unborn children even if they are in Bangladesh or if they are in Toledo. We think human life ought to be special and ought to be sacred, and killing it, exterminating it, however you do it, is wrong and ought not to be paid for with tax dollars. That is what the struggle is about, and we are entitled to access to the political process to try and make our point.

But when misstatements are made, we have to wonder who is being mindless. For example, family planning flourishes under our program. Forty percent of all the dollars that are spent worldwide on family planning come from the United States and did under Reagan and Bush.

□ 1200

It is simply two organizations that will not accept the money because they want to continue promoting abortion. So there are 300-some organizations that are happy to take our family planning money. Meanwhile around the world family planning, properly understood, which is either helping someone to get pregnant or keeping them from getting pregnant; it is not exterminating the pregnancy once it has occurred, and that is what my colleagues are talking about, and we are asking those gentlemen from Mount Olympus across the rotunda to please understand we are for family planning, we are for foreign aid. It is abortion we are not for. We think that is despicable, we think it is wrong, and we do not think tax dollars ought to go pay for it.

So overpopulation; we have heard two speakers bemoan that as one of the great problems in the world. I suggest that is an unsophisticated look at a serious problem. Density is what we should look at, how many people per square mile. There are countries on the globe with a higher density than many of these countries that have overpopulation problems and yet a high standard of living. Japan, Switzerland, Holland have high density, high standard of living. Maybe it is something more than the number of people, maybe it is the economy, maybe it is the kind of government, maybe it is society. But that is a rather superficial look at the problem of overpopulation.

The money is fungible. If we give the money to the International Planned

Parenthood of London, and they say, "We're going to spend our money on abortion and not your money," that is a bookkeeping transaction and does not fool anybody.

So I suggest that we stand fast, we continue to tell the gentleman and gentleladies across the rotunda we do not want to fund abortion.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, please let the RECORD reflect that this gentleman has not called the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] any names.

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to express my respect for my chairman, for the gentleman from New Jersey, and of course for my wonderful colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. Speaker, the language of this proposed amendment is simply not going to fly. We know, everyone knows, that the Senate will not accept this approach. Even if they did, the President would veto the bill. We are wasting our time, we are tying up the House, we are tying up this legislation. We are delaying programs that ought to be going forward, we are delaying our commitment to Camp David that we have always observed, and I think it is totally disingenuous to say, as some on the opposite side are saying that our side is delaying the bill. They are delaying the bill.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Illinois just said family planning is not abortion. That is exactly right. It is against current law to spend any U.S. funds for abortion, and those of us who are arguing this matter are supporters of family planning, and not supporters of abortion. To hold all family planning funding hostage to legislative language that will not be agreed to by the Senate or by the President is to hold this entire bill hostage. And, to hold up other bills over this issue is to hold those bills hostage as well.

Mr. Speaker, we do not fund abortion. We have never funded abortion. I have always supported the Hyde amendment both domestically and internationally.

This issue is not going to be resolved with this proposal. This issue is simply delaying this entire bill from going forward, and it seems to me that we should defeat this proposal and strip all language on both sides of this issue out of this bill, and let the legislation go forward and become law.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding this time to me, and I applaud the subcommittee chairman for this amendment. I think it is a very reasonable approach to dealing with this problem.

There are a lot of things that go on up here in Washington, and it is, I believe, very hard for the American public to keep a watch on everything. One

of the amazing things that has gone on up here in Washington is immediately after this President was inaugurated he started funneling a lot of foreign aid dollars into programs that promote abortion on an international scale, and the American people, in this environment that we are in of huge deficits, a huge national debt, I believe clearly do not want taxpayer dollars being used for this kind of a purpose.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] has come up with a very reasonable approach. He is saying that we can continue to give these organizations money but that the ones that are actively out there promoting abortion, particularly the forced abortion like we have in China, which I would imagine 99 percent of Americans find reprehensible, and it is amazing that this administration would want to pump money into those kinds of organizations. It is saying that we will not do that unless the authorizing committee actually authorizes this.

