

and SHAYS changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. QUINN) having assumed the chair, Mr. SNOWBARGER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1127) to amend the Antiquities Act to require an act of Congress and the concurrence of the Governor and State legislature for the establishment by the President of national monuments in excess of 5,000 acres, pursuant to House Resolution 256, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 197, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 495]

YEAS—229

Aderholt	Bilbray	Buyer
Archer	Bilirakis	Callahan
Armye	Bishop	Calvert
Bachus	Billey	Camp
Baesler	Blunt	Campbell
Baker	Boehkert	Canady
Ballenger	Boehner	Cannon
Barcia	Bonilla	Castle
Barr	Bono	Chabot
Barrett (NE)	Boswell	Chambliss
Bartlett	Boyd	Chenoweth
Barton	Brady	Christensen
Bass	Bryant	Coble
Bateman	Bunning	Coburn
Bereuter	Burr	Collins
Berry	Burton	Combest

Condit	Inglis	Riggs	Manton	Pallone	Sherman
Cook	Istook	Riley	Markey	Pascrell	Skaggs
Cooksey	Jenkins	Rogan	Martinez	Pastor	Slaughter
Cox	Johnson, Sam	Rogers	Mascara	Payne	Smith (NJ)
Cramer	Jones	Rohrabacher	Matsui	Pease	Smith, Adam
Crane	Kasich	Ros-Lehtinen	McCarthy (MO)	Pelosi	Snyder
Crapo	Kim	Royce	McCarthy (NY)	Pomeroy	Spratt
Cubin	King (NY)	Ryun	McDermott	Porter	Stabenow
Cunningham	Kingston	Salmon	McGovern	Poshard	Stark
Danner	Klink	Sandlin	McHale	Price (NC)	Stokes
Deal	Klug	Sanford	McIntyre	Quinn	Strickland
DeLay	Knollenberg	Scarborough	McKinney	Rahall	Tauscher
Diaz-Balart	Kolbe	Schaefer, Dan	McNulty	Ramstad	Taylor (MS)
Dickey	LaHood	Schaffer, Bob	Meehan	Rangel	Thurman
Dooley	Largent	Sensenbrenner	Meek	Reyes	Tierney
Doolittle	Latham	Sessions	Menendez	Rivers	Torres
Dreier	LaTourrette	Shadegg	Millender-McDonald	Rodriguez	Torres
Duncan	Lewis (CA)	Shaw	Miller (CA)	Roemer	Towns
Dunn	Lewis (KY)	Shimkus	Minge	Rothman	Velazquez
Edwards	Linder	Shuster	Mink	Roukema	Vento
Ehrlich	Livingston	Sisisky	Moakley	Roybal-Allard	Visclosky
Emerson	Lucas	Skeen	Mollohan	Rush	Walsh
Ensign	Manzullo	Skelton	Moran (VA)	Sabo	Waters
Everett	McColum	Smith (MI)	Morella	Sanchez	Watt (NC)
Fawell	McCrery	Smith (OR)	Murtha	Sanders	Waxman
Foley	McDade	Smith (TX)	Nadler	Sawyer	Wexler
Fowler	McHugh	Smith, Linda	Neal	Saxton	Wise
Frelinghuysen	McInnis	Snowbarger	Obey	Schumer	Woolsey
Galleghy	McIntosh	Solomon	Olver	Scott	Wynn
Ganske	McKeon	Souder	Owens	Serrano	Yates
Gekas	Metcalf	Spence		Shays	
Gibbons	Mica	Stearns			
Gilchrest	Miller (FL)	Stenholm			
Gillmor	Moran (KS)	Stump			
Goode	Myrick	Stupak			
Goodlatte	Nethercutt	Sununu			
Goodling	Neumann	Talent			
Goss	Ney	Tanner			
Graham	Northup	Tauzin			
Granger	Norwood	Tausin			
Green	Nussle	Taylor (NC)			
Greenwood	Oberstar	Thomas			
Gutknecht	Ortiz	Thornberry			
Hall (TX)	Oxley	Thune			
Hansen	Packard	Tiahrt			
Hastert	Pappas	Trafficant			
Hastings (WA)	Parker	Turner			
Hayworth	Paul	Upton			
Hefley	Paxon	Wamp			
Herger	Peterson (MN)	Watkins			
Hill	Peterson (PA)	Watts (OK)			
Hilleary	Petri	Weldon (FL)			
Hobson	Pickering	Weldon (PA)			
Hoekstra	Pickett	Weller			
Horn	Pitts	White			
Hostettler	Pombo	Whitfield			
Houghton	Portman	Wicker			
Hulshof	Pryce (OH)	Wolf			
Hunter	Radanovich	Young (AK)			
Hutchinson	Redmond	Young (FL)			
Hyde	Regula				

NAYS—197

Abercrombie	Dicks	Hinojosa
Ackerman	Dingell	Holden
Allen	Dixon	Hooley
Andrews	Doggett	Hoyer
Baldacci	Doyle	Jackson (IL)
Barrett (WI)	Ehlers	Jackson-Lee
Bentsen	Engel	(TX)
Berman	English	John
Blagojevich	Eshoo	Johnson (CT)
Blumenauer	Etheridge	Johnson (WI)
Bonior	Evans	Johnson, E. B.
Borski	Ewing	Kanjorski
Boucher	Farr	Kaptur
Brown (CA)	Fattah	Kelly
Brown (FL)	Fazio	Kennedy (MA)
Brown (OH)	Filner	Kennedy (RI)
Capps	Flake	Kennelly
Cardin	Foglietta	Kildee
Carson	Forbes	Kilpatrick
Clay	Ford	Kind (WI)
Clayton	Fox	Kleccka
Clement	Frank (MA)	Kucinich
Clyburn	Franks (NJ)	LaFalce
Conyers	Frost	Lampson
Costello	Furse	Lantos
Coyne	Gejdenson	Lazio
Cummings	Gephardt	Leach
Davis (FL)	Gilman	Levin
Davis (IL)	Gordon	Lewis (GA)
Davis (VA)	Gutierrez	Lipinski
DeFazio	Hall (OH)	LoBiondo
DeGette	Hamilton	Lofgren
DeLauro	Harman	Lowey
Delahunt	Hastings (FL)	Luther
Dellums	Hefner	Maloney (CT)
Deutsch	Hinchee	Maloney (NY)

Becerra	Jefferson	Weygand
Gonzalez	Schiff	
Hilliard	Thompson	

NOT VOTING—7

□ 1223

Mr. STUPAK changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 256, the title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Antiquities Act regarding the establishment by the President of certain national monuments."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2159, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 2159.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LARGENT moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2159 be instructed to insist upon the provisions contained in section 581 of the House bill (relating to restrictions on assistance to foreign organizations that perform or actively promote abortions).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LARGENT] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LARGENT].

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say that very simply, the proposal that is before the House at this time to instruct the conferees on the foreign operations appropriations bill is simply

to say this is well traveled, yet controversial ground that the House has already spoken on earlier this year.

The vote was taken on the foreign operations appropriations bill to accept what is known as the Mexico City policy, and that is to say that no U.S. tax dollars are to go to any organizations that perform abortions, with the exceptions of the life of the mother, rape, and incest, and this motion to instruct the conferees on the foreign operations appropriations bill simply says to our conferees, we want them to adhere to the language that we voted 234 to 210 on on September 4.

Mr. Speaker, that is the motion to the conferees.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the motion is very simple, very straightforward. It asks our conferees to stand firm on a policy that has been in place for a decade, the Mexico City policy: that no funds of the United States that we contribute to international organizations should be used to support organizations who, in the course of family planning, advocate, promote, and perform abortions.

We do support responsible organizations that do engage in family planning but avoid any representation of or performance of abortions. American taxpayers have a right to know that their funds will not be used to pursue a policy that is antiethical to the conscience of most Americans.

