

better job in our foreign policy apparatus. Senator BIDEN has been a good partner, I believe, with Senator HELMS, as the ranking member on that committee that reported this legislation, in developing this State Department reorganization.

So this is very important legislation which has been a long time coming.

The second part of that bill does provide for the U.N. arrearages, something over \$900 million, I believe. You can still argue about how much really the United States owes to the United Nations. You can still argue that the United Nations doesn't always make the right decision. You can argue back and forth. But it is an agreed-to compromise which will allow the United States to fulfill its commitment in a way that a majority of those directly involved, Republican and Democrat, conservative, moderate, and liberal, feel is a fair way to get this job done.

So that is an important part of this package, not only the reorganization of the State Department, which will be of tremendous benefit, I believe, in the next few months and years of this administration and of future administrations, but then you add to that that we are finally addressing this question of U.N. arrearage. That is very important.

There is also included in this bill language that maybe nobody is totally happy with but language dealing with the so-called Mexico City issue, which is language that would have some restraints on lobbying other governments and organizations with taxpayers' dollars to promote the changing of laws to provide for abortions or to deal with the abortion issue. It is an issue that we have been tangled with for years. I am not diminishing it by putting it that way, but it is just something that we have been trying to find a fix to. There is no easy answer. You have passionate people on both sides of the issue. And I have clearly been on one side of the issue forever. I don't think that taxpayers' dollars should be used to promote abortion. Does anybody want to question JESSE HELMS on this issue? Anybody? No.

Now, the others who are on the other side of the issue, such as Senator BIDEN, they argue very strongly. They have been consistent on the other side. This is a compromise. This is a part of the package. This is a way to deal with three very important issues in this package. It has been agreed to reluctantly, but now I think with understanding and vigor, by the Senators who are involved directly with this legislation.

So I urge my colleagues to think about it, recognize that you may not like one piece of the three or maybe two of the three, but what is the alternative? Are we never going to reorganize the State Department? Are we never going to deal with the U.N. arrearage issue? Is the abortion issue going to be involved with U.N. arrearage, State Department reorganization, IMF, appropriations bills? How long

will this go on this year? This is the solution. So I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I caution the administration and urge them to stop lobbying against this legislation, their bill. I have expressed this to the Secretary of State, in which I said, "Madam Secretary, this is the last train out of Dodge on the U.N. arrearage." Now, I don't believe it will happen—if this bill doesn't pass the Senate and if this bill is not signed by the President, then the U.N. issue is probably dead for the year.

Am I advocating that? Am I defending it? No. I am just stating a fact. I don't see how you do it. Senator HELMS and Senator BIDEN have reluctantly agreed to this process, but it is the only process, I believe, that will allow us to deal with these three difficult, complicated, but important issues.

So I hope the Senate will have a good debate today and will think about it. I don't think anybody is going to be surprised by what is in here. We do not need a lot of pontificating on either side of the aisle. You are for or against State Department reauthorization. You are for or against the U.N. arrearage issue. And you may be for or against the abortion issue. But this is a reasonable solution, and I hope it will pass when we vote on it Tuesday at 2:25.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

---

#### BILL PLACED ON THE CALENDAR— S. 1981

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, before I yield the floor, I understand there is a bill at the desk that is due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1981) to preserve the balance of rights between employers, employees and labor organizations which is fundamental to our system of collective bargaining while preserving the rights of workers to organize, or otherwise engage in concerted activities protected under the National Labor Relations Act.

Mr. LOTT. I object to further proceedings on this matter at this time, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

---

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

---

#### FOREIGN AFFAIRS REFORM AND RESTRUCTURING ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to consideration of a report of the committee of conference on the bill (H.R. 1757) to consolidate international affairs agencies, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State

and related agencies for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and for other purposes, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1757), have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by majority of the conferees.

The Senate proceeded to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of March 10, 1998.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 6 hours of debate equally divided in the usual form. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the distinguished occupant of the chair, who is a valued member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I say good morning to him, and all the others who are here this morning.

Mr. President, back in the middle of the 20th century—and when I say that I sound like I'm talking about a long time ago—Congress created a number of temporary, independent federal agencies. I think it was a bad mistake. If I had been here, I would not have voted to do that, having the hindsight that I have. But, of course, members of Congress did not have the hindsight. They had just gone through, not too many years earlier, a horrible World War and were trying to get this Government stabilized, trying to help get the rest of the world stabilized. This seemed like a good idea, to create these specialized, independent Federal agencies.

Ronald Reagan, when he was President, had to deal with what these independent agencies had become—and they did grow mighty independent. He would say, "There is nothing so near eternal life as a temporary Federal agency."

I read the other day that the responsibilities of just one of these agencies is duplicated by about 42 other entities in the Federal Government. And of course the cost of running the U.S. bureaucracy has risen constantly. Furthermore, there is what has become an interesting psychology among those who not only run these agencies but are employed by them. The agencies have become the personal little fiefdoms of these bureaucrats, and they fight tenaciously at any attempt to do away with their turf or, as this conference report proposes to do, to mesh these agencies with the rest of the State Department foreign policy apparatus. In order to pass this legislation, we have gone through a great deal of difficulty, but turf protection is only one of the difficulties. Let me proceed, if I may, to give some further historical reference, with an assessment of the situation that now exists.

Of course, we have before us as the pending official business the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998, which I believe, it is fair to say, is the most comprehensive and far-

reaching foreign policy reform ever considered by the Congress of the United States regarding both the United Nations and the executive branch of this country. Now then, the distinguished Senator from Delaware and I, and many others, have spent not months but years working on this proposition. We made every proper and reasonable concession in arriving at the general draft of this legislation that is now before us in the form of a conference report issued by the House and the Senate.

So it has been the result of long and painstaking negotiations between the Congress and the administration. The sweeping and bipartisan reforms contained in this conference report are clearly designed to enhance America's post-cold war foreign-policy-making process and to force some fundamental reforms on the United Nations.

With the full support of the administration, this legislation shuts down two Federal agencies—the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the U.S. Information Agency. I say “now.” That is a relative term, in terms of doing something in the Federal Government. It has to be done within the next 18 months.

The legislation also requires the Secretary of State to rein in the existing increasingly unwieldy U.S. foreign aid agency, the Agency for International Development, and it strengthens the independence of U.S. public diplomacy and international broadcasting programs.

The legislation also mandates a series of deep-seated reforms at the United Nations, which many Members of this Senate and of the House of Representatives have been demanding for years. I remember the distinguished Senator from Kansas, a gentle lady if there ever was one, Nancy Kassebaum, whose ire was raised when she found out what was going on in terms of irresponsibility in the operation of the United Nations.

How to get it under control? I am going to discuss that in some detail in just a minute. All you hear these days is talk about how wonderful the United Nations is—and that is not so, it is a bureaucratic nightmare—and how bad the United States and the American people are for not paying what is called “the arrearages.” Hogwash. For more than a year, I have worked with Senator BIDEN, Senator GRAMS, Senator GREGG, and others, to create a package of reform benchmarks—reforms that the State Department must certify that the United Nations has completed—before they are paid any of these so-called arrearages. In other words, it is a very clear put up or shut up.

For months, we negotiated these reforms with the State Department and the White House. In fact, we even shared our proposals with Kofi Annan, the distinguished Secretary-General of the United Nations, so that the international elite in New York and Geneva

would not be blindsided by these requirements for reform of the United Nations.

Kofi Annan came down and visited me one day. We had a nice visit. We went to several places on Capitol Hill together. One by one—in S. 116, down on the first floor of this Capitol, which is one of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing rooms—we went down the list, benchmark by benchmark by benchmark by benchmark, and he nodded, and he nodded, and he nodded.

This conference report contains the fruits of hundreds of hours of bipartisan negotiations. Maybe it could be done better, but I don't know anybody in this Senate who is going to take the time to do it better, because it is going to take hundreds upon hundreds more hours to change the kinds of things that we worked out.

You are going to have the lobbyists from the United Nations piling all over Senators, “Oh, you can't do this, we've got to have our money right now.” You are going to have lobbyists for this agency and this independent agency and all the rest. They don't want to be folded into the foreign policy apparatus that exists and which costs billions upon billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money.

It is either now or never. The game playing is over, and the enactment of this legislation represented by this conference report between the House and the Senate is the last shot the President will have at enacting this legislation. If members want to go home and tell their constituents, “Well, I didn't like this aspect,” or “I didn't like that aspect,” I am going to be right behind you saying, “Yes, but ‘what he didn't do’ or ‘what she didn't do’ is vote to clean up a mess in Washington, DC.”

This conference report, as I say, contains the fruits of hundreds upon hundreds of hours of labor. Once these U.N. reform benchmarks are implemented, only then will be made \$819 million available for the United Nations and other international organizations. In addition, the President will be authorized to forgive an additional \$107 million in debt that the United Nations owes the United States. Nobody ever mentions that. Of course, it is a lot bigger than that when you figure in the American people have paid for all of these police actions that the United Nations has been doing all around the world. But that is neither here nor there for the time being.