Now our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who like to put money into these kinds of programs know that they can never get authorizing language for something like this, so they are going to fight this tooth and nail, but I think it is a very reasonable approach in the part of the committee, the subcommittee chairman. I applaud him for coming up with this solution to the problem.

We need to get this bill through. I support the bill. I support all my colleagues who would stand up and rise in support of this bill, and it is a good solution to the problem.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, this is unfortunate that this debate has gone along these lines with linkages that should not be made. We should not be discussing family planning dash abortion. This is a family planning issue. And we are talking about no international funds can be appropriated to any international societies unless an authorization bill is passed. Well, we have not had an authorization bill for a number of years, and if my colleagues want this amendment passed, it should be attached to the authorization bill.

But this is unfortunate, that we have to be doing this, because for years and years people around this world understood that the way to deal with population problems, health problems, children who are born into families where they are not wanted, is through family planning, and to do this today means we do not realize that family planning works, and eliminating this aid would hurt countless families throughout the world and increase the number of unintended pregnancies.

We do not want abortions; we want pregnancies not to happen. Countless women around this world have no access to health care screening and do not have information on how to plan a

family, how to avoid an unwanted pregnancy. Denying U.S. funds for these services does not make sense. It is an arbitrary denial, dealing with something that we all, as world citizens, should be dealing with.

Mr. Speaker, right here I have a statement of the administration's policy. We are all trying to deal with legislation, we all know we should be going forward and not getting into these kinds of discussions, and the administration says:

If the previous House-passed language on population contained in section 518 and the substitute language were dropped, the Secretary of State would recommend that the President sign the bill.

One more problem eliminated, and we could go for it. We really should not be debating the way we are today. We should just be getting on with the business of the House.

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

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

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Callahan motion. This motion is worse than the original amendment—it would prohibit any funding for family planning until the foreign aid authorization bill is approved—legislation which historically has not been enacted into law. Thus, this motion effectively kills all family planning funding for the rest of this fiscal year.

One point must be reiterated in this debate—this amendment attempts to address a nonissue—foreign aid dollars do not currently pay for any abortions and never have. For 20 years, foreign aid policy and law has clearly stated that U.S. funds cannot be used to pay for abortion services or to lobby on the issue.

What this amendment does do is kill family planning programs—resulting in more abortions.

Mr. Speaker, this foreign aid bill already includes drastic cuts in funding for population assistance overseas. The Callahan motion will further endanger women's health and will deny women and couples access to family planning information. It will increase, not reduce, abortions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this motion.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am not here to call anyone any names. I think this is a debate that really is for world health. Family planning is good health. It is good for the world's families. It is instructive that over the years this type of family planning has saved more lives, and it has done so because the world's women and families have been eligible for family planning education. It is good health.

Mr. Speaker, we do not need to encourage these misstatements that have been offered about the facts that family planning is promoting abortion and forced abortions in China. Mr. Speaker, I have gone on record saying that the atrocities in China should not be tolerated. None of us are accepting of that.

But with this legislation, it would be illegal to appropriate funds for international family planning programs. That is all, that is the bottom line, of what their policy does help implement world family planning.

Organizations like International Planned Parenthood offer health care screening and information on family planning. Denying funds to organizations like International Planned Parenthood is nonsensical. This language would implement an international gag rule. The people that would be suffering would be millions of women and families across this world. One million women die each year as a result of reproductive health problems.

I started out saying this is a health bill, we want to support family planning because it is good health. This debate has nothing to do with abortion and current law which, as we all know, prohibits for the last 20 years the use of U.S. funds for abortion. It is time to err on the side of families, women, and good health.

Defeat this legislation. We want to keep what the law says, good health, good family planning, and support for our world's family of women and our world's families. In this season of caring and giving, Mr. Speaker, can we do any less?

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this motion which would eliminate all funding for international family planning organizations. This motion exempts family planning programs from the waiver in the bill that permits appropriations for foreign aid programs without passage of the foreign aid authorization bill, a bill that has not been passed in 12 years.