Performance of abortion has been rejected by the Congress for the 2½ decades that I have served in the Congress in domestic activities; we should not support it in international activities, and I urge support of the gentleman's instruction.

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

I rise in opposition to this motion to instruct. The conferees have been working diligently to resolve all the sensitive and contentious issues in this bill, including the population issue. I think that every person in this Chamber agrees that we all must work hard to reduce the number of abortions that are performed in our country and worldwide. This motion to instruct does not achieve that. Indeed, a vote for this motion to instruct is a motion to call for a Presidential veto.

We were prepared to go to conference last evening; we resolved our outstanding issues. The conference was canceled at the last minute by the Republican leadership because they are trying to work out this problem, and this injection of the motion to instruct is not necessary. We have had at least 6 votes on this issue on 4 separate bills.

The best way to reduce the number of abortions, and that is our goal, is to have the most effective family planning.

My colleagues and I have clearly signaled a willingness to offer reasonable

alternatives through the Gilman-Pelosi substitute to provide assurances that abortion is not and will not be used as a substitute for contraception.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] said that this motion to instruct would say that no funds could go to organizations that in the course of family planning advocate, promote or perform, abortions.

□ 1230

I agree with him. That is not what this motion to instruct does, however. That is what the Gilman-Pelosi alternative proposes, but this motion to instruct is a gag rule on any organizations which are trying to advocate and provide family planning services.

Mr. Speaker, I will submit for the RECORD some of the examples of where the family planning successfully has reduced the number of abortions.

Mr. Speaker, the very Mexico City authorizing language is contained in the State Department authorization bill which is now in conference. The President has made it clear he will veto the bill if the Mexico City language is attached, and this motion here will call for a veto of our bill. It will hold hostage all of our foreign assistance, including critical money for Middle East peace at this sensitive time. The Mexico City provision will crush our international family planning efforts which work to reduce the number of abortions performed worldwide.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this motion to instruct and to allow the conferees freedom to continue their efforts to work together to resolve this difficult issue.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in this House of Representatives, are they not tired of this debate? Are they not tired of having to make this contentious vote week in and week out, month in and month out? Let us resolve the issue which recognizes our common ground in reducing the number of abortions, which recognizes U.S. law which says that no funds can be used to perform abortion internationally, the Helms law, which Senator HELMS himself wrote and which is the underlying law to all of this. This is not about any U.S. dollars going to underwrite, subsidize, or be fungible for organizations that are promoting family planning.

Maybe as in every other household in America, in this House we have to have a talk about the facts of life. We have to have a talk about the birds and the bees. If we want to reduce the number of abortions, it should be clear that effective family planning is the best way to do that. The best way to resolve the issue for us legislatively is to let the conferees work. It has to come back before this body to accept or reject. But this motion to instruct is not constructive. Indeed, it is counterproductive to our goals.

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

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New

Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who really has been lionhearted on this issue, my friend and colleague.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LARGENT] for his courage in offering this motion along with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Largent-Hyde motion to instruct conferees to the foreign ops bill to uphold the House position on the pro-life Mexico City policy—the Hyde amendment of foreign aid.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the pro-life laws and policies of almost 100 countries that restrict abortion are under siege and the engine driving this global pro-abortion push is the nongovernmental organizations funded by the U.S. Government.

The House position, adopted 234 to 191, permits the flow of funds only to those organizations that pledge to provide only family planning and not abortion. In other words, the innocent children are not put at risk.

Mr. Chairman, who we subsidize, not just what, but who we subsidize, who we give hundreds of millions of dollars—and these are discretionary funds, this is not entitlement spending—does matter.

Let me remind Members that the simple fact of the matter is that the long-standing law the Helms amendment stipulating that no U.S. funds can be directly used for abortion was found to be infirm and incomplete and riddled with loopholes. Money is fungible. The millions of dollars that we give to a group immediately frees up other funds that can be used, and in this case are used, for performing and aggressively promoting abortion.

It should matter greatly to each and every one of us not just what an organization does with its specific subsidy, but the rest of its agenda as well. It is a package deal.

Mr. Speaker, many groups use family planning as the Trojan horse to conceal their real agenda, abortion on demand. We closed those loopholes back in the mid-1980's with the implementation of the Mexico City policy. Regrettably, Mr. Clinton reinstated the loopholes.

Many Planned Parenthood affiliates around the world are leaving no stones unturned in their obsessive campaign to legalize abortion on demand around the globe. If they succeed, millions of babies will die from the violence of abortion on demand.

I urge Members again, as I did in previous debates, to carefully consider the 1992 IPPF, International Planned Parenthood Federation, abortion manifesto called Vision 2000. We call it Nightmare 2000, because it is a global strategic plan to usher in a world of free abortion. Nightmare 2000 was adopted by Planned Parenthood and its 140 affiliates in 1992 and they are trying to implement it around the world. The blueprint for action is designed to "bring pressure on governments" and

to, quote, further "campaign for policy and legislative changes to remove restrictions against abortion." In other words, topple the pro-life laws.

Mr. Speaker, can anything be more clear? Pressure governments to nullify their pro-life policies? Campaign for abortion on demand? And we, Mr. Speaker, if we fail to include the Mexico City language in our foreign policy statute will put hundreds of millions of dollars at their disposal to advance this antichild campaign of pressure.

Fred Sai, who is former chairman of IPPF, said, and I quote, "Now, for the first time the IPPF strategic plan, Vision 2000 * * * outlines activities at both the Secretariat and Family Planning Association level to further IPPF's explicit goal of increasing the right of access to abortion."

Planned Parenthood is an abortion purveyor and should not be subsidized.

Who we support does matter. Planned Parenthood's explicit goal is the eradication of every pro-life law, policy, and/or constitutional provision protecting babies on the face of the Earth. IPPF has an elaborate plan of action, to promote abortion in Central and South America where unborn children are now legally safeguarded. They have plans to repeal the pro-life laws in Africa, the Muslim countries in the Middle East, and several Asian countries as well.

In Poland, for example, the chairman of the Parliamentary Group on the Family, Stanislaw Kowolik, lashed out in public debate at the external factions in Poland for meddling in that country and pushing for liberalized abortion.

Another example of a backlash against the United States and Planned Parenthood pressure to legalize abortion is in the Philippines. A headline in the Philippine Daily Inquirer last July read: "Flavier Hits U.S. Pressure on Abortion," and then the newspaper quotes Senator Juan Flavio: "We have just celebrated our 50th anniversary of independence from America, but we can still see insidious methods of imperialism trying to subvert our self-determination by using [population control] funds as subtle leverage. I strongly oppose abortion. It is prohibited by our laws and the Philippine Constitution. Hence, we should be prepared to lose foreign funding rather than be pressured into causing the death of unborn children."

The abortion promotion by Planned Parenthood is so extreme in the Philippines that the president of IPPF's own affiliate, it is known as the Family Planning Organization of the Philippines, FPOP, resigned over what he called IPPF's hidden agenda to use his affiliate as a Trojan horse to legalize abortion.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly, strongly urge a "yes" vote for the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LARGENT] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] to affirm the House-passed language in the foreign operations bill.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, this proposal is before us because there is, evidently, a small number of very committed and determined and, some might say, zealous Members on that side of the aisle who still believe that if they hold up Government long enough, that they can get their way totally on this issue.

I think that we spent about 8 months defining our differences on this issue, and now is the time when we need to reconcile those differences on behalf of a greater good.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that we have now seen both sides of this debate, in my view, demonstrate their irresponsibility. Last week, we saw some of the groups who are most interested in family planning reject out of hand the Pelosi-Gilman amendment because it was not pure enough in promoting their goals. Now this week, we see the other side of the issue just as rigid, just as unwilling to compromise, indicating that they would rather tie up all of American foreign policy than compromise one iota on this issue.