What I am saying, Mr. President, is that there has been no disagreement about any of these provisions. So the substance of this bill, a complete overhaul of our Government's foreign policy apparatus, and the reform of the United Nations, which has to come before a dollar changes hands, remains virtually unchanged since the Senate passed this bill, by a vote of 90 to 5, on June 17, 1997.

Let me restate for the obvious an important point. This conference report

remains virtually unchanged from the bill passed by the Senate by a vote of 90 to 5 last year. The Senate has overwhelmingly endorsed the reforms, and the Clinton administration has signed off on them. Let's see who reneges on this agreement. Will it be the administration? Will the administration veto this bill because of two or three lines that it happens not to like? We will find out, won't we?

All those Senators who say, “Well, I don't like this aspect of it, so I'm not going to vote for any of it,” had better be prepared to explain what they, in effect, voted against. If they want to come and sit down and talk with JOE BIDEN and me, we will explain the purpose and the reason for everything in this bill.

And yet—and this is bothersome to me, I confess—we are now facing a razor-thin majority vote in the Senate. We might not even have a majority. Far from lobbying the Senate for passage of this legislation, the President has been standing over there in the wings and has indicated that he may veto the bill, the substance of which his administration had negotiated with us and agreed to with us.

Why is the President threatening to veto this bill? One small provision—a few words included by our House colleagues—section 1816 bars American organizations from using U.S. taxpayers' dollars to lobby foreign governments to change their abortion laws. I guarantee you, that is all there is to it, and the President sits down on Pennsylvania Avenue and says, “If you don't take that out, I'm going to veto it; I don't care whether you save billions of dollars or not.”

Mr. President, as they do in grade school, this is show-and-tell day—put-up-or-shut-up.

I tell you one thing, I have tried to get along with the administration, but if the administration vetoes this bill because of those few lines, I am going to go do everything I can, go everywhere I can and explain exactly what the President did. I have dealt with him on this thing and he has been very accommodating, and so have his people, but if he wants trouble on this bill, just veto it, and I will give him some trouble.

That little provision for which he is threatening to veto this bill—let me repeat—it stops those who advocate abortion—that is the deliberate destruction of innocent and helpless human life—from using tax dollars paid by the American people to lobby foreign governments to change their policies on abortion.

I did not want to have the subject mentioned. I could have put it in this bill when it went through the Senate, but I thought we ought to address the real problem in this bill, and that is this foreign policy apparatus which has become so bloated and with so many other Federal entities running around duplicating each other's business.

I do not believe in my heart of hearts, or cannot believe, that Mr.

Clinton and his Democratic allies in the Senate would be willing to sacrifice the payment of U.N. arrears—one of their top foreign policy priorities—just to preserve the ability of nongovernmental organizations to use American tax money to lobby foreign governments on the question of abortion. I refuse to believe that the President is going to “pick up his pen,” as Ronald Reagan used to say, and veto it. If he does, some of us are going to react.

But that is exactly what a lot of people are proposing in the Senate: “Oh, I can’t vote for it because of that abortion language.” They don’t care anything about all the millions of dollars this legislation is going to save, or about the elimination of the duplication of bureaucracy. Instead, two or three little lines involving, what I regard anyhow, an abuse of American taxpayers’ money, are the grounds for voting against this bill.

Some on the other side have been heard going around calling section 1816 the “Mexico City” policy. It “ain’t” the Mexico City policy, not a bit of it. I helped write the Mexico City policy way back when Ronald Reagan, by Executive order, made it part of this country’s position. But don’t take my word for it. I want every Senator to read the bill or the conference report, especially section 1816. And to help them look for it and find it, section 1816 is on page 102 of this conference report. If you can’t find page 102 of the conference report, come right here, and I will find it and put it in your little hot hands. But let’s not play games about it. Put up or shut up, show and tell.

What did Ronald Reagan’s Mexico City policy do? It forbade any expenditure of U.S. taxpayer money going to any organizations that performed abortions abroad.

Ronald Reagan was a strong and sincere, genuine pro-life President. You do not see many of them coming along. The provision in this conference report does not do what the Mexico City policy did.

As much as I wish it were otherwise, section 1816 will not cut off funding to organizations that perform abortions as required under President Reagan’s original Mexico City policy. All section 1816 does is simply prohibit population control groups from using American taxpayers’ money,—which they will receive under current law anyhow—to lobby foreign countries to overturn their laws pertaining to abortion. That is it, sum total. If anybody in the press or the media doubt it, come on down here; we will talk about it. No, they are not even here. There is one lonely soul sitting up there in the media gallery.

Initially, last year, the House did include or try to include President Reagan’s full Mexico City language in this bill. When the House did that, the Clinton administration said, “No. The President will veto this bill.” And there ensued a months-long standoff

which lasted until the waning hours of the last session of Congress.

Now, then, Mr. President, despite my personal support—my personal support—for the Mexico City policy, I urged my House colleagues to remove that provision from the bill. I said, “We can fight that battle on another battleground. Let’s not kill this one opportunity we are going to have to re-vamp and consolidate and shape up the foreign policy apparatus of this country.” I did this because I knew that the President would never accept a full reversal of his administration’s stand on the Mexico City policy which was totally at odds with those of the stand of Ronald Reagan.

Last November, in an effort to reach a compromise, the House of Representatives’ leaders watered down the abortion language in the bill to the point that I have stated over and over this morning—simply to ban the use of U.S. dollars to lobby foreign governments to change their abortion laws. But despite an exceedingly reasonable offer from the House, this was still not good enough for the administration. The administration rejected this compromise as the session came to an end last year, citing nonbinding report language that they claim would have barred the U.S. groups from even attending international conferences aimed at changing abortion laws. This they said would amount—get this, Mr. President—this would amount to a “gag rule.”

Come this spring, House leaders offered a second compromise. They agreed to remove the offending report language, softening it simply to prevent the use of U.S. tax dollars to sponsor such conferences. So it is all right to attend them, but do not use tax money to sponsor them. In fact, I have to say this about the House leadership. They have been so reasonable in their efforts to reach a compromise that today the abortion language before us in this legislation is so limited that its approval would be little more than a symbolic concession on the part of the Clinton administration.

But even that appears to be too much from what I hear because the lobbyists say all Democrats must vote against this bill. That is the word I am hearing floating around. And we will see when the roll is called on it. We will see.

At this point it is unreasonable, I think, to suggest that it is the House leaders who have been exhibiting intransigence. While the House has offered compromise after compromise, giving up 90 percent of their ground, the administration still, to this day, is demanding total and complete capitulation. What they are saying is: “Kill the conference report. Forget it. Don’t do away with any of these irrelevant, unnecessary Federal agencies and the bureaucracies. Let’s keep on keeping on.” They do not seem to care what the costs are. I have not heard that mentioned one time—not one time—by the administration.

Mr. President, I am not going to take any more of the Senate’s time discuss-

ing this issue, because I do not view it as central to the reforms contained in the conference report. I want to get back to that before I turn over the podium to my good, fine friend, Senator BIDEN.

Mr. President, not anybody—not the administration, not the Democrats, certainly not JESSE HELMS—got everything any of us wanted in this conference report. I acknowledge that. But we did work together in a remarkably novel way to cooperate, and to craft the legislation that is before the Senate today that forms the conference report. This legislation, save for one single provision on international abortion lobbying, is the result of strong bipartisan consensus. And that is a novelty around this place. And that is the reason it passed the Senate the first time around 90-5.

I think, Mr. President, it will be a terrible mistake for the Senate Democrats and the White House to kill these absolutely imperative, essential, necessary reforms in order to defend the bureaucratic status quo at the United Nations, not to mention within our own executive branch, to defend the bloated foreign policy apparatus.

So let me be candid. This legislation represents quite possibly the last chance to bring true, deep-seated change to the United Nations in return for U.S. arrearages payments. If Democrats succeed in voting down this conference report or if the President chooses to veto this legislation, then they together will decide what is going to happen in the future; they will bear sole responsibility, I think, for the unpaid dues to the United Nations. And nobody is going to tell Kofi Annan, if this conference report goes down in the Senate or if it is vetoed by the President, “The check’s in the mail,” because it is never going to be in the mail, certainly not if I have anything to do with it.

This Senator, for one, will delay crying, weeping, when the White House complains that funding has not been made available to the United Nations. Next time I see the President I am going to say, “Mr. President, you did it. You did it.”

Mr. President, I yield the floor. Thank you very much.

Mr. BIDEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, there is not much that my colleague from North Carolina, the chairman of the committee, has said that I take issue with. Sitting with my staff here, as I was waiting to speak, I said, “I have this long statement that is prepared that goes into detail about the bill. The truth of the matter is, the debate here is almost not about the bill, not about the conference report.”

I can and I guess I will at some point do what I probably shouldn’t do and that is second-guess what the rationale and motivation of the House leadership

is and what the rationale and motivation of the President and administration is relative to the one thing that doesn't have a darn thing to do with what the Senator and I worked so hard to put together—and, I might add, the Presiding Officer, as well is a member of the committee. He will remember we spent a lot of time on this—a lot of time.