In other words, it would be illegal to appropriate funds for international family planning programs—and only international family programs—until the passage of the stalled foreign aid authorization bill. This new tactic by my antifamily colleagues is even more drastic than the restrictions they have been attempting to impose on the bill. This new approach will effectively kill the international family planning programs at issue by denying them funding.

Organizations like International Planned Parenthood offer basic health care screening and information on family planning. Denying funds to organizations like International Planned Parenthood is nonsensical. This language would implement an international gag rule.

With the world's population growing at an unprecedented rate, one of the most important forms of aid that we provide to other countries is family planning assistance. As a world leader, the United States must work to reduce the complications of pregnancy, childbirth, and unsafe abortions, which 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.

But this debate has nothing to do with abortion itself. Current law prohibits—and has for 20 years—the use of U.S. funds for abortion. Foreign aid policy and law clearly states that U.S. funds may not be used to pay for abortion procedures or to lobby on the issue.

Thus, the proposed motion would simply eliminate funding for legal, and essential, health and family planning services—not abortion. Legitimate and effective international health organizations would be prohibited from providing valuable and desperately needed family planning information to women around the globe. I urge my colleagues to defeat this dangerous motion.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

□ 1215

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and for the gentleman's leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in complete respect, as our chairman knows, for his leadership on our Foreign Operations Subcommittee. As a member of that subcommittee, I have seen him shepherd our bill through many storms. We have this one remaining obstacle.

As Members know, we have gone back and forth and back and forth on the issue of family planning in this bill. Frankly, I do not see any reason for us to have to go through this, because this controversy is based on a false premise, the premise that \$1 in this bill would be spent to fund abortions. That funding is not allowed by U.S. law, and we do not need any language to further prohibit it.

Let us all say that we all agree in this Congress that we abhor, we abhor the family planning methods used in China. I mention that issue because I see my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, rising, and I know that issue is a bone of contention in this bill, but shouldn't be in this Congress. We all agree that it is a gross violation of human rights for the women, indeed, for the families, the people of China, to have to be subjected to China's family planning methods. The practices are atrocious and I will not go into them, except to say that no funding from this bill supports the China program.

With that in mind, Mr. Speaker, that first, none of the funds would be used for abortion, and second, that none of the funds will be used to support the family planning program which we all abhor in China, the question arises: Why are we holding the poorest of the poor people in the world who depend on family planning funds that are provided in this bill hostage to the Chinese regime's policy.

Mr. Speaker, I call this, with all due respect to my colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], our distinguished chairman, the make matters worse amendment. We had a situation which was a challenge to us about funding for family planning. We have been fighting that fight. Many people

who support family planning but do not support every medical option available to women to terminate a pregnancy support us in opposition to this rule. I am very pleased that staunch anti-choice Members, and I do not say that as a badge of honor, oppose this amendment. The gentleman from Ohio, TONY HALL, and I have been on opposite sides of the choice issue, and he voted against the rule on this bill because of the restrictions it places on family planning. Restrictions that are not per se in the bill, but restrictions which are by way of procedure. If we do not get the funding through this bill now and if we have to wait for an authorization at the end of the session, as we are, waiting to go out for the holidays, what will happen to the family planning funds that are so desperately needed so very soon for so many people in the world?

That is why I call this the make matters worse amendment. It tries to resolve a conflict that I do not think should be there in the first place, because we all agree that China's policy is abhorrent and none of our funds should go to it. And because we all know that there is no funding for abortion allowed under United States law. So why can we not come to a sensible conclusion which enables us to fund family planning?

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

Ms. PELOSI. I am pleased to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], because although we differ on the issue of choice, he has been a champion on funding for child survival issues and the like; but as a tactic, I think the way that the chairman has decided to proceed on this will present huge obstacles to getting our family planning money out there when it is needed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. We do work together on a number of other issues, but unfortunately, on this one we have a difference.

Let me reiterate, and make this so very clear to everyone who may be listening to this debate, that we will provide family planning funds, as we did during the Reagan and Bush years when we provided in excess of 40 percent of all the subsidies globally for family planning, but we did it in a way that did not promote or perform abortions. That is the key.