All this motion to instruct does today is demonstrate something we have known for months, that the supporters of the Smith language have a small majority in the House but they do not have two-thirds. We have all known that before. All that does is demonstrate that a group has enough votes to get something to the House but not enough votes to get it by the President. That means that responsible adults would find a way to compromise an issue without sacrificing principle.

Now, we have already offered as a committee to try to resolve this by giving the Smith forces in this House a big win, a win which I think they ought to have, by eliminating all U.S. funds to the U.N. population program if they do not get out of China, because, in my view, they have a coercive abortion program in China.

Mr. Speaker, in my view, that is a large win that that group ought to accept. Sooner or later we have to recognize that neither one of the hard positions on this issue have enough votes to put their position into law. That means, as adults, we have to find some other way to proceed to get this bill passed.

Sooner or later, despite this motion today, which will pass but which will have no great import in terms of the eventual outcome, despite that motion, we will have to get down to getting our business done. All this does is stand in the way of getting our work done.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BARCIA], on the other side of the aisle, to dispel the notion that this is some right-wing, radical group on this side of the aisle.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to instruct the

conferees to insist on the House provisions reinstating the Mexico City restrictions on international family planning funding.

Mr. Speaker, as a pro-life Member, I strongly believe that our tax dollars should not be used to subsidize organizations that perform abortions or actively work to legalize abortions in developing countries.

We fought this battle in the House last month when the provision was added to the foreign operations appropriations bill. We did not add this provision as trade bait, we offered it as a matter of conscience, a matter of conviction, and a matter of morality. We cannot go back on our word on so vital an issue as the right to life. Let us not put innocent children at risk. Let us stand against the effort to bring down the pro-life policies of almost 100 countries that restrict abortion.

Mr. Speaker, our conferees must insist on this provision.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this motion to instruct. In fact, the conferees are trying to resolve this issue. We should not interfere with their work. We have had this debate already on this floor. No one is suggesting abortion on demand.

Let me point out once again the deep flaw in the policy that this motion deals with here. Under current law, current law of the United States, not one dollar of U.S. family planning funds can be used to perform or even counsel women to obtain abortions anywhere in the world. No matter what they say, no matter what they do, that is the fact. This, in fact, is a gag rule, as the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] has pointed out.

I will say this to my colleagues on our side of the aisle and on the other side of the aisle, that they are putting innocent children at risk and women at risk. For many women and children across the world, U.S. family planning aid can literally mean the difference between life and death.

Mr. Speaker, 600,000 women die in childbirth every year around the world. Access to family planning in the developing world would reduce unintended pregnancies by one-fifth. We could save the lives of 120,000 of these women. Family planning allows women and men to choose how many children they want and when to have them.

□ 1245

Spacing children further apart, breast feeding them can improve a child's chance of survival by up to 20 percent. U.S. family planning aid funds have supported health clinics around the world which give poor women their only access to preventive health services, which can detect disease like cervical cancer in the early stages and save lives. Vote against this motion to instruct. It is wrong.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT].

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Speaker, this issue comes down, to me, to a very simple proposition. We do not use taxpayer dollars to fund abortions in the United States. We certainly should not use taxpayer dollars to fund abortions in China and generally abroad.

There are millions and millions of people in this country, many of them my constituents, who are deeply opposed on grounds of conscience to abortion. Out of respect for them, and because a vast majority of this House and of this Government, at least rhetorically, wants abortion to be at least discouraged, wants public policy at least to discourage abortion, out of respect for them we are scrupulously careful not to use taxpayer dollars to fund abortions in the United States. Why should we send money abroad where it can be used to fund abortions there?

The other side says it will not be used to fund abortions; that is implicit in the language. What is wrong with making it clear, crystal clear? We are sending this money to places like China where admittedly they have policies not just of abortion but forced abortion, where thousands, maybe hundreds of thousands of women every year are forced to undergo abortion. Why should we not make it clear that our dollars, whatever they do over there, our dollars will not be used to support that?

That is what this struggle is about. It is a struggle, Mr. Speaker, where both sides are very sincere and hold their positions deeply. I credit the other side with that view. One cannot listen to the passion of their arguments without believing that.

I agree totally, we should not hold anything else hostage to this issue. We should not do it. This is an issue where Members have deeply held, sincere beliefs. Let us get this money and this policy off of the foreign ops bill and let us fight this out separately. There is no reason to hold up any other part of the foreign ops bill. Let us bring it out, aid to Israel, aid to Africa, any of the rest of it, let us bring it out and let us vote for it, and I will vote for it. But let us not tie this to the rest of that bill.

If we are going to have a dispute over this, and I hope we can work it out, if we are going to have a dispute over this, like guests in somebody's house, let us not bust up the living room. Let us at least step outside if we are going to have a fight over this. Let us pull it off of the rest of the foreign ops bill and bring it out.

There is no reason to have a big fight over this that holds up the government. I do not want that. I do not think those of us who support this measure want that. But we do not want our tax dollars to be used for abortions in China and abroad when we do not allow them to be used for abortion here.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, it either is good news or plain news to some of our colleagues on

the other side of the aisle that no U.S. dollars can be spent, may be spent, any verb we want, to use abroad on performing abortions. So to use that in an argument in this debate is not a compliment to our colleagues' intelligence. The Helms law prohibits any funds to be used for abortion. What we are advocating is funding for family planning and for those organizations who advocate family planning as a means to reduce abortions.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the very distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly rise to agree with virtually everything that the gentleman from Missouri said, with the exception of whether or not there is money for China in this bill. I understand there is not.

But I rise also to explain, while I will be voting "present" on the motion to instruct conferees, I am strongly pro-life. I have consistently voted for the Mexico City policy, along with the rest of the House. However, after three painful years of trying to get this policy through the Senate on this bill and accepted by the White House, I have come to the conclusion that we cannot codify the Mexico City policy on an appropriations bill or perhaps anywhere else until we have a Republican President.

This issue has delayed final consideration of the Foreign Operations Act for 3 years in a row. It was the last issue resolved on last year's final appropriations bill. This year it is blocking two major pieces of legislation, the Foreign Operations Appropriations Bill and the State Department authorization bill. And this is an authorization issue which should be resolved in that authorization bill, not this bill.

I would love to see the Mexico City policy enacted into law, but we have got two big problems. The Senate will not take it, and the President will not sign it. This motion to instruct the conferees simply ignores that fact. The House position is well established. What we need is a motion to instruct the Senate conferees, but the votes in the Senate are simply not there. But our biggest problem is with the President, Bill Clinton. He will veto the bill that contains Mexico City policy language, make no mistake about it.

So I sympathize with my colleagues who believe strongly as I do in the Mexico City policy, but this is a futile exercise which offers no solution, only continued stalemate. Therefore, I am voting "present."

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], the majority whip and a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LARGENT] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] bringing this motion to instruct because this is not a futile exercise. This is a motion to instruct the conferees of the House that represent the House position, to send a message to the Senate. Mr. Speaker, message to the Senate: The House will not give in on this issue, period. We will not back down. We will not back away. And we just dare the Senate to stop us in our quest.

Mr. Speaker, message to the President: If the President dares to veto this bill because of Mexico City language, we would relish it because obviously we know where the administration, particularly the Vice President, Mr. GORE, Mr. Speaker, is coming from. Because in a speech on global warming, Mr. GORE already revealed where he is coming from. He says there are too many people in this world providing too much pollution in this world and, therefore, and I quote from a newspaper article, "Vice President GORE warned that overpopulation fosters global warming, yesterday suggested expanding abortion programs in developing countries to help reduce the environmental threat."

That is what they are using this money for, Mr. Speaker. We will not back down. Message to the Senate and to the President: We will not give up on this issue.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I want the RECORD to show that Vice President GORE's speech makes no reference to advancing abortion programs to reduce population. Perhaps the gentleman was misinformed by a newspaper article.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], for whom I have a great deal of respect, the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. EWING]. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] is recognized for 3 minutes.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank both of my colleagues for yielding me this time.