There has been talk, led by my friend from North Carolina, about reorganizing the State Department for the past several years. Nothing ever really happened. There was a lot of work, don't get me wrong, but in terms of producing something that would become law, nothing ever happened.

We have been debating and talking about U.N. arrearages. We have really been debating the U.N. arrearages, or whether or not it was a reasonable, functional, useful organization. That has been a raging debate probably since the mid-1980s. It has been around for a long time but, in terms of the political chemistry on this floor of the U.S. Senate, for the last probably 10 to 12 years in earnest. As a matter of fact, I think my friend from North Carolina would acknowledge with me that in both our political parties it has taken on, in the fringes of our parties, a status that far exceeds anything about what the United Nations does or doesn't do. On one end of my party it is the salvation of the world, and on the other end of the Senator's party it is the Devil incarnate. It has kind of replaced the fervor that involved the debate for and against communism. It is a new thing, a new political dynamic.

We worked very hard and we actually came up with a resolution. I respectfully suggest that what we did—and we made serious compromises—the Senator from North Carolina did not come to this conclusion gently, nor did the Senator from Delaware in terms of the compromise relative to what we did in the United Nations here. But the vast majority of the people who are informed on this issue, both in politics and in the foreign policy establishment and in the world community, acknowledge that what we did is a reasonable, straightforward and, I think, significant piece of work.

I don't want to get my friend from North Carolina in trouble. I think the most significant thing about it is the Senator from North Carolina signed on to this. That puts in perspective not only the arrearages but what he has wanted to do to get the United Nations to change its tune a little bit. Hopefully, we will not be arguing another decade about whether or not it is a salvation of the world or the Devil incarnate. We will have a pretty clear-eyed view of what we expect of the United Nations and what we think its value is. That is a very valuable contribution all by itself, in my opinion.

The third thing we did here, and I am sure my friend will not mind my saying this because we both said it publicly in different iterations over the last year

or so—when I inherited this job from the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, who retired, I went to see the chairman. We came here together, same year, same time. We have been friends; we have been ideological foes. We have been on the opposite sides on issues, and we have been together. We have been hanging out with each other for 25 years. I went to him and I said—which is, I guess, uncharacteristically blunt for me—“We can play this flat or we can play this round, Mr. Chairman; how do you want to do this?”

He came back and said, “JOE, what are your priorities? What is important to you? This is what is important to me. Let's agree with what we can, and fight it out where we cannot agree.” He has kept his word in everything he said to me. I said, “It is important to me, with the end of the cold war, the Berlin wall down, that we do not cut back our foreign policy establishment.” As we are cutting back our defense establishment I think as far as we should cut it back, cutting back our defense establishment, there is a need for us to extend our foreign policy reach and establishment, whether it means embassies or consulates or enough personnel or intense involvement in other countries. He said, “It is not my intention in reorganization to emasculate the foreign policy,” the 150 function, as we call it in budget parlance.

So the third piece of this deal here is the State Department has been trying to get full funding for all its operations for years. And it is in here. Now there are reorganization provisions. The President agreed to the reorganization, and we put the structure of it into this bill. The Administration didn't like some of it. But the Senator and I agreed it was necessary. And in return we got a pretty balanced package here.

Now, so far, so good, as they say. The Senator, I think, is fond of telling the joke about the guy who jumps off the 100-story building and as he passes the 50th floor a group of people are standing at a window and yell out, “How is it going?” And the guy falling down says, “So far, so good.” That is how I felt about this whole operation. I am feeling real good. We just haven't hit the ground yet. Everything we have done I am, quite frankly, proud of.

I think we have made what has to happen. In a democracy of 250 million people, we make compromises. But the end result is, I think this conference report strengthens the foreign policy and the ability to conduct foreign policy and the security of the United States of America.

Now, that is the so-far-so-good part. We both knew, the chairman and I, that the President wanted fast track, something he feels very strongly about. He probably could have saved fast track if he were willing to compromise on Mexico City, although that wasn't attached. I understand at the end of the day there were some in the House who said, if you attach this, we will go along with fast track. He didn't do it then. He didn't do it on other things.

By the way, I have to say for the Record, because I want to be straight up about this, my colleagues know this, but so that everybody understands how I approach this, the abortion issue is not one that I live and die on. I think government should stay out of the business. I vote against funding of abortion and I vote against restrictions on a woman's right to an abortion, which makes everyone angry with me. The only person happy with me is me, in my conscience. But this for me is not on the list of the 10 most important issues facing America. It doesn't make that list for me. I must admit I do not have the passion for or against what is being debated in here to think it is warranted or worthy of being attached to what I consider to be a serious array of foreign policy considerations affecting this Nation.

On the other hand, the Senator from North Carolina does. It is a matter of great passion and commitment to him. His opposition to abortion from the day we arrived on this floor of the U.S. Senate and I first became acquainted with him to today has not waned a bit. I respect him for that. I disagree with his approach—at least most of it. I vote against funding, so that part we agree on, but I disagree with his approach. But I respect it, as I do people like my friend Senator BARBARA BOXER and others who vehemently feel the other way on both funding and access.

The reason I bother to tell you that, Mr. President, is this. It took nothing on my part, I had to make no compromise to say to our House friends and to our friends in the Senate, we want to keep Mexico City off of this; but it did take some real sacrifice on the part of my friend from North Carolina to say, as he did last year, look, keep this off. There are other vehicles. We can fight this out other places. Don't confuse it with this historic undertaking.

We have, I think, accomplished, in at least what we passed out of the Senate—I will be straight up with everybody. We hung tough on that. The truth of the matter was neither one of us were able to affect the House's attitude toward this. The one thing I think we share a lot in common, the one thing the chairman and I share in common is we are realists. We have been here for 25 years; we know how this place works. This is not something that—not because we are so smart, you would have to be an idiot to be here 25 years and not know how it works—speaking for myself. It is pretty clear that once we could not control what would happen in the House and what Representative SMITH—who, I might add, I suspect, although he knows a lot about the issue, knows a lot less about the issue than my friend from North Carolina. My friend from North Carolina was dealing with this issue before a lot of other people knew it existed. It became clear that we could not do much about it.

Although the chairman and I still disagree on a number of things, one

thing we have established—and I am proud of it, and I think he is too—is that we are absolutely straight with each other. So he came to me and said, “Look, JOE, this is in. They are going to compromise on this, but it’s going to be in. So my position now, JOE, is it’s in, so let’s pass the whole thing.” I tried my best and kept my promise, I stuck with my commitment, but I told him, “If it’s in, I am going to have a problem sticking with the deal—that is, pushing this through.”

Let me tell you why. It has less to do with the merits of the argument relating to Mexico City than it does if we pass it here with this attached, even though the President will veto it. I am going to be completely blunt about this. If we pass this, my worry is that it will embolden the “Congressmen Smiths” and others to suggest that they can keep doing this on everything that comes over here. I want to tell my friend straight up, that is my rationale.

I am of the view—and this is like reading the entrails of goats and guessing like the soothsayers did 2,000 years ago what is going to motivate Members of the House or an administration to act or not act. My feeling is, since the Senate has not passed this Mexico City language in the past, and there is a majority that votes against Mexico City language—and this is purely presumptuous on my part—if Speaker GINGRICH, keeping his commitment to his people, put it in, he realizes and is able to say, the Senate will not pass this, the President will not veto it, let’s move on; we have a better chance of getting to the spot we want to get to—the Senator and I—which is to clear up the U.N. arrearages, reorganize the State Department, and fully fund the State Department.

So I guess what I am saying is, the only place we disagree is tactically what is the better thing to do to get what we both want, notwithstanding that we disagree on Mexico City. I vote against Mexico City restrictions; the Senator votes for them. But I don’t think that is what is motivating either one of us here at this moment. To speak for myself, that is not what is motivating me at the moment. What motivates me at the moment is, what do I tell my colleagues on my side of the aisle, a fair number of whom listen to me on these issues—and that is presumptuous to say, but it is just because I am the ranking member. What do I tell them is the most likely route for us, at the end of the day, to be able to get the State Department reorganized, get the U.N. arrearages paid, and funding for the State Department through the supplemental?

The conclusion I have reached—and I would not bet college tuition on it for my daughter—is to stand firm, demonstrate there are not enough votes here to pass Mexico City, with the knowledge the President is going to veto it and the pressure is to get on with the business of foreign policy. I could be wrong about that.

One way or another, I think it is fair to say that at least the Senator and I know—from different perspectives—that isn’t going to become law. The President is going to veto this with this language attached. I could—and I am inclined to, because I am proud of it—spend a great deal of time talking about the merits of each of the pieces of this conference report. I will refrain from that, because I would be preaching to the choir. I am preaching to the author here. It is not like I am going to say anything he doesn’t know.