Ms. PELOSI. Reclaiming my time and in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say, if Members abhor abortion, as we all do, they should support family planning and vote against this amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 3 minutes.

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

Mr. DORNAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER], the conscience of the minority party, who is pro-family, pro-defense, and pro-second amendment.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that I rise in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Alabama, in strong support of it, and I urge the House to adopt this motion.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I hope as Missouri goes, so goes the House.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] is trying to do, and with great respect for human rights voices like the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], on the other side of the aisle, and to try and clarify here for the 1,300,000 audience that watches this on C-SPAN that would think we are debating two different issues here today. Everybody suddenly gets up and says they are all against abortion.

Now, a gentleman on the minority side from Illinois held up a penny, so I will hold up a penny. All pennies today are Lincoln pennies. Lincoln, our greatest President from the State of the gentlemen from Illinois, Mr. HYDE and Mr. DURBIN, finally came to realize that the greatest evil in our country since its founding was slavery. We now have great religious leaders all over the world talking about the culture of death in the womb, of the elderly, of the infirm, of the physically challenged.

Since our country first met with the House of Representatives 206 years and 9 months ago, two enormous evils have confronted us: slavery and the taking of innocent life through abortion. There is a benchmark in this House as of November 1: 139 people a few on my side of the aisle, stood up and said that execution-style coup de grace to the base of the skull, removing the brains, partial birth abortion, was OK. Those in the medical profession that do nothing but abort, nothing but abort, and in the other Chamber one of our lady Senators objected to us calling them abortionists instead of doctors. If that is all they do, they are not doctors in this Member's eyes, they are abortionists. So we start with a benchmark of 139 who find even a coup-de-grace abortion OK.

Now we have this group that stands up and says: "I am against abortion, but do not listen to the pro-lifers on this side or that side of the aisle." Money is fungible, down to a penny. If we free up money with all sorts of U.S. restrictions and we know they are not going to be obeyed, then it is going to drive abortion and the political undermining of the laws, and the majority of the 185 nations in the U.N., over 100, will have their laws undermined by these people who are driven almost as a religious conviction about abortion.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. James Timothy McMahon, who with Dr. Haskell worked out partial birth abortion, is buried near my parents in Holy Cross Cemetery in Culver City. I visited that

cemetery Sunday. He renounced his whole life to abortion. Money is fungible, listen to the pro-lifers.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my colleagues on the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee for their work on this year's Foreign Operations Appropriations Act (H.R. 2666). On balance, H.R. 2666 moves us in the right direction as we seek to come to grips with the role of the United States in the post-cold war world.

However, I rise to express my opposition to a specific provision adopted by the conference that would impose a moratorium on the use of antipersonnel landmines by the U.S. military.

This provision does nothing to address the problem that led to its adoption—namely, the tens of thousands of unexploded non-self-destructing landmines that are taking a tragic toll on civilian noncombatants around the world. Instead, it unilaterally bars the United States from using a legitimate weapon in combat for defensive purposes while other nations are not similarly restricted.

Even the administration, which has made a global ban on the use of antipersonnel landmines one of its foreign policy objectives, is vigorously opposed to this moratorium. No less an authority than the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Shalikashvili, has noted that "antipersonnel landmines will be required by U.S. forces for safe defense in the foreseeable future" and that a prohibition on their use would place American forces at risk.

General Shalikashvili expressed his concerns in a letter to me on September 12. I find his arguments logical and persuasive, and request at this point that a copy of his letter be inserted in the RECORD.

Landmines are an integral part of current U.S. war-fighting doctrine and an important economy of force multiplier. They played a critical role in defending our troops during the decisive final stage of the Persian Gulf war by protecting General Schwarzkopf's forces as they closed in to defeat Saddam Hussein's army deep within Iraqi territory.

The U.S. military uses antipersonnel landmines in strict accordance with the international laws of armed conflict. This moratorium would place unreasonable and unprecedented restrictions on the use of a lawful weapon.