Let me be very emphatic about where we are on this bill. This bill was drafted by me. It carries my name as the chief sponsor.

Regardless of what some have told my colleagues on the floor today, there is no way that anybody anywhere in the world can spend one dollar on an abortion. Let us make that perfectly clear. This is not whether or not money contained in this bill can be spent on abortion because it absolutely cannot, so let us make that clear. I wish those of my colleagues that choose to speak on this would indicate to those that they are speaking to the

prohibition that is very definitely there. None of the money in this House bill can be spent on abortions anywhere in the world, period.

Now, what we are trying to do is, as we have had to face for the last 3 years, is to handle a situation which should not even be in this bill. It should be in the authorization bill. Generally when we come to the floor the authorizers are objecting because we are putting authorizations in an appropriation bill and they say no.

The proper place for this issue to be addressed is in the Committee on International Relations. They have a bill in conference that they are trying to get it on but they do not have the votes. So they are saying, let us shift the burden of responsibility to the Committee on Appropriations, which is violative of our rules and violative of our normal procedures.

So let us look also at the fact that under my leadership, under my chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, we have cut population spending by nearly 40 percent. Does anybody come up and say, well, chairman, well subcommittee members, we appreciate the giant step that you have made? No. Instead they come and they give indication to Members of Congress that we are authorizing abortions, which we are not.

So I am leaving it up to the House people to decide. If Members want the appropriators to also be authorizers, give us carte blanche. We will do it all, if that is what they want, but they cannot pick and choose. And they cannot mislead this House with false information that there is something in this bill that would permit in any form, shape, or fashion \$1 of this money to be spent on abortions, because it is absolutely false.

So we can vote our conscience. I am pro-life. I am unashamedly pro-life. I am proud of that fact. Phyllis Schafly came to me about 3 or 4 months after the Roe versus Wade decision. I was the first legislator in the entire country to do something to try to negate some of the problems that Roe versus Wade came up with.

Anyway, my colleagues should vote their conscience on this. But this is not a vote as to whether or not any of this money can be spent on abortion because it absolutely cannot.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH].

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I have a hard time understanding, where is all the beef? The Largent motion is entirely in order. It is not out of order and we should be having this debate now. If there is absolutely no chance of any money going to fund abortions, which there is, why are we seeing the objection on the other side that is so vehement and an unwillingness on the part of some Members to address the issue instead of attacking us personally?

I think that it is very plain and clear, the President has stated that with this motion in the bill, he will veto the bill. I think the White House is making their position very plain and clear, but we in the House will not back down on this policy. That is a message to the Senate and to the White House. Yes, this is an issue we are fighting for and fighting hard for. It is appalling that Mr. GORE would try to take care of what he perceives as global warming with a new program on abortion. I say that the Largent motion is entirely in order and should be supported as the issue has been in the past.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, because the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] so eloquently explained that this is not abortion money, it is family planning for the world, I rise to oppose this motion to instruct.

□ 1300

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY], a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong opposition to this misguided motion to instruct conferees. This is just another extreme motion that aims to end family planning overseas.

The proponents of the motion claim that it simply cuts abortion funding. As the chairman of our subcommittee said so eloquently, abortion funding overseas has been prohibited since 1973, and this motion would cut abortion funding from zero to zero. There is not a dollar of funding for abortion in this bill. Therefore, this motion must be after something more, and that something is family planning.

One of the most important forms of aid that we provide to other countries is family planning assistance. No one can deny that the need for family planning services to prevent unintended pregnancies in developing countries is urgent, and the aid we provide is absolutely invaluable. When women are unable to control the number and timing of births, they will rely on abortion, often illegal, unsafe, and life-threatening.

This motion misses that critical point and continues to delay final passage of the foreign aid bill. The conferees on the foreign operations bill are working very hard to construct a foreign aid bill that will be acceptable both to the Congress and to the President, but the proponents of this motion are clearly unconcerned about the fate

of the foreign aid bill. They are ignoring the critical assistance the bill provides to some of the neediest people around the world. They are disregarding the fact that this bill creates the framework for the United States to further its foreign policy goals, and they are using the false logic that family planning equals abortion to the exclusion of all other critical issues in the bill.

Our subcommittee went to Egypt in the past year. We visited the child-maternal survival clinics. We saw the critical need. We need to help women understand how to space pregnancies. Otherwise we are creating more abortions and putting people in desperate, desperate conditions and threatening their lives.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this misguided notion and let the conference committee continue to do its work to pass a foreign aid bill.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], one of the cosponsors of the Largent-Hyde motion to instruct.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LARGENT] for yielding me this time.

There are so many things that are said that are not totally true. The gentlewoman said this is an attack on family planning. The fact is 40 percent of the money that pays for family planning in the world comes from the United States and will still come from the United States whether this succeeds or not. It is just it will not go to the organizations that perform abortions or counsel for abortions. But the money is there and it will be spent. We will drench the world with condoms, it is just not through International Planned Parenthood. So that is just not so.

The second thing is, my good friend, the gentleman from Alabama, [Mr. SONNY CALLAHAN], says not a dollar of this will go for abortion. He is so right. He is so right. Not a dollar will go for abortion. But that is not the end of the story. When the United States gives money to International Planned Parenthood we free up their money that can be spent for abortions. We facilitate abortions. So this individual dollar cannot be spent for an abortion. He is right. But by giving them these dollars, we free up other money to procure abortions.

The problem is this country has a policy of not subsidizing abortion. Why does that end at the water's edge? Why does the policy of not subsidizing abortions not extend globally? It ought to, without harming family planning.

So the gentleman is right, by law this money cannot go for abortions, but the consequences of this money frees up other moneys that go for abortions. So abortions are facilitated. And babies are just as dead if they have been facilitated into abortion as if the money has gone for abortion.

I think the motion to instruct is well advised, it is sound, it is consistent with the policy of this Congress and

this country of not paying tax dollars for abortions.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong opposition to this amendment. In the first place, it is a deliberate poison pill. The sponsor knows it is veto bait. But in addition to my opposition on tactical grounds, it should be opposed for substantive policy reasons.

When we last debated this issue in the foreign operations bill on September 4, we had the opportunity at long last to lay it to rest. We could have reached a constructive compromise by assuring one another that if in fact Federal funds meant for international family planning programs were being used to pay for abortions, they would be withheld.

It said that we would ensure if United Nations family planning money was being used in any way we did not like in China, it would redirect the funds to other family planning operations. The compromise was fair and, most importantly, it would have maintained funding for a program that in any humane context must be maintained. But the compromise failed and now we have another opportunity in conference to restore these assurances.

The Senate passed a bill without the Mexico City provision. If we include the Senate language we will operate on the continued assurance of the Hyde language that has forbidden the use of Federal funds for abortion since 1972. If we include the Senate provisions, we can continue to provide these family planning services to the families that need them so desperately, families that live in the most abject poverty and are without the resources or the education to exercise any effective control over the size of their families.

To deny them that information and risk the lives of hundreds of thousands of women who die from pregnancy-related complications is inhumane, it is cruel, it is wrong, and I urge my colleagues to allow the conferees to work out a compromise that is fair, without the added pressure of this destructive instruction.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHIMKUS].

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Largent-Hyde motion to instruct the conferees.

I am not tired of fighting for life. Once the public understands that what we have here is an elaborate shell game, shifting money to one area to free up money to another, there will be a national outcry. If we do not provide money for abortions in the United States we should not fund abortions internationally.

This elaborate shell game must end. This motion to instruct the conferees does that and allows Federal money to go where it should, family planning.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], who is a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations as well and of our Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time. As a member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct.

Child survival and maternal health programs are the cornerstone of our foreign aid bill, and access to family planning is critical to protecting the health and welfare of children and women in any and all nations that receive our assistance.