I can put in the RECORD the details of what constitutes what we have accomplished and what is in the conference report. In many respects, the conference reported back a better bill than we put out. In many ways, it has been a better bill. But time is our enemy. Time is our enemy.

I must again be completely blunt with my colleagues. At one point, I counseled that we not even debate this, let’s vote, get it over with, and send it to the President and let it be vetoed. I believe the more time we take to deal with the U.N., the more difficult and intransigent the U.N. becomes, the harder it is for Ambassador Richardson to take what we have given him and get the results we want, the harder it is for us to unravel a State Department that needs unraveling, in terms of reorganization. Time is not our friend.

I read on the way down this morning on the train—I commute every day from my home State of Delaware. I have a little ritual, and my friend knows about this. I read my local paper because of its interest and out of self-defense, I read the New York Times, and I read the Wall Street Journal, and that gets me to Baltimore. From Baltimore on, I prepare whatever I am going to do that morning. So commuting 4 hours a day isn’t all bad, because you have a lot of time to prepare.

On the way down, I read in the New York Times this morning’s lead article about the IMF. It is pretty clearly unrelated to this issue but tangentially involved with the issue of Mexico City. But it looks like IMF isn’t going to go anywhere. I will not put this in the RECORD. I don’t often put in news articles. But this is on page 9 of the New York Times, entitled, “GOP Snubs White House on Billions for IMF.”

Well, there are only three or four major foreign policy considerations on our plate right now. NATO is a big one, and the Senator and I will deal with this come Tuesday. Then there is IMF, the U.N., and reorganization of the State Department. It seems to me—and I do not in any way—and I give my friend my word on this—direct any of this at him or to anyone in particular. It seems a shame that three of those four major issues get tied up in what is in fact a divisive and, understandably, national debate relating to abortion.

Sometimes I wish we had the House rules, which say that whatever you do has to be germane. But then I am not so sure, because I realize they can get

the Rules Committee to do anything they want. But it is too bad we can’t say that we are going to debate foreign policy and settle it, that we are going to fight out abortion, and that we will fight out education, and so forth. I understand the practical reasons why that is not the case, but the truth is that it creates real problems.

The one and only place—and I will cease after this—where I disagree with my friend from North Carolina, the chairman of the full committee, is on this issue of whether or not there has in fact been a compromise that has been put forward by the House leadership on the issue of Mexico City. It has been stated—and this is the only place I disagree with my friend—that the House anti-abortion forces, led by SMITH of New Jersey and GINGRICH, the Speaker, compromised on 90 percent of what the Mexico City language is. In truth, I think that is illusory. I don’t think there is any compromise.

Let me for the record, for those who are going to make difficult decisions here on how to vote—I am going to vote no on this bill. The reason I am going to vote no on this bill is because I am opposed to Mexico City. That is true. But that is not the main reason I am going to vote no. To be honest with you, were I President of the United States, I would have a harder time deciding whether to veto this or not because I care so much about the three provisions.

Arguably, someone could say why not swallow on another provision that you strongly disagree with, but in comparative weight, in terms of how it affects the national interest, arguably you should go ahead and not veto. But I am not President. I am a U.S. Senator. As a U.S. Senator, I am obliged to explain my rationale for why I am going to vote against this. I am reiterating what I said at the outset. I think if we vote no in this body, whether you are for or against Mexico City, we, quite frankly, take the House leadership off of a bit of a dilemma. I believe in my heart that much of the House leadership would rather this not have been in this bill. They know how important this is, even though I am not questioning their support for the Mexico City language.

It is a little bit like my saying I feel very, very strongly about tobacco companies being able to target advertising to children—very strongly. I think they have been outrageous in what they have done. Should I attach that tobacco language to this foreign policy bill? Would that be appropriate no matter how strongly I feel about it? Should I say I am not going to fund the United Nations arrearages, I am not going to reorganize the State Department, I am not going to fund the State Department, and, by the way, although it is not in this bill, I am not going to replenish the International Monetary Fund even though there is an economic crisis in Asia that could still spill over to the United States? And the single

most significant thing we could do to stop that from happening is regenerate confidence to the degree that everyone knows there is enough money in the IMF to help these countries get back on their feet. Should I say because of my feeling about tobacco advertising that I am ready to scuttle all three of those? I think that is inappropriate.

I think the House leadership—I could be wrong, but I think the majority of the House thinks it is inappropriate. It does not matter. A minority in the House, as has occurred in the Senate, with Democrats as well as Republicans, on other issues, both of us have attacked it. I think the strongest message we could send is to stop it. The Senate is not going to accept it. The President clearly will not accept it, because then I think the leadership on the other side will say, "Look, minority within our minority. I know this is important to you. I kept my commitment to you. We tried it. Now let's get down to the business of the Nation."

I could be wrong about that. But that is why JOE BIDEN is voting against the thing that he, at least 49 percent, was responsible for creating, this bill, along with the 51 percent of my friends, including the Senator from North Carolina. I cannot think of anything other than the crime bill that I put as much time into than this. This is a little bit like sacrificing your child. I put a lot of time and energy, and my staff put in hundreds of hours, as has the chairman's staff. I am proud of our product. But I know the President is going to veto this. What is going to embolden the CHRIS SMITHS of the world to continue to throw a monkey wrench into the foreign policy of this Nation?

My point to my colleagues on my side of the aisle is to vote no. That, coupled with the President being against it, maybe will allow us to get down to the regular business of the Senate again. But I could be wrong.

Again, this is a tactical judgment, from my standpoint, on how we get on with conducting the foreign policy of this Nation and taking on our responsibilities in the U.S. Senate to do that.

But having said that, let me make sure everybody understands what Mexico City is. You say to people out there, "Well, this is about Mexico City. Well, is it about smog? What do you mean Mexico City? What is this about? Corruption? Drugs? No. It is about Mexico City."

Mexico City is a consequence of a reference to a meeting which took place on population planning back in 1984 where a whole bunch of nations got together under the auspices of the U.N. They were going to meet in Mexico City and decide how they should deal with the notion of population planning. The Reagan administration announced administratively a new policy on international population assistance, which was a change in what the U.S. Government policy had been as it related to assisting organizations involved in population planning in other countries.

Let me make a very important distinction. Even I had to go back and read this. This is not about involving any restrictions on governmental agencies. Money we send to the Mexican Government, the Mexican Government can use in population planning funds—if we send them any—any way they want with one restriction, and it is the Helms law. Senator HELMS—and I supported it—argued that we should not be sending taxpayer dollars to other countries in the form of foreign aid if those other countries, or private organizations within those countries, are going to take our taxpayer dollars and perform abortions—in the case of China, coerced abortions, where the Chinese Government has coerced people into having abortions, forced abortions, to maintain this one-child policy, one child per family. So it became law. It is still law. Under the Helms amendment, taxpayer dollars collected and sent overseas, in what most people would refer to as foreign aid, cannot be used to perform or to coerce abortions. That is the law.

Mexico City is in addition to that. Mexico City says—I caution my staff to correct me if I make even any nuance mistake about this because it is important—Mexico City comes along and it does two things. It says when the United States, by whatever mechanism, sends American taxpayer dollars to nongovernmental organizations instead of to the comparable Department of Health and Social Services in Mexico—for example, they have a comparable agency in their Federal Government like we have in ours—sending funds to them, it gets treated one way. Sending funds to, say, Mexico City Planned Parenthood, not a U.S. corporation, not a U.S. entity, but a Mexican entity, or any other country, in Argentina, in China, in Vietnam, the Mexico City directive of President Reagan said not only can they not use their funds because the Helms amendment blocks use of any taxpayer dollars—OK? Not only the government, but to these private agencies. The addition that President Reagan, through Executive order, laid out was the following. It said not only can they not use our funds, the money we send, say, to Planned Parenthood Mexico, they cannot use their funds—let me get this straight for everybody. Right now, if we sent, through a population control program, money to Planned Parenthood Mexico, Planned Parenthood Vietnam, Planned Parenthood—I don't know that they have one but assume they do—and we sent money to the Government of Vietnam, the Government of Mexico, the government of another country, as well for population control under our law, if we find out they, either the private agency, or the government, is using that money to perform abortions, then it is against Federal law. We stop doing it. It is the Helms amendment. It cannot be done.

OK. That is the law. That is not in question here. That is the law now, and

it will stay the law. But this is a different deal. Former President Reagan said not only do we want to stop that; we want to stop these nongovernmental agencies from using their own money. So now Planned Parenthood in Mexico gets a dollar of U.S. taxpayers' money; they can't use that dollar to perform abortions. They can't use that dollar to go out there and be promoting those abortions. OK.

But now let's say they have a fundraiser in Mexico City, and all Mexican citizens show up and they contribute \$2. So they have \$3 to spend now, two of their own that they raised that has nothing to do with taxpayers' dollars and one that is the American taxpayers' dollar. Mexico City says they can't even use their own dollars, their own money to do either of two things: One, to perform abortions or, two, to lobby their own Government on anything relating to abortion.