Other countries, most notably China and Russia, have made it clear that they consider landmines to be an integral part of their overall military posture, and have refused to forswear their use.

In summary, a unilateral moratorium on antipersonnel landmines use by the United States will diminish the U.S. ability to conduct ground combat operations. It would put our soldiers at greater risk and require increased expenditures to maintain an equivalent level of battlefield protection. The potential cost of this moratorium is likely to be measured not only in dollars, but in American soldiers' lives.

We should all oppose this moratorium, and should instead continue to ensure that we provide our fighting men and women in uniform the tools they need to accomplish the missions they are called upon to perform.

THE CHAIRMAN, JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF,
Washington, DC, September 12, 1995.

Hon. FLOYD SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on National Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I solicit your support on the topic of landmines during the forth-

coming FY96 Authorization Bill Conference. The proposed legislation in the Senate bill would ban use of anti-personnel landmines by US forces except in narrowly defined scenarios. I have significant concerns because, as written, American personnel would be placed at risk.

The proposed legislation, beginning 3 years after enactment, would prohibit the use for 1 year of anti-personnel landmines by US forces, except in marked and guarded minefields along internationally recognized national borders and demilitarized zones.

The legislation would effectively prohibit the use of all self-destructing mine systems because they employ a combination of anti-tank and anti-personnel mines. Self-destructing anti-personnel mines represent approximately 65 percent of the US total anti-personnel mine inventory. Mines were an indispensable component of the coalition's ability to conduct the maneuver warfare that made such an important contribution to victory in DESERT STORM. Significantly, mines secured the right flank of General Schwarzkopf's ground offensive in western Iraq.

I wish to emphasize that mines used by US Armed Forces self-destruct a short period of time after emplacement with a high degree of reliability and do not pose a significant humanitarian problem. Restricting anti-personnel landmines to "internationally recognized national borders" and demilitarized zones effectively prohibits their use by US forces in most combat scenarios. Defensive minefields around sensitive military installations such as Naval Station Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, would also be precluded. US forces are heavily dependent upon such minefields for security.

The US military strongly opposes the illegal and irresponsible use of these mines and is a proponent of humanitarian demining activities to alleviate suffering caused by them. However, anti-personnel landmines will be required by US forces for safe defense in the foreseeable future. Congress and the American people expect us to fight and win conflicts with minimum casualties. That goal requires the retention of the capabilities provided by the advanced, self-destructing mine systems which would be prohibited under the proposed legislation.

While I wholeheartedly support US leadership in the long-term goal of anti-personnel landmine elimination, unilateral actions which needlessly place our forces at risk now will not induce good behavior from irresponsible combatants. As practical solutions are pursued, our priorities must be to maintain warfighting superiority while concurrently protecting the safety of US service men and women. I consider this to be a critical force protection issue and request your support to defeat the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. SHALIKASHVILI,
Chairman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired. Pursuant to House Resolution 296, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 201, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 850]