This motion is about roadblocks. It sets up roadblocks to basic health care and family planning services for women in developing countries, and it is a roadblock to passage of our foreign operations bill, which has many essential purposes.

Every day, Mr. Speaker, more than 31,000 children under the age of 5 die in developing countries. By helping women space their children at least 2 years apart, at least one in four of these infant deaths can be prevented. Every year 585,000 women, one woman for every minute of every day, dies of causes related to pregnancy and childbirth. That is an absolutely horrendous statistic, and 99 percent of these women live in developing countries. The fact is that 25 percent of these deaths can be prevented by allowing women the simple means to delay motherhood.

Family planning is critical to the lives of women around the world and especially in developing countries. These women and their children do not need any more roadblocks. I urge my colleagues to defeat this motion.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask again for the division of time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Ewing). The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LARGENT] has 13½ minutes remaining and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the majority leader.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma, for bringing this resolution to the floor, this motion to instruct conferees.

The issue here is very clear and very, very important, an issue that could hardly be more heartfelt by the people who are concerned about the way their tax dollars are used in this case. Very simply, we are saying we do not want some nearly \$400 million of American taxpayers' dollars to go to agencies without clear prohibitions against the

use of that money for the performance and the conduct of abortions.

There should be no doubt about it. Whatever other activities they do, that is another matter. But, clearly, we are insisting on the House position: American tax dollars should not be used for the promotion of or the conduct of the practice of abortion.

I encourage all my colleagues to vote "yes" on this motion.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL], a member of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, the subcommittee chairman was exceptionally clear and forceful. He deserves an awful lot of credit for his courage and the position that he has taken.

None of this money goes to perform abortions. My dear friend and our colleague, the majority leader, said no money should go to perform or conduct abortions. He is right, and none of the money does.

The debate here is about money going to an agency and then that agency counsels concerning abortion. None of our money goes to the performance of abortion, but an agency that receives the money is permitted to conduct counseling, to tell a woman about an abortion right that she may have in that country.

With the gentlewoman's permission, I wish to yield to the sponsor of the motion, if he might be able to respond to the following question, which deals with the issue of fungibility, because that is at the heart and soul of this debate.

Our good friend, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, argues fungibility. If we give money to one of these agencies, it will free up money that these agencies could otherwise use for abortions. If that were so, it seems to me the gentleman from Oklahoma ought to be opposed also to the \$1.2 billion we give to economic aid for Israel.

Israel is a country, our ally, that allows abortion, and in the appropriate circumstances government funds abortion in Israel. If fungibility is the argument, does the gentleman from Oklahoma not also oppose \$1.2 billion in aid to Israel?

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

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I was here in 1984, when the Mexico City policy was crafted, and let me remind Members that the Mexico City policy was a minimalist policy, a bottom line, a very modest policy. Countries were excluded, because in countries around the world, we only have one government. Nongovernmental organizations, there are a multitude of them. There are Planned Parenthoods, there is the Pathfinder Fund,

there is a large number of nongovernmental organizations.

We wanted to stop funding the abortion industry. Because what happens, they become an extension of our foreign policy and they use perhaps some of their own money, but money is fungible, as was stated so clearly. Our money frees up their money to crusade to bring down the right to life laws in these countries.

So I would have preferred countries were included, but they are not. We compromised that back in 1984.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] for the purposes of asking the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LARGENT] a question, but not for yielding our time to the other side to make arguments that are not a response to the gentleman's question.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I respect the gentleman, and I wish my good friend and colleague from Oklahoma had responded to my question. He chose not to. Fungibility is the issue. If it is, then it is an issue with regard to the \$1.2 billion to Israel as well.

My good friend from New Jersey said, and I just heard him say, he wished that provision was included. Well, I am pleased to hear him at least being consistent, but I think others on the side of fungibility ought to recognize that they are not being consistent.

Last, in the few seconds remaining, bear in mind that when people come for abortion services around the world, they frequently get family planning advice for the first time. For the first time. And so by allowing family planning agencies to offer advice on abortion, we prevent the second abortion.

The statistics are remarkable. About four out of five women in Tanzania who come in for abortion have never heard of family planning; two out of three in Egypt and one out of two in Turkey. So we would prevent the second abortion from happening if these women, who seek abortion advice, also receive family planning advice so another abortion does not happen.

□ 1315

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN], my friend and colleague.

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

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, on September 4, this House did give our conferees some instructions. We passed this language.

The reason that this is a problem is because our conferees are not following what we told them to do in the first place. We instructed them what to do by the very amendment that we passed in this House. There would be no conflict if they would follow the will of the House as already had been voted.

I am greatly disappointed in some of the words that I have heard spoken

today where we see process has become very much more important to many of the Members of our side than principle. When that happens in this body, God forbid what is going to happen to our land.

If we are going to abandon principle so we can get a bill passed, shame on us. Shame on us if we are going to abandon our principles. Every life is worth saving. Whether it is at the beginning, the moment of conception, or at the end, it is worth saving.

Message to the appropriation chairman: We are going to stand for life. This language should be there. We will pass this today.

Message to Mr. GORE: Life is important. It does not cause pollution. It is all valuable. Mistakes of human life may cause pollution, not babies, not children, not adults.

Message to the President: If, in fact, you want to hold up foreign appropriations over the fact that we should not be spending money to abort newborn babies in other countries in the world, something very much different than what we do here, then hold it up.

I will vote against any foreign appropriations bill that does not have that language. And I would encourage my fellow Members on this side of the aisle and the other to support this motion to instruct. It is the right thing to do on principle. To heck with the process.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I think this debate is less about principle than about the issue of the real consequences of this measure.

As the father of a new, healthy boy, I am very deeply grateful that my wife had access to early prenatal care. The real consequence of this measure, though unintended, I know, but the real consequence would be to deny thousands of women around the world the very prenatal care that my wife and I so cherished, the prenatal care that helped bring a healthy baby boy into this world.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad pro-life Members in this House have spoken out against this measure. This should not be a matter of pro-life or pro-choice. Family planning should not be that choice.

The fact is that, under the law, not one dollar of U.S. taxpayers' money can be spent anywhere in the world to provide for abortions. That is the law, period. Some have said, if we send family planning dollars abroad, organizations can free up money then for abortion. Well, using that logic, I assume the United States should stop all military aid to allies, the United States should stop military aid to countries ravaged with disease, the United States should stop all food aid to children in foreign nations who are starving to death. Perhaps we should stop dismantling nuclear warheads around the

world because those dollars could be used somehow to free up money for abortions.

Mr. Speaker, the principle I stand by is that that fungibility argument stretches logic to a point of being illogical. The fact is, family planning reduces unwanted pregnancies. The fact is that every dollar cut from family planning is going to increase the possibility of abortions around this world.

For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I will actively oppose this measure, intended well, I know, by its sponsors, whom I respect. But I think they have an obligation to also look at not just our principles but the consequences of our actions on this floor. The consequences of this measure would be ill-founded.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LARGENT] for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, this is an extremely important debate at a critical time, for two reasons. One, we have already voted in this House to instruct the conferees in a manner that they are not following. So I think it is time to reinforce our original intentions.

And the Vice President of the United States has suggested that global warming is due to lack of family planning. Intellectually, there may be some truth to that, but so far as family planning equals abortion, I hope he did not mean that. It is about time to understand that family planning does not include taxpayer dollars for abortions.

Unfortunately, without this instruction, the groups who receive the \$385 million of family planning money are, some of them, very much engaged in the business of abortion. And I bet my colleagues there are tons of pro-choice taxpayers who would say, "I do not want my dollar sent overseas to engage in abortion activities even though I may be pro-choice."

That is the issue of the moment, of the day, maybe of the century. And now is the time cleared for the House to express we disagree with the way the conference is going and we want them to get back on track. And prenatal care is not a part of family planning money. Abortion, unfortunately, is, whether we like it or not.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, can we ask how much time we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LARGENT] has 9½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTTLER].