Now, the irony here is if they were the Right to Life Committee in Mexico City, they also could not lobby with their own money their Government to end abortions. It is a gag rule. We are saying what we can't say to their Government—even Mr. SMITH and others have not tried to say—any money we send to the Mexican Government to control population can't be used to perform abortions, and if they take any of our money they can't use any of their own money to do anything relating to abortion. We don't say that. We know we can't tell another Government they can't use their own tax dollars, but we feel we can tell a nongovernment agency, these NGOs they talk about, nongovernment organizations, we think we can tell them what they can do not only with the money we send them but with their own money.

That is the objection this President has. By the way, we went through a similar debate here in the United States on the so-called gag rule. It would be unconstitutional. We could not say to local Planned Parenthood in Duluth, MN, "You are getting some Federal funding; you can't use the Federal money. . . ." We can say that. But we could not then say, "With your money, you can't even tell anybody who comes in to see you about the options that are available." We can't say to a local doctor in the United States of America, "Look, we can pass a law saying you cannot perform an abortion with taxpayer dollars"—we could do that, but under our first amendment we could not say to the doctor or clinic, using their own funds, you cannot counsel the patient, "By the way, there are four ways to deal with your problem. One of them is . . ." We can't do that.

That is what we call the gag rule. But we are going to gag the world. We are going to tell the world, if you are involved with us in any way, you not only in accepting our dollars cannot use our dollars, you can't use your own dollars. The President and a vast majority of my colleagues feel very

strongly—I admit they feel more strongly than I do—about that as a matter of principle.

So what is this fight about? Where did the compromise come in? What did the House do to make this Mexico City language more palatable or reflect what is called a compromise by my friend from North Carolina? Well, the compromise contained in this report would put Mexico City into place, make it law—it is not law now, but it was an Executive order, by the way, from President Bush and President Reagan, and eliminated by President Clinton. This would now put into legislation Mexico City language. But here is what the language said. It would permit the President to waive the restriction on U.S. funds to a group that used its own money to perform abortions. Hardly any of these groups do that. So it is really not giving up much, and it would require the President to say, you can use your own money to perform an abortion.

That is allegedly the compromise. But let's look at what it leaves in place. And by the way, there would be a small financial cost in doing so. Population funds would then be limited to \$356 million in that year as opposed to \$385 million if he exercised this waiver. That is the penalty the President would pay to waive. But there is no waiver authority on the provision which is referred to as the lobbying restriction. And this is the more important provision because (a) few of the organizations that receive population funds actually perform abortions, and (b) from the administration's viewpoint, the principle worth upholding is one embodied in the first amendment of our Constitution, and that is this provision restricts free debate.

In fact, the reason the restriction applies only to foreign organizations and not domestic organizations is that it wouldn't be permitted under our Constitution under the first amendment if we tried to apply this language to an American nongovernmental organization. It would be unconstitutional.

Now, the statement of the managers in the conference report elaborates on the definition of lobbying and makes it clear that the provision is in fact designed to restrict speech. What are we doing now? We are telling them they can't use their own money to speak to their own Government, not our Government, not our money, can't use their own money to speak to their own Government about the issue of procreation.

Let me read the managers' statement, fancy term for saying what is contained in the attachment to this legislation. This is relating to what constitutes lobbying. "Such practices include not only overt lobbying for such changes but also such other activities as sponsoring rather than merely attending conferences and workshops on the alleged defects of the abortion laws as well as drafting and distributing of materials or public

statements calling attention to defects in the country's abortion laws."

That is pretty broad. That is the problem the administration has. This is so far-reaching in terms of what it does as it relates to speech that as a matter of principle they have made no bones about it; 3 days after they came into office they scrapped this language. It is now being forced down their throat if they want to be able to conduct the foreign policy of the United States of America.

So my disagreement with my friend from North Carolina relates only to whether or not this is really a compromise. None of the language is changed. Only the ability of the President to waive the first section, not the second section. And by my understanding the managers' definition of what constitutes lobbying is even broader than anyone reasonably would think lobbying is in our country.

Now, I think this is antidemocratic. It is a gag rule. It is inappropriate for us to do this. It interferes in ways we should not be interfering. And it will have no impact, in my view, on whether there are more or fewer or lesser abortions performed in the United States of America. As a matter of fact, I am of the view—and I am, as I think 99 percent of Americans are, opposed to abortion. No one likes abortion. Even among those who have had one and/or perform them, I don't know anybody who likes abortion. But I think, ironically, Mexico City could cause more abortions to be performed worldwide. If Mexico City's restrictions are reimposed, several population organizations, including the largest in the world, the International Planned Parenthood Federation, will not any longer take any U.S. population control money. They are going to say, "If the price for us taking your money is we have to not use any of our money ever again, then we don't want your money." Is that a good idea? What have we accomplished?

I think these restrictions could lead to significant cutbacks in family planning assistance in several countries. Such assistance increasing access—for example, assistance to increase access to contraceptive services, to information related to everything from the rhythm method to the use of condoms to the use of the pill, all those things which are critical in preventing unwanted pregnancies—I think that the lessening of the amount of money available for that, because you know these organizations are not going to accept U.S. money, I think it is going to increase the number of abortions.

I think this is especially so in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, where abortion, under the Communist period, was often the method used for family planning. For example, in Kazakhstan, U.S. assistance to some two dozen clinics, Planned Parenthood-type clinics in Kazakhstan from 1993 to 1994, led to a 41 percent decline in the number of abortions performed in that country.

Did you hear what I just said? When we were engaged in pointing out to the people of Kazakhstan what alternatives they had to deal with unwanted pregnancies other than abortion, and that information was made available, the number of abortions declined by 41 percent. In Russia, contraceptive use increased from 19 percent to 24 percent in the years 1990 to 1994. During this period, from 1990 to 1994, the number of abortions dropped from 3.6 million performed in Russia to 2.8 million. If, like me, you want to stop abortions, you had over 800,000 fewer abortions in Russia because we were providing money to train and to make available information to Russian women and men about the use of contraceptives.

But what are these organizations going to do now, when they say, if we give them money, they know they can't even talk to their governments or attend conferences and talk about abortion? They are not going to take the money.

In Ukraine, the Ministry of Health reported an 8.6 percent decrease in abortions between January and June of 1996, which it directly attributes to the women's reproductive health program that began in 1995 with U.S. funding. For every 100 abortions performed in the 6 months before, there were 8 fewer performed in the next 6 months. Why? Because of population services.

Now, look, I don't mean to, I don't intend to, and I don't pretend to want to engage my friend in a debate on abortion. As I said when he was necessarily off the floor, the only place we disagree as it relates to this conference report is how much of a compromise the House really made. I would argue essentially they made no compromise and allowed the President to waive in one circumstance the Mexico City restriction which is hardly ever used anyway. I think—I know from the administration's perspective and the majority of my colleagues on this side and about 8 or 10 on your side, that it is a larger principle of whether or not we can impose internationally a gag rule that can't be imposed nationally because of our first amendment. Again, I am not arguing the merits of it, but I am arguing that is enough, I think, to doom this conference report.

And I will conclude by saying—and I thank my friend for his indulgence—but I conclude by saying the only other thing we probably disagree on, and only of late, is tactically what is the best way to get what we both want done. I think if the Senate rejects, as well as the President veto's threat exists, tactically that puts up more of a wall that says, Look, let's deal with foreign policy, not with Mexico City on this; pick another vehicle.

But I want to tell you—and I don't say this to be solicitous—I don't know anyone who is tactically smarter, in terms of Senate procedure, than my friend from North Carolina. We have both been here the same number of years, but I do not have his knowledge

and experience relative to the rules. But I think I have almost as much of an instinct about what will motivate or not motivate our colleagues in the House or the Senate.

So, again, we disagree on only two points: One, this is not much of a compromise on Mexico City; two, tactically I am urging my colleagues to vote "no" to make the point that this is not an easy access, to keep attaching this kind of language. Because it will allow, in my view, the leadership in the House to say, "Look, if we want to get something done, let's not attach it."

That is my rationale. We have no disagreement on the legislation. We both made real compromises on the core of this. I think we both, on both our parts—it is presumptuous of me to say this and self-serving for me to say this—but think we did a good job. I think we worked the way one of the major newspapers in America said the way the committee is supposed to work. We actually heard the facts, debated it, fought it out, resolved it, and did what was reasonable in the outcome.

So I say to my friend, I don't know where this will all lead except I am confident, either because of action on this floor or by the President, this conference report is not going to become law and we are going to have to go at this again. But I fear, as he does, time is awasting. It is harder each time to put Humpty-Dumpty back together again. Time is running out. We are moving into an election year. I do not in any way question his motivation. I do not in any way suggest that I know my tactical judgment is better than his. But I have reached this conclusion—and we talked about this—I have reached this conclusion for the reasons I have stated.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, do not be misled by the modesty of the distinguished Senator from Delaware. He knows as much about tactics as anybody I have ever seen. It is true that we came here the same day. I think we have learned at the feet of certain masters that we have known. Some have gone—departed. But, anyway, it has been great working with the Senator. I appreciate his kind comments, and we will have to see how it comes out.