YEAS—226

Allard	Gillmor	Ortiz
Archer	Goodlatte	Orton
Army	Goodling	Oxley
Bachus	Goss	Packard
Baker (CA)	Graham	Parker
Baker (LA)	Gutknecht	Paxon
Ballenger	Hall (TX)	Peterson (MN)
Barcia	Hamilton	Petri
Barr	Hancock	Pombo
Barrett (NE)	Hansen	Portman
Bartlett	Hastert	Poshard
Barton	Hastings (WA)	Quillen
Bateman	Hayes	Quinn
Bereuter	Hayworth	Radanovich
Bevill	Hefley	Rahall
Bilirakis	Heineman	Regula
Bliley	Herger	Riggs
Boehner	Hilleary	Roberts
Bonilla	Hoekstra	Roemer
Bono	Hoke	Rogers
Brewster	Holden	Rohrabacher
Browder	Hostettler	Ros-Lehtinen
Brownback	Hunter	Roth
Bryant (TN)	Hutchinson	Royce
Bunn	Hyde	Rush
Bunning	Inglis	Salmon
Burr	Istook	Sanford
Burton	Jacobs	Saxton
Buyer	Johnson, Sam	Scarborough
Callahan	Jones	Schaefer
Calvert	Kanjorski	Seastrand
Camp	Kasich	Sensenbrenner
Canady	Kildee	Shadegg
Chabot	Kim	Shaw
Chambliss	King	Shuster
Chenoweth	Kingston	Skeen
Christensen	Klink	Skelton
Chrysler	Knollenberg	Smith (MI)
Clinger	LaFalce	Smith (NJ)
Coble	LaHood	Smith (WA)
Coburn	Largent	Solomon
Collins (GA)	Latham	Souder
Combest	LaTourette	Spence
Cooley	Laughlin	Stearns
Costello	Lewis (CA)	Stenholm
Cox	Lewis (KY)	Stockman
Crane	Lightfoot	Stump
Crapo	Linder	Stupak
Cremeans	Lipinski	Talent
Cubin	Livingston	Tanner
Cunningham	LoBiondo	Tate
de la Garza	Lucas	Tauzin
Deal	Manton	Taylor (MS)
DeLay	Manzullo	Taylor (NC)
Diaz-Balart	Mascara	Tejeda
Dickey	McCollum	Thornberry
Doolittle	McCrery	Tiahrt
Dornan	McDade	Trafficant
Doyle	McHugh	Volkmer
Dreier	McIntosh	Vucanovich
Duncan	McKeon	Waldholtz
Ehlers	McNulty	Walker
Ehrlich	Metcalf	Walsh
Emerson	Mica	Wamp
English	Miller (FL)	Watts (OK)
Ensign	Mollohan	Weldon (FL)
Everett	Montgomery	Weldon (PA)
Ewing	Moorhead	Weller
Fields (TX)	Murtha	Whitfield
Flanagan	Myers	Wicker
Forbes	Myrick	Wolf
Fox	Neumann	Young (AK)
Frisa	Ney	Young (FL)
Funderburk	Norwood	Zeliff
Galleghy	Nussle	
Geren	Oberstar	

NAYS—201

Abercrombie	Bilbray	Castle
Ackerman	Bishop	Chapman
Andrews	Blute	Clay
Baesler	Boehert	Clayton
Baldacci	Bonior	Clement
Barrett (WI)	Borski	Clyburn
Bass	Boucher	Coleman
Becerra	Brown (CA)	Collins (IL)
Beilenson	Brown (FL)	Collins (MI)
Bentsen	Bryant (TX)	Condit
Berman	Cardin	Conyers

Coyne	Horn	Payne (VA)
Cramer	Houghton	Pelosi
Danner	Hoyer	Peterson (FL)
Davis	Jackson-Lee	Pickett
DeFazio	Jefferson	Pomeroy
DeLauro	Johnson (CT)	Porter
Dellums	Johnson (SD)	Pryce
Deusch	Johnson, E. B.	Ramstad
Dicks	Johnston	Rangel
Dingell	Kaptur	Reed
Dixon	Kelly	Richardson
Doggett	Kennedy (MA)	Rivers
Dooley	Kennedy (RI)	Rose
Dunn	Kennelly	Roukema
Durbin	Klecicka	Roybal-Allard
Edwards	Klug	Sabo
Engel	Kolbe	Sanders
Eshoo	Lantos	Sawyer
Evans	Lazio	Schiff
Farr	Leach	Schroeder
Fattah	Levin	Schumer
Fawell	Lewis (GA)	Scott
Fazio	Lincoln	Serrano
Fields (LA)	Lofgren	Shays
Filner	Longley	Sisisky
Flake	Lowe	Skaggs
Foglietta	Luther	Slaughter
Foley	Maloney	Smith (TX)
Ford	Markey	Spratt
Fowler	Martinez	Stark
Frank (MA)	Martini	Stokes
Franks (CT)	Matsui	Studds
Franks (NJ)	McCarthy	Thomas
Frelinghuysen	McDermott	Thompson
Frost	McHale	Thornton
Furse	McKinney	Thurman
Ganske	Meehan	Torkildsen
Gejdenson	Meek	Torres
Gekas	Menendez	Torricelli
Gephardt	Meyers	Towns
Gibbons	Miller (CA)	Upton
Gilchrest	Minge	Vento
Gilman	Mink	Visclosky
Gonzalez	Moakley	Ward
Gordon	Molinari	Waters
Green	Moran	Watt (NC)
Greenwood	Morella	Waxman
Gunderson	Nadler	White
Gutierrez	Neal	Williams
Hall (OH)	Nethercutt	Wilson
Harman	Obey	Wise
Hastings (FL)	Olver	Woolsey
Hefner	Owens	Wyden
Hilliard	Pallone	Wynn
Hinchee	Pastor	Yates
Hobson	Payne (NJ)	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—5