Mr. HOSTETTTLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LARGENT] for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear what this motion does. This motion simply instructs the conferees to

hold to the House position on what has been referred to as the Mexico City policy. That policy says that agencies that perform family planning as a result of funding of the U.S. Federal Government do not take part in performing abortions or counseling abortions.

Now, there are those that have said that if this instruction goes through, that somehow family planning will end. During the Reagan administration, there were over 350 agencies that agreed to this policy, to the Mexico City policy. And so family planning will not end as a result of this. We will have plenty of folks that will take U.S. Federal taxpayers' dollars and use them for the purposes of family planning.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a common-sense approach to tell the conferees what the House wants. And what the House wants is the same thing that the American people want in the United States. We do not want to export abortion as well as keep it in the United States.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAPPAS], my friend and colleague.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. LARGENT] and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. HYDE] for offering this motion.

We are talking about the consistency, we are talking about the lives of unborn human beings. Those of us who are in the House, 435 of us throughout the country, are honored to be here and cast votes such as this, which are votes of conviction. And I have heard here today some folks, whom I have a great deal of respect for, who, as the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN] said, care more about getting something done, in my opinion, than the content of that legislation.

The American people and the citizens of the district that I represent care about not us just doing something, but care about what we do. I plan to vote for this conference instruction motion, which is consistent with the vote that we took a number of times here. I would implore the Members who have voted for this policy in the past to search their consciences once again and to be true to their convictions.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, let me respond briefly to my good friend, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] who talked about "stalemate." I would suggest to my colleagues that stalemate in the progression of legislation to save the lives of innocent children from the violence of abortion is always preferable over capitulation. Preservation of both children's lives and mothers' lives is of infinite importance. Inconvenience—even hardship in legislation—pales to insignificance in the equation.

Let us make no mistake about it, abortion is violence against children.

Dismemberment, chemical poisoning, there is no other way to construe it; abortion is violence against kids.

In response to my dear friend from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], his bill subsidizes the overseas abortion industry, the very people who are killing babies and trying to bring down the right-to-life laws of sovereign countries. So I do not think we can pretend to believe that the Helms law passed in 1973 is sufficient. The reason why the United States embraced the Mexico City policy in the first place back was because the Helms amendment was inadequate and loophole ridden.

Finally in response to Ms. PELOSI, the Vice President AL GORE clearly stated, and I have the transcript, when asked what the administration is doing in the area of global warming, launched into gloating about the demise of the pro-life Mexico City policy by Executive order. It is right here in black and white. Mr. GORE blames the babies of the poor for the consumption excesses of the rich and powerful. He makes them do the dying to advance an opinion on global warming. Mr. GORE'S message is clear. Let us rid the planet of billions of people in South America, Central America, Africa, and Asia. Sorry, but I truly believe his views to be racist and elitist. Someday soon the people of these developing nations are going to fully recognize that to some, their presence on Earth is regarded as something bad. People aren't pollution—every child has just as much right to be here as my kids—or AL GORE'S kids.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting to hear the arguments that are being made in support of this motion to instruct, because either our colleagues are not aware of the facts or they choose to ignore them.

For the RECORD, just because our colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], talked about Mr. GORE'S speech at the end, I would like to submit the Vice President's statement for the RECORD, where it very clearly points out what he did say in his speech.

And, yes the President did sign an Executive order changing the Mexico City policy. And I applaud him for that, for changing that gag rule on international family planning organizations. But the Vice President did not say what he has been quoted as saying here today.

Let us just say, in good faith, we will attribute it to practices and inaccurate news accounts, because anyone who has read the Vice President's statement will know that, in answer to his question about global population, he said the three things that the administration would advance would be child survival, availability of birth control information, and the empowerment of women, especially politically, socially, in the context of family.

That is what the Vice President talked about. I would like to submit his statement for the RECORD for all of our colleagues to see.

I think that in the course of our trying to develop an alternative so that we can make peace in this House over the issue of what our colleagues call abortion and what we are saying is family planning, this is not about abortion. They can say it all they want, but that is not what this debate is about. It is about international family planning initiatives that save lives.

Our colleagues have said that we are in support of abortion on demand. That simply is not true. It says that we want to fund organizations to promote abortions. And, indeed, our alternative did exactly the opposite of that. It said that the funds would go to organizations that do not promote international abortion as a method of family planning and, indeed, that utilize these funds to prevent abortion as a method of family planning.

They have talked about funds going to China. And our alternative not only withheld the funds from the UNFPA of the amount of funds going to China; we said, if UNFPA went into China, they would receive no funds, no funds, not just the amount that is spent in China, no funds to spend any other place in the world to address what we believed were their sincere concerns.

But I have to draw the line when our colleagues come to the floor and say that we are for abortion, we are promoting organizations that are abortion factories, that we are for abortion on demand. I hate to even say the word. I cannot even believe that I, in public or in private or in mixed company, would be using such a word, so anathema is the concept to me. But the fact is that they want to inject that most unfortunate issue.

We all agree abortion is a failure, it is a failure across the board, and we want to reduce the number of abortions. But do not tell us that we cannot have appropriate international family planning initiatives because of the mischaracterization of what those initiatives are by one-third of this body.

One hundred and thirty-two Members of the Republican caucus, a majority of the Republican caucus, voted to cut off all of the family planning funds in this bill under the Paul amendment. So let us understand what the motivation is in this debate.

I had hoped that we could have a respectful debate, respectful of each other's point of view on this. But I refuse to allow those of us who are fighting this fight on international family planning to be characterized as proabortion or for abortion on demand.

And, indeed, also agreeing with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], our distinguished chairman, not \$1 in this bill goes for the performance of abortion. If they want to talk about fungibility, let us open that issue up across the board on every issue that comes before the House.

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

Question. Kerri Coleman (sp), CBS Nightly News in Cleveland, Ohio. Mr. Vice President, you were talking about global population, you know, growing essentially out of control. Has the administration thought in any way, shape or form about policy affecting those developing countries relative to overpopulation. I know it's a sticky subject, but have you guys sat down and thought about the recommendations to the rest of the world.

VICE PRESIDENT GORE: Yes sir, we have. And one of the first things actually in the first few days that President Clinton was in office, he signed an executive order changing a policy that had been called the Mexico City Policy because the last worldwide conference on population was in Mexico City and a previous administration had said the United States would not participate in any of these international programs and the president changed that. Then we went to the next worldwide conference which was in Cairo on population and development. The president asked me to lead the delegation there. We created a new consensus and got a new worldwide approach that most everybody in the world has joined into.

Now we probably don't want to spend much time on this, but the—this doesn't have to be as controversial as some people make it out to be. There are certain conditions which, when established in a country, lead to a dramatic change in their population growth rates. The scientists talk about what they call a demographic transition that goes from high birth rates and high death rates to low birth rates and low death rates. And most all of the developed countries, the advanced countries, have made that transition.

And you know, we think back—we don't need to think back more than one or two generations in the United States to when our parents—and certainly our grandparents—were in families with six, eight, 10 kids and more. It hasn't been that long ago. But now, you know, it's—the two-child family is the average and so forth.

Well, the developing countries still have very, very large families. What makes for that difference? It turns out that there are about three things:

Number one, child survival rates, which, when you think about it, is really important, because most of these countries don't have a Social Security system. They count on the fact that at least some of their children will survive into adulthood and take care of them when they're old. If you have a very high child mortality rate, and a high percentage of the children die in infancy or in childbirth, then you've got to have a lot of children in order to guarantee stability and—I mean, you know, in your old age. And that's just a factor. So when you increase the survivability of children and decrease child mortality, it tends toward a lower family size.

Second, availability of birth control information and culturally appropriate and acceptable techniques. And that's the controversial part. But they decide that for themselves. And when that's available, that's the second factor.

The third factor is the empowerment of women, socially, politically, and in the context of the family, to participate in the decisions about childbearing. And I guess with some people that's controversial, too. I don't think it should be.