Mr. President, how much time remains? I believe we had, at the outset, a total of 6 hours allocated. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HELMS. How much time remains on each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator HELMS has 2 hours 31 minutes; Senator BIDEN has—somewhat less than that.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair, and I thank the Parliamentarian.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—and I know the Senator from

Delaware will agree—that any quorum call that occurs during this allotted time be charged equally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HELMS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, can the Chair advise the Senator from Vermont where we are on the time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware used 50 minutes of the 3 hours. In consequence, to his side, there are 2 hours 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. BIDEN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEAHY. Yes.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, is the time in control of the Senator from Delaware?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I yield as much time as my friend from Vermont would like, and I ask unanimous consent that since I am going to be absent from the floor, that he have the authority to yield any time he wishes as well. I have 2 hours 10 minutes left. I yield up to 2 hours 5 minutes to my friend from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Thank you, Mr. President. I assure my friend from Delaware, I will not utilize all that time. I yield myself such time as I require within those constraints.

Mr. President, when the Senate passed its version of the State authorization bill last year, it contained no reference at all to international family planning or the Mexico City policy, which, as we know, restricts U.S. Government funds to private family planning organizations. The reason for that was obvious. Family planning has nothing to do with the State authorization bill.

This bill is about how many Assistant Secretaries of State there will be, the bureaus, how they are set up, and so on. It is not about running Planned Parenthood.

The House saw things differently. Unfortunately, a minority in the House saw yet another opportunity to hold hostage important foreign policy legislation, and they did, like funding for the United Nations and the reorganization of the State Department. In doing so, they sought to force the President to embrace a discredited family planning policy he has repeatedly and publicly rejected.

For some reason, the House seems to think that sending it down to the White House to get a certain veto represents some kind of victory, when all it does is guarantee that we will revisit this issue again and again and again.

When I came to the Senate, we had members of both parties who tried to represent the United States in the best way possible. They would join in a bipartisan agreement on foreign policy, to act in ways that would make the United States as strong as possible.

Somehow, in the past few years, we have some who seek to make political points or fill out forms on fundraising letters, or whatever, and they distort the foreign policy of the United States for their own short-term political gain. It is almost as though, with their ego, they feel that whatever their issue is all that matters, and the foreign policy of the United States can be thrown overboard. They are going to make their point, they are going to send out their fundraising letters, they are going to recruit their supporters based on how they might distort the foreign policy of the United States, and they could care less of the consequences. I will give you an example.

An agreement was reached last year with the Republican leadership and the Democratic leadership of the House and the Senate and the President of the United States that we would pay the dues that we owe under law and under treaty and under agreement to the United Nations. It is money we agreed to pay, are legally obligated to pay, and have not paid.

Then, on the very day that the United States was asking the Security Council of the United Nations to stand solidly with us on the question of sanctions on Iraq, on the very day that the United States was asking a disparate group in the Security Council to agree with us against Saddam Hussein and his refusal to comply with his obligations under the Security Council resolutions, on that same day the Republican leadership of the House of Representatives broke its word—broke its word to the President, broke its word to the American people, broke its word to the Congress—and killed the bill to pay our dues to the United Nations.

And why? Because a handful of people in the House of Representatives wanted to include the so-called Mexico City language that did not have the support of even a majority of the Senate not to mention enough votes to override a veto, and which the President had made unequivocally clear he would veto.

The U.S. Congress should have the honesty and the maturity to put the interests of the country ahead of the individual political interests of Members. We are asked to do this often as we should be. There has to be some reason for serving here other than sending out fundraising letters or making political points. Maybe it seems novel to some, but I come from the old school and we Vermonters feel that the country comes first.

Mr. President, it would be one thing if the only problem with the Mexico City policy were that it is totally non-germane to this bill, which it is, but it

is a lot worse than that. It is anti-family planning, anti-free speech, anti-women, anti-children, and flies in the face of the very democratic principles we are encouraging other countries to adopt. It is among the most illogical and misguided approaches to an issue I have seen in my time here.

What the House has done is send us a conference report that we have no opportunity to amend, which contains a controversial provision that was not in the Senate version, that was never voted on by the Senate, that is certain to be vetoed and which, despite repeated attempts, has not won a majority of votes in the Senate for over a decade.

Mr. President, we could simply voice vote this conference report and let the President veto it, but that would resolve nothing since the proponents of the Mexico City policy would simply play the same game with the IMF supplemental, and if that failed, with the other appropriations bills. I am waiting for them to put it on a bill dealing with highways or national forests or agricultural research or some other thing. The rules are irrelevant to them. Logic is irrelevant to them. Good sense is irrelevant to them. And the interests of the country are apparently irrelevant.

The only way we are going to put a stop to these antics is for the Senate to reject the Mexico City policy altogether, for the Senate to stand up and say, "We will not play these games." We will be the Nation's conscience.

I am among those who believe we should pay our debts to the United Nations. If the United States gives its word that it is going to do something, then we should do it. We bring our children up that way. We tell them if they give their word, they ought to keep their word. Well, we are the ones who are the keepers of the word of the United States. When the United States gives its word, we ought to be honest enough to back it up.

The United Nations is helping solve global problems that we could not possibly solve by ourselves, even though they are problems that affect the United States of America. Unfortunately, the amount authorized here falls far short of what we owe, and it is encumbered with too many restrictions.

Others, including the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, want to reorganize the State Department. But if we pass this conference report with the Mexico City language, there will be no State reorganization because it will be vetoed and it will be held hostage by the House indefinitely.

So the Senator from Vermont believes there is only one option: Defeat it, and send it back to the House. There are no guarantees, but that is our best hope of getting the Mexico City policy stricken from this bill so the President can sign it.

Before I discuss what this version of the Mexico City policy would do, let

me remind all Senators what should be common knowledge. United States law explicitly prohibits the use of U.S. Government funds to pay for abortion or to lobby for abortion. That has been the law for years. You wouldn't know it to hear some of the proponents of the Mexico City policy talk. But that is the law. We have passed it time and time again. We have all voted for that. In fact, the last time I believe was about 6 months ago.

We will have our next opportunity to vote to reaffirm that prohibition on the Foreign Operations bill in a couple of months. No one needs to worry about where they stand on that.

So when the proponents of the House Mexico City language say it is needed to ensure that taxpayer funds are not used for abortion, they conveniently forget to mention that our law already prohibits that. I remember the "Saturday Night Live" character Dana Carvey, who would say, "Isn't that convenient." Well, for them it is convenient.

Because what they really want to do is prohibit funding for private organizations that use their own funds for abortion even where abortion is legal. In fact, the version that is in this conference report goes even further. It would prohibit those private organizations from even speaking about abortion.

Now, can't you imagine how we would all react if the Parliament or the Congress or ruling committee of any other country passed a law, and standing up they would say, "In this law, no private organization in the United States can speak on a particular issue." Lord love us all, Mr. President, there would be such a flood of Senators and House Members to come down and say, "How dare they. How dare they, in that"—and fill in the blank of whatever country it is—"How dare they tell the United States what to say or people in the United States what they can say."

Yet that is what the House would have us do. We would laugh them out of the Chamber because it would so obviously violate our first amendment. But we have some in the other body who do not believe that private organizations, even American organizations, have the right of free speech outside our country.

I was going to say that they should reread our history, but it is apparent that I presume too much. They should simply read it. Do we really want to go down this road? This isn't a Democratic issue or a Republican issue; it is a free speech issue. It is about the right of people to voice their opinions as representatives of private organizations where it is legal to do so. It is shameful for the U.S. Congress, which the world looks to as a beacon of free speech and democracy, to even think of curtailing that right. And yet the House would have us do that in countries that are struggling to become more democratic and more free.

What kind of an example is that? How can the same people stand up and say, we stand for the principles of America, except in those instances where they conflict with whatever our political agenda is and then we are willing to trample on them?

What is described innocently as a lobby ban is in fact a gag rule that flies in the face of efforts to reduce unsafe abortion worldwide. Private organizations receiving U.S. funds would be prohibited from even calling attention to defects in legal abortion laws. They would be prohibited from trying to make abortion safer and reduce the number of women worldwide—hundreds of thousands of women—who die from unsafe abortions. Why on Earth would we want to do that?

Members of the House argue they have made a difficult concession by allowing the President to waive one of the restrictions. Either they are joking or they assume we do not bother to read what we are voting on. They fail to mention that if the President exercises the waiver, which they fully expect him to do, scarce family planning funds would be cut an additional \$44 million in this year alone, meaning a \$224 million cut from the 1995 level.

What would be the consequence? Millions of women who might otherwise receive access to family planning would become pregnant, and there would be millions of abortions that otherwise would have been prevented. The evidence that voluntary family planning reduces unwarranted pregnancies and abortions is beyond dispute. It can be seen in every country in the world. The irony is that the provisions sent to us by the other body would result in more abortions, not fewer, because it would sharply cut funding for family planning.