Brown (OH)	Mfume	Velazquez
McInnis	Tucker	

□ 1243

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. McInnis for, with Mr. Brown of Ohio against.

Mr. LAZIO of New York and Ms. DUNN of Washington changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. EWING and Mr. KILDEE changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST FURTHER CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1977, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-403) on the resolution (H. Res. 301) waiving points of order against the further conference

report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1977) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON FARMINGTON RIVER PURSUANT TO WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Resources:

To the Congress of the United States:

I take pleasure in transmitting the enclosed report for the Farmington River in the States of Massachusetts and Connecticut. The report and my recommendations are in response to the provisions of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, Public Law 90-542, as amended. The Farmington River Study was authorized by Public Law 99-590.

The study was conducted by the National Park Service, with invaluable assistance from a congressionally mandated study committee. The National Park Service determined that the 11-mile study segment in Massachusetts and the 14-mile study segment in Connecticut were eligible for designation based upon their free-flowing character and recreational, fish, wildlife and historic values.

The 14-mile Connecticut segment of the river has already been designated as a Wild and Scenic River pursuant to Public Law 103-313, August 26, 1994. The purpose of this transmittal is to inform the Congress that, although eligible for designation, I do not recommend that the Massachusetts segment be designated at this time due to lack of support by the towns adjoining it. If at some future date the towns should change their position and the river has retained its present characteristics, the Congress could reconsider the issue. Also, for 3 years from the date of this transmittal, the Massachusetts segment will remain subject to section 7(b) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. Section 7(b) prohibits licensing of projects by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and Federal or federally assisted water resource development projects that would have a direct and adverse effect on the values for which the river might be designated. Finally, the report includes the Upper Farmington River Management Plan that is referenced in Public Law 103-313 as the plan by which the designated river will be managed.

The plan demonstrated a true partnership effort of the type that we believe will be increasingly necessary if we are to have affordable protection of our environment in the future.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 13, 1995.

□ 1245

WAIVING THE PROVISIONS OF CLAUSE 4(b) OF HOUSE RULE XI AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 297 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 297

Resolved, That the requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported from that committee for the remainder of the first session of the One Hundred Fourth congress providing the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, any amendment thereto, any conference report thereon, or any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], I know he is going to support this rule which will get all of our Members home by Christmas, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, during the consideration of the resolution, all time yielded, of course, is for debate only.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is similar to rules we granted prior to the Thanksgiving recess for the consideration of general appropriations bills, continuing appropriations resolutions, the debt limit bill, and the Balance Budget Act.

In this instance, we would be waiving clause 4(b) of rule XI, which requires a two-thirds vote for the same day consideration of special rules reported from this committee, for rules that deal with bills, resolutions, amendments, and conference reports dealing with five separate matters:

First, general appropriations bills; second, continuing appropriations measures; third, debt limit measures; fourth, the Balanced Budget Act; and fifth, measures relating to United States troops in Bosnia.

At the request of the minority leadership, we have dropped two provisions from an earlier draft that would have waived the layover requirement for all conference reports and created special suspension days on days other than Mondays and Tuesdays.

As Members may be aware, there is already a standing House rule that permits the same day consideration of special rules for any matter during the last 3 days of a session. But that rule is not activated until we have adopted a