But when those three conditions are established, those countries make that change, and their population begins to stabilize.

We're actually beginning to experience some good news around the world with the beginnings of a stabilization in world population. But the momentum in the demographic system is such that we're inevitably

going to go to eight or nine billion. The question is whether these changes will keep us from going to 10, 12, 14 billion. But there's emerging good news there. Now, that same kind of momentum, of course, is in the greenhouse gas emission part of this, too.

Yes, right here.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge my appreciation for the last speaker's admittance that abortion is a failed policy as far as family policy is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the State of Washington, Mrs. LINDA SMITH.

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that this was brought to the floor by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LARGENT] in that I think it clarifies something. This debate is needed. It appears that we all agree to appropriate family planning. But it is clear, very clear, that we do not agree that abortion should be birth control.

We have heard over and over again that money cannot be used for abortions, so why have this debate? Why clarify it? But I say the very debate means that we need to clarify it, we need to stand today and say that we will reflect the American people's values.

Every policy shows that they do not want their money to fund or facilitate abortions in America. Why should they want their money to fund or facilitate abortions in foreign countries? This reflects the values of Americans. To be told that we should be worried about a money bill, a spending bill, and that money is more important than principles and values, does not reflect America's values.

Mr. LARGENT. We have how many minutes remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LARGENT] has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT], my friend and colleague.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] said that this is not abortion. Then I think the simple solution of that is, just go ahead and accept the language then, if we are not dealing with abortion. Let us go ahead and put it in this conference report and instruct our conferees. It was the will of the House earlier.

I heard earlier that this was supposedly just a small group of people who were upset about this bill, which would include myself, who opposed using the tax dollars for abortion.

If my colleagues go down to the average American city on Main Street and stop people there and say, "Do you think we should use your tax dollars to go overseas to give it to groups like Planned Parenthood International so they can lobby for laws to allow abortion on demand?" they would say no.

The majority of Americans would say no, because what they are doing with abortion on demand is, they are encouraging countries like China and

India to allow sex selection, where they can take their female children and discard them, in hopes of getting a male child next time. Or they can use it for birth control.

Vice President GORE's statements, I think, were very clear to me. This is not America's values, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that we will vote for this and include it as instruction for conferees.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I am the last remaining speaker. I will close debate if the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] will yield back.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LARGENT] has the right to close.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS], and I say that painfully, as he announced his plans over the weekend, a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I really wanted to ask her a question. I appreciate her fine leadership on this bill and this issue.

I still am mystified by some of the terminology and characterization of this issue. It seems to me that if family planning leads to fewer unwanted children, it necessarily follows that there would be fewer abortions to the extent that this country asserts its leadership and provides resources for family planning around the world.

So would not the antiabortion vote be "no"?

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

Mr. SKAGGS. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] is quite correct. If we want to reduce the number of abortions, as we all do, we should support international family planning, or family planning domestically, as well.

The statistics are quite encouraging in terms of the countries. For example, in the Ukraine, where the Ministry of Health reported an 8.6 decrease in abortions between January and June 1996, it was a result of the women's reproductive health program, which began in 1995 with USAID funding.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] would further yield, I thank her for her response.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] is recognized for the balance of her time, 1½ minutes.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just talk about the bill and why, from a procedural standpoint, I would urge our colleagues not to support the motion to instruct.

We have worked very hard on this particular issue in the context of a fuller bill. We all come to this body

bringing our principles, our beliefs, and the necessity to get a job done, the challenge to get a job done.

□ 1330

We have advocated. We have debated. We have characterized. We have attributed motivations. We have been through it all. The time now is for us to exert leadership and draw this to a conclusion. Advocacy is something that we are elected to perform here, but at some point we have to face the facts and face the votes, and come to a conclusion which ends the debate.

The vote here today will do nothing but draw, if the conference committee were to follow these instructions, draw a veto, prolong the agony, and hold up child survival funds, funds to fight infectious diseases, the funding for the Middle East peace, at a very fragile time in the Middle East peace, our fight against narcotics; in addition to that, all of the resources we are putting out there to promote U.S. exports to grow our economy, as is one of the pillars of the President's foreign policy, to grow our economy through promoting exports, and many, many other worthy provisions in this legislation.

So the time for advocacy is over, the time for leadership is here. Let us find our area of common ground and resolve this issue once and for all. Vote against this motion to instruct.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close the debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LARGENT] is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues may be saying, why are we talking about this issue today? Let me just make it very clear why that is. The fact is that the House conferees, if we look at the way they voted the last time we voted on this issue, which was carried by the overwhelming majority of this House, 234 to 210, we voted to support the language that we are trying to instruct our conferees to retain. Our House conferees do not agree with the majority that voted in the House. So many times we hear on a variety of issues, the House must work its will. The House has worked its will. The majority voted. It said, keep the Mexico City policy that says that no dollars will go overseas to fund abortions.

I did not say that the right way, according to the subcommittee chairman on the Committee on Appropriations. Let me say it this way. No one can argue with what I am about to say. More abortions will be performed as a result of funding that comes from this subcommittee if we do not retain the Mexico City policy. More abortions will be performed if we do not retain the House's position on the Mexico City policy that says no United States tax dollars can go to any agency that performs abortions. That is correct. That is not wrong.

Let me also talk about some of the arguments that have been made

against this motion; that again, we are going over the same ground we have covered in the House already. The Vice President said that the reason that we have global warming is that there are too many people; no, not here in the United States, because these people he needs to vote for him in the year 2000. It is other countries. It is the other guys, you have too many people, and you are warming the globe up. We cannot do that. What we need to do is send you more money so you can have abortions there, so there are fewer of you and more of us. That is wrong. That is wrong.

People have said, we cannot do this because the President is going to veto it for sure. Let me just tell the Members, the President is only one branch of this Government, not all three, and not all great ideas begin down at Pennsylvania Avenue. The House has spoken. We are right to retain the advice of the House with this measure.

We need to say to the President: There are some things that are so important we are willing to stand toe-to-toe, nose-to-nose to you, and say, we count, too, and so do the children, not only of this country but of the world, and we are here to protect them.

There have been a lot of Members that have talked about the process, people who want to stop the process. I will tell the Members that on this matter the principle is more important than the process. Damn the process, this is too important.

There have also been people that have said, including the gentlewoman from California, have we not debated this long enough? Have we not gone over this? Is this just not old territory? Why rehash this issue? To recall the voice of Winston Churchill, I will say to the gentlewoman from California that we will never, never, never surrender on this issue of defending children both at home and abroad. Our voice will never be silenced. We may lose, we have lost in the past, but we will never fail to put up a fight. That is the message.

Let me just say, in closing, that I appreciate my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have come to the defense of the unborn, and urge all of my colleagues to vote in support of the House's position on the Mexico City policy, to say that we will not continue to use United States taxpayer dollars that in any way facilitate more abortions in the world, that that is an ill-advised use of taxpayer moneys.

If we ask people, are you pro-choice, pro-life, it is pretty evenly split. But if we ask people, should we be using taxpayer dollars to fund abortions, overwhelmingly in this country the people have said no, do not use my taxpayer dollars to help facilitate more abortions in our country. It would be hypocritical to say that we are not going to fund taxpayer funded abortions in this country, but we are going to wink and nod and look the other way, we are not going to talk about this issue, when it

applies overseas. That is wrong, that is hypocritical, and the House needs to speak and work its will today.

Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition of this motion to instruct the conferees to adopt the Mexico City family planning restrictions to the 1998 Foreign Operations appropriations bill.

Unlike the House, the Senate wisely chose not to insert the Mexico City family planning policy into its Foreign Operations appropriations bill. As the House conferees meet with the Senate conferees to produce a final version of this bill, I sincerely hope that the Senate position will prevail and the Mexico City policy will be dropped.