Now, let us be honest. They say they don't want abortions. That is fine. I respect that. Who wants abortions? I wish there would never be another one. But you don't accomplish that by cutting money for family planning. It is so logical. If you have good family planning the number of unwanted pregnancies goes down and the number of abortions goes down. You can't say, "We don't want you to have abortions but we also don't want you to have contraceptives." Be honest. That is what it comes down to.

Studies done in the United States show that the use of family planning reduces the probability of a woman having an abortion by a staggering 85 percent. In Russia, the average woman had seven abortions in her life, but since AID began providing modern contraceptives to Russia the number of abortions has gone way down and continues to go down.

In Kazakhstan, AID support for family planning clinics led to a 59 percent increase in contraceptive use and a 41 percent decrease in abortion among women served by the clinics. There have been similar declines of abortions

when contraceptives were made available from Latin America to eastern Europe. In one of the poorest countries, Bangladesh, where abortion is prohibited, education about contraceptives and alternatives to abortion has contributed to a significant reduction in fertility rates over the past 10 years. Even in Bangladesh, where abortion is illegal, 50,000 women are hospitalized each year because of complications from illegal, unsafe abortions. Family planning funding will help reduce those numbers. These are women's lives that are saved. Why do the people who support the Mexico City language not care about them? Is it because they live in a different country?

Another argument they make is that although U.S. funds are not spent on abortion they free up other funds that are spent on abortion. The old "money is fungible" argument. Do they really want to go down that road? Do they really want to say we cannot send aid to countries because they might use some of that aid on abortion because abortion is legal there? Does that mean that because abortion is legal in Israel—we give aid to Israel, it is deposited in the Israeli Treasury—that we should shut off U.S. aid to Israel because other Israeli Government funds are used for abortion? Whoops, not going to do that, and I am not suggesting we should. Obviously, we are not going to cut aid to Israel because the Israeli Government supports abortion. But why should the rules be different for private citizens? If anything, they should have more protection to speak freely. They are not a government. They ought to be able to speak freely.

Should we stop funding nuclear safety programs in Russia because abortion is legal there and abortions are provided at government hospitals? Should we say that we will put at risk the lives of Americans for a nuclear accident and cut off funds for nuclear safety programs in Russia because they won't make abortion illegal? Maybe we should cut off aid to any State in the United States because abortion is legal. That would be all 50 States.

Of all things, family planning is something we should support. Unlike nuclear safety, it does help reduce the number of abortions. Yet the Mexico City policy would prevent us from supporting private family planning organizations. Crazy, absolutely crazy.

Mr. President, whether you are pro-choice or pro-life, you should oppose the Mexico City policy. One of my best friends in the U.S. Senate, a man I admire greatly, a man who was a mentor to me when I first came to the Senate, served as chairman of our Senate Appropriations Committee, is now retired, the former distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, Senator Hatfield. He is strongly pro-life. I greatly respected Senator Mark Hatfield for that. I greatly respected him for a lot of things because I felt he was a man who always followed his conscience. He opposed the Mexico City policy not be-

cause he is pro-abortion, he was adamantly the other way, but because he said if you have family planning, especially with the U.S. prohibition against using it for abortion—if you have family planning the number of abortions will go down. He knew from the hearings we had in the Appropriations.

Voting for the Mexico City policy may make for a good press release, but it would cut funding for family planning. It would increase the number of abortions. We should reject this attempt to push this misguided policy down our throats. We should send the bill back to the House.

Mr. President, before I yield the floor I want to say a final word about the tactics used here. These are vitally important foreign policy programs, but this is the second time in 6 months that the House has used this type of blackmail. This is the second time in 6 months a small group in the House has pushed their political agenda no matter how much damage it might do to the integrity and the word of the United States worldwide—last year, it was the IMF and U.N. funding; this year it is the U.N. funding and they are threatening again to block funding for the IMF. If that fails, it would be funding for disaster relief in Vermont or California or Minnesota, Oregon, or anywhere else.

And all because they do not have the votes to override a veto of the Mexico City policy. Whatever happened to democracy, to the legislative process? Instead, we have a handful who prefer gridlock and blackmail. They shut down the Government first and now this. If it were up to them they would hold hostage billions of dollars for these economic and security programs indefinitely. No wonder the Congress is seen by so many Americans as an embarrassment.

Mr. President, I have been proud to serve in the U.S. Senate for almost 24 years. I am proud that the people of Vermont have sent me to this body. In our over 200-year history, I am the only member of my party to ever serve in the U.S. Senate. But the other party sent great, great leaders that I revere and admire, people I try to emulate. The Senators from Vermont have always felt that the integrity of the United States must be protected, that the United States, when it gives its word, must stand by it. The first Ambassador to the United Nations was a Vermonter who gave up his seat in the U.S. Senate to be appointed to that post, to again stand up and say that when the United States gives its word, it keeps it.

I hope that some—mostly in the other body, and maybe some in this body—will step back and say, let us worry less about our own political lives and our own political future, for whatever short moment that may be, and think in the long term for our country. None of us owns a seat in the U.S. Senate; I don't, the distinguished Presiding Officer doesn't, none of us do. It is

the same in the other body. We are privileged and honored to represent our States for the time that we are here. Most of us do it with a great deal of care and in the interest of our State and our country. I know my friends who are on the floor here at this moment are all people who fall into that category.

But there are always times when we have to say that the political interests we may have individually are greatly outweighed by the interests of the United States of America, because we will come and go, the country will remain, and the country can either be weakened or strengthened by what we do. This is a time when we ought to stand up and fulfill the obligations of the United States, fulfill our high standards, and keep our word. So in this case, I hope that this conference report is defeated.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Oregon). The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, the pending business before the Senate is the Conference Report on H.R. 1757, the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act. I take the other side of this issue. I strongly encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support passage of this important foreign policy initiative.

As Chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations of the Foreign Relations Committee, I spent many hours along with my colleagues on the Committee and with the Clinton Administration crafting legislation which will strengthen America's leadership role in the international arena.

This Conference Report is a true "reform" bill. H.R.1757 abolishes two federal agencies and reorganizes their essential functions into the Department of State. It brings long overdue reform to the United Nations. It prioritizes our international affairs expenditures and authorizes important foreign policy initiatives. In fact, the core reforms contained in this legislation were originally approved by the Senate by a vote of 90-5 on June 17, 1997.

I think it is fair to say that this is one of the most far-reaching and comprehensive foreign affairs bills undertaken by the Congress. This reflects Congressional acknowledgment of the need to create a more effective foreign affairs apparatus, both at home and at the UN, in order to confront the post-Cold War challenges to U.S. peace and security.

The pending legislation is the result of a good-faith effort to accommodate conflicting perspectives on how we, as a nation, should allocate our resources. There were tough, lengthy negotiations on this package. We had to reconcile competing interests, and as a result, no one can claim that the final product contains everything that they would wish. I will be the first to say that this bill does not contain all of the reforms

I originally sought. I would have preferred much more in the way of reforms and budget discipline. But this is a good agreement; and in this case, we must not let the perfect be the enemy of the good.

Now, let me say that I understand some on the other side of the aisle may vote against this bill, and the President has indicated his intention to veto it, because of a provision that contains a part of the so-called "Mexico City" language. Specifically, section 1816 of this bill would prohibit organizations that receive U.S. taxpayer dollars from lobbying to change abortion laws—either for or against—overseas.

Now, let me make clear some of the important initiatives that would not be enacted if this Conference Report is defeated.

The President and the Secretary of State have indicated that payment of U.S. arrears to the United Nations is a top priority. This bill would authorize a three-year payment plan of \$819 million, and an additional \$107 million in debt reduction, to the United Nations and other international organizations in return for comprehensive management and fiscal reform of the United Nations. Rejection of this conference report would eliminate this funding and kill the management and fiscal reform measures.

The President and the Secretary of State have agreed that a fundamental restructuring of U.S. foreign affairs agencies is long overdue. This bill eliminates the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the U.S. Information Agency and folds their functions into the State Department, while still maintaining firewalls between the State Department and the essential broadcasting activities and public diplomacy of USIA. It also consolidates certain functions of the Agency for International Development into the State Department and grants the Secretary of State greater authority over foreign aid spending. Without the pending legislation, this reorganization cannot go forward.

The Drug Czar, General McCaffrey, has agreed that keeping our children free from drugs is a top priority. This bill requires the State Department to develop and implement a comprehensive counternarcotics strategy. Without this bill, this important initiative will not go forward.

The Secretary has been a tireless advocate for investment in the U.S. diplomatic infrastructure, citing examples of deplorable conditions of U.S. missions overseas, including ambassadors washing dishes in bathtubs, and outdated computer systems. This bill fully funds the capital investment fund and provides urgently needed resources for embassy construction in Berlin and Beijing.

Containment of Saddam Hussein and support for a democratic movement in Iraq are essential to advancing democracy in the Gulf. This bill authorizes programs to assist a democratic Iraqi

resistance, to create a Radio Free Iraq broadcast, and to reconstruct communities not under the control of Saddam Hussein. None of these programs will be authorized if this legislation is not enacted.

Mr. President, this Conference Report lays out comprehensive and achievable reforms, both here at home in the nation's foreign affairs bureaucracy and in the United Nations. My visits to the U.N. as the U.S. Congressional Delegate to the U.N. General Assembly served to reinforce my commitment to salvage this organization. In this age, any organization burdened with a bloated bureaucracy and no mechanisms to control spending, will collapse under the weight of its own inefficiency. If we do not take a leadership role in reforming the U.N. now, a powerful, entrenched U.N. bureaucracy looking after its own short-term interests may condemn the U.N. to irrelevance as we move into the 21st Century.

When Secretary of State Albright was serving as Ambassador to the U.N., she warned that "poor management" could be the U.N.'s "Achilles' heel" saying, "I cannot justify to the taxpayers of my country some of the personnel arrangements, the sweetheart pension deals, the lack of accountability, the waste of resources, the duplication of effort and the lack of attention to the bottom line we often see around here."

Well, Congress cannot justify these excesses to the American taxpayers either. That is why we have stepped forward with a bipartisan reform plan that will compel the United Nations to address these concerns. As I stated previously, the pending legislation provides a three-year payment of \$819 million in arrears to the United Nations and \$107 million in debt reduction that the U.N. owes that U.S. in conjunction with the achievement of specific benchmarks that will help enhance the vitality of the U.N.

Mr. President, this bill also takes steps to address another concern of mine, and that is the move to ensure that survivors of torture will be treated with the compassion which they deserve. One provision that I authored prohibits the involuntary return of any person to a country in which there are substantial grounds for believing that he or she would be in danger of being subjected to torture. Another provision authorizes the U.S. to contribute \$3 million in fiscal 1998 and another \$3 million in fiscal year 1999 to the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture, ensuring that treatment centers in more than 50 countries will continue to receive support.

The United States should take a leading role in encouraging the establishment of additional programs, both at home and abroad, for the treatment of torture survivors. My home state of Minnesota is fortunate to have the first comprehensive treatment center in the United States for survivors of

torture. The Center for Victims of Torture has treated over 500 patients since it was established in 1985, and has enabled them to become productive members of our communities by overcoming the atrocities suffered in their countries of origin. We must continue to support treatment centers, like the one in Minnesota, which help those who cannot help themselves—survivors of torture. Dedicating more of our U.N. voluntary funds for this purpose will help provide this important service to more needy survivors.

I strongly believe the U.N. is an important forum for debate between member states and a vehicle for joint action when warranted. It is not a world government. However, the U.N. must endorse reforms that provide transparency and accountability so it is embraced as an important world forum for discussion and for coordinating action to promote international peace and security, not as a world government. I firmly believe that this package will improve the U.N. and assist it in winning back public support in the United States.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation. I commend the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee for his diligence and perseverance in achieving this comprehensive reform plan.

Little has changed since the Senate approved this legislation last November by voice vote, and last July by a vote of 90-5. It certainly would be disappointing, and I believe short-sighted, now to reject reorganization, payment of U.N. arrears, and other key foreign policy initiatives because the President has decided that single-issue politics is more important than U.S. foreign policy interests. My colleagues should heed the warning of the Secretary of State that failure to pay the U.N. arrears would result in a "shut-down for our national security policy." If this is the case, then it would be irresponsible to reject these funds because of opposition to the prohibition on U.S. aid recipients against lobbying foreign governments to change their abortion laws. Mr. President, this legislation advances key American foreign policy interests, and I hope that all of my colleagues will support its passage.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, there are several provisions in this conference report which trouble me greatly. For example, the bill abolishes the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA) and merges its functions into the Department of State. As one who has always believed that there are sensible ways to reorganize our foreign affairs agencies, I do not oppose this merger. However, I am concerned that the bill fails to augment the State Department's budget in fiscal year 1999 to ensure that the vital activities for which ACDA is now responsible will continue. The bill also perpetuates and increases funding for international broadcasting activities—an approach

which, in my view, is not the most effective use of scarce resources at a time when there are so many other sources of information available globally. However, the main reason why I am going to vote against this conference report is that it imposes unacceptable conditions on funding for international family planning organizations.

Section 1816 of the bill was offered by Congressman CHRIS SMITH in a sham conference process in which no Democrat from the Senate or the House was invited to participate. It has been billed by its author as a so-called "compromise" to bridge the gap between the House, which has voted to reinstate the Mexico City policy of the Reagan and Bush administrations, and the Senate, which has repeatedly supported the Clinton Administration's decision to abandon it. The Mexico City policy ended assistance to private family planning organizations overseas if the organization was involved in voluntary abortion activities even if US funds were not used for such activities. Of course, since 1973 US funding for abortions overseas has been banned by law and international family planning organizations have been prohibited from using US funds to pay for abortions. Even abortion opponents agree that there is no direct US funding of abortions abroad.

Make no mistake about it. The Smith provision is no compromise. First, it tries to dictate how foreign family planning organizations use their own funds by mandating that no US population assistance may be given to any foreign organization unless the organization certifies that it will not use its own funds to counsel or perform abortions. If the President exercises the waiver of this provision, funding for family planning activities will be cut by \$44 million.

Far worse, however, is the expanded ban on lobbying which amounts to a gag rule on organizations receiving US population funding. The Smith provision prohibits funding for any foreign organization that "engages 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." The statement of managers makes it clear that the phrase "alter the laws or governmental policies" is broadened well beyond traditional lobbying to include "sponsoring conferences, and workshops on the alleged defects of the abortion laws, as well as the drafting and distribution of materials or public statements calling attention to such alleged defects." In other words, under this prohibition, which is not waivable, any foreign organization which dares to enter a legitimate public policy debate on the abortion issue in its own country would be denied US family planning assistance.

The lobby ban in the Smith amendment is anti-democratic in every sense

of the word. As Secretary of State Albright has said, it is "basically a gag rule that would punish organizations for engaging in the democratic process in foreign countries and for engaging in legal activities that would be protected by the First Amendment if carried out in the United States." It sacrifices free speech, a right we Americans hold dear, for ideological purposes on the abortion issue.

This gag rule harkens back to the old days of American imperialism by telling others in foreign countries what they can and cannot say and do. It runs counter to our long held belief in pluralism, open political processes and democratic participation, and it undermines a central tenet of our foreign policy: encouraging democratic political practices abroad and participation by non governmental organizations in those processes.

The Mexico City provision in this conference report, with its gag rule, will not reduce the number of abortions but rather increase it. The effect of this provision, if enacted, would be to cut funding for family planning programs, thereby decreasing access to the most effective means of reducing abortion.

Finally, Mr. President, I think it is a travesty that the reorganization of our foreign affairs agencies—an issue on which the Administration and the Congress have finally found common ground after much disagreement—and our efforts to pay our debts at the United Nations and promote much-needed reform in that body are being held hostage to a domestic issue which is irrelevant to the substance and goals of this bill. This is not the proper place or the proper time to engage yet again in a debate over Mexico City. For this reason alone, I urge my colleagues to vote against this conference report.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LIEBERMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. LIEBERMAN pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 216 are located in today's RECORD under "Submission of Concurrent and Senate Resolutions.")

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that I be able to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. GRAMS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1982 are

located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, what is the pending business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the conference report to accompany H.R. 1757, the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, has the Pastore rule run its course for the day?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That will not expire until 1:20 today.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I therefore ask unanimous consent that I may speak out of order for such time as I may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ISTEA

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on Wednesday evening, the committee of conference on the reauthorization of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act, or ISTEA, had its first opportunity to sit down in full conference and discuss the differences between H.R. 2400 and S. 1173, respectively, the House- and Senate-passed highway bills. As a Senator who is not a member of the conference committee but as a Senator who is, nevertheless, deeply committed to increasing substantially the size of our national investment in transportation infrastructure, I rise to urge the conferees to complete expeditiously their deliberations on the highway reauthorization bill. The conferees and all Senators are fully cognizant of the imminent—the imminent—arrival of May 1, the date beyond which all States will be prohibited by law from obligating any Federal-aid highway funds.

Senators will recall that, during the months of February and March, I and a number of other supporters of the Byrd/Gramm/Baucus/Warner amendment, spoke on the Senate floor on a daily basis to discuss the critical need for the Senate to turn immediately to the ISTEA, or the highway, reauthorization bill. I thought it was extremely important that all 100 Senators, all 50 Governors, and the thousands of State legislators and mayors and transportation agencies throughout our Nation were fully aware that the Surface Transportation Extension Act—the short-term ISTEA extension bill passed at the end of last year—includes a deadline on the authorization of our federal aid highway and transit programs. That short-term bill, P.L. 105-130, the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 1997, includes the following passage, and I quote from the law of the land.

The Magna Carta of 1215, which the English barons forced King John to sign at Runnymede on the meadow near the Thames River, had a phrase