Supporters of the Mexico City policy argue that it is necessary to ensure that the United States shouldn't fund abortion overseas. However, it is important to remember that the United States is expressly prohibited from doing so. I repeat, no U.S. aid goes toward abortions overseas.

The Mexico City policy would take that funding restriction further and say that no U.S. aid could go toward health clinics overseas that provide abortion or abortion-related services. Those health care clinics would have to choose between forgoing U.S. aid and denying thousands of women access to much-needed health care or not providing abortion services to women who have the right to choose according to their country's laws.

The Mexico City policy would have the unfortunate consequence of preventing thousands of women from receiving family planning services, prenatal care, and other important reproductive health care services.

The result of the Mexico City policy would be more unintended pregnancies resulting in more abortions, more maternal and infant deaths, and more economic and environmental strain on families. I urge the House to protect women's reproductive health care worldwide and vote no on this motion.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LARGENT].

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 194, answered "present" 1, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 496]
YEAS—233

Aderholt	Bartlett	Bonilla
Archer	Barton	Bonior
Armey	Bateman	Bono
Bachus	Bereuter	Borski
Baker	Berry	Brady
Ballenger	Bilirakis	Bryant
Barcia	Bliley	Bunning
Barr	Blunt	Burr
Barrett (NE)	Boehner	Burton

Buyer	Hulshof	Pickering
Callahan	Hunter	Pitts
Calvert	Hutchinson	Pombo
Camp	Hyde	Portman
Canady	Inglis	Poshard
Cannon	Istook	Quinn
Chabot	Jenkins	Radanovich
Chambliss	John	Rahall
Chenoweth	Johnson, Sam	Redmond
Christensen	Jones	Regula
Coble	Kanjorski	Riggs
Coburn	Kaptur	Riley
Collins	Kasich	Roemer
Combust	Kildee	Rogan
Cook	Kim	Rogers
Cooksey	King (NY)	Rohrabacher
Costello	Kingston	Ros-Lehtinen
Cox	Klecicka	Royce
Cramer	Klink	Ryun
Crane	Knollenberg	Salmon
Crapo	Kucinich	Sanford
Cubin	LaFalce	Saxton
Cunningham	LaHood	Scarborough
Danner	Largent	Schaefer, Dan
Deal	Latham	Schaffer, Bob
DeLay	LaTourette	Sensenbrenner
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (KY)	Sessions
Dickey	Linder	Shadegg
Doolittle	Lipinski	Shaw
Doyle	LoBiondo	Shimkus
Dreier	Lucas	Shuster
Duncan	Manton	Skeen
Dunn	Manzullo	Skelton
Ehlers	Mascara	Smith (MI)
Emerson	McCollum	Smith (NJ)
English	McCrery	Smith (OR)
Ensign	McDade	Smith (TX)
Everett	McHugh	Smith, Linda
Ewing	McInnis	Snowbarger
Foley	McIntosh	Solomon
Forbes	McIntyre	Souder
Fowler	McKeon	Spence
Fox	Metcalf	Stearns
Galleghy	Mica	Stenholm
Ganske	Miller (FL)	Stump
Gekas	Moakley	Stupak
Gillmor	Mollohan	Sununu
Gingrich	Moran (KS)	Talent
Goode	Murtha	Tauzin
Goodlatte	Myrick	Taylor (MS)
Goodling	Neal	Taylor (NC)
Goss	Nethercutt	Thomas
Graham	Neumann	Thornberry
Granger	Ney	Thune
Gutknecht	Northup	Tiahrt
Hall (OH)	Norwood	Trafficant
Hall (TX)	Nussle	Walsh
Hamilton	Oberstar	Wamp
Hansen	Ortiz	Watkins
Hastert	Oxley	Watts (OK)
Hastings (WA)	Packard	Weldon (FL)
Hayworth	Pappas	Weldon (PA)
Hefley	Parker	Weller
Herger	Paul	Whitfield
Hill	Paxon	Wicker
Hilleary	Pease	Wolf
Hoekstra	Peterson (MN)	Young (AK)
Holden	Peterson (PA)	Young (FL)
Hostettler	Petri	

NAYS—194

Abercrombie	Clayton	Fattah
Ackerman	Clement	Fawell
Allen	Clyburn	Fazio
Andrews	Condit	Filner
Baesler	Conyers	Flake
Baldacci	Coyne	Foglietta
Barrett (WI)	Cummings	Ford
Bass	Davis (FL)	Frank (MA)
Becerra	Davis (IL)	Franks (NJ)
Bentsen	Davis (VA)	Frelinghuysen
Berman	DeFazio	Frost
Billray	DeGette	Furse
Bishop	Delahunt	Gejdenson
Blagojevich	DeLauro	Gephardt
Blumenauer	Dellums	Gibbons
Boehlert	Deutsch	Gilchrest
Boswell	Dicks	Gilman
Boucher	Dingell	Gordon
Boyd	Dixon	Green
Brown (CA)	Doggett	Greenwood
Brown (FL)	Dooley	Gutierrez
Brown (OH)	Edwards	Harman
Campbell	Ehrlich	Hastings (FL)
Capps	Engel	Hefner
Cardin	Eshoo	Hinchee
Carson	Etheridge	Hinojosa
Castle	Evans	Hobson
Clay	Farr	Hooley

Horn	McKinney	Sandlin
Houghton	McNulty	Sawyer
Hoyer	Meehan	Schumer
Jackson (IL)	Meeke	Scott
Jackson-Lee	Menendez	Serrano
(TX)	Millender	Shays
Jefferson	McDonald	Sisisky
Johnson (CT)	Miller (CA)	Skaggs
Johnson (WI)	Minge	Slaughter
Johnson, E. B.	Mink	Smith, Adam
Kelly	Moran (VA)	Snyder
Kennedy (MA)	Morella	Spratt
Kennedy (RI)	Nadler	Stabenow
Kennelly	Obey	Stark
Kilpatrick	Oliver	Stokes
Kind (WI)	Owens	Strickland
Klug	Pallone	Tanner
Kolbe	Pascrell	Tauscher
Lampson	Pastor	Thurman
Lantos	Payne	Tierney
Lazio	Pelosi	Torres
Leach	Pickett	Towns
Levin	Pomeroy	Turner
Lewis (CA)	Porter	Upton
Lewis (GA)	Price (NC)	Velazquez
Lofgren	Pryce (OH)	Vento
Lowe	Ramstad	Visclosky
Luther	Rangel	Waters
Maloney (CT)	Reyes	Watt (NC)
Maloney (NY)	Rivers	Waxman
Markey	Rodriguez	Wexler
Martinez	Rothman	White
Matsui	Roukema	Wise
McCarthy (MO)	Roybal-Allard	Woolsey
McCarthy (NY)	Rush	Wynn
McDermott	Sabo	Yates
McGovern	Sanchez	
McHale	Sanders	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Livingston

NOT VOTING—6

Gonzalez	Schiff	Thompson
Hilliard	Sherman	Weygand

□ 1407

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon and Mr. DEUTSCH changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. HANSEN, BONIOR, and COX of California changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TEXAS LOW-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE DISPOSAL COMPACT CONSENT ACT

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 258 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 258

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 629) to grant the consent of the Congress to the Texas Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Compact. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Each section of the bill shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for

amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be fifteen minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE] is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], my good friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 258 provides for consideration of H.R. 629, the Texas Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Compact Consent Act, under another completely fair and open rule.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Commerce.

Under the rule, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may give priority recognition to those Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to their consideration. And to expedite consideration of H.R. 629, the rule also allows the Chair to postpone recorded votes and reduce to 5 minutes the voting time on any postponed question, as long as the first in any series of votes is not less than 15 minutes.

Finally, as is customary, the minority will be provided with a motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, in 1980 Congress passed legislation to provide a system for States to take responsibility for the disposal of low-level radioactive waste. Examples of low-level radioactive waste include waste that is disposed of