it imposes on everyone else. The House then proceeded to eliminate three committees and 25 subcommittees, to cut one-third of committee staff, to implement truth-in-budgeting baseline reform, to limit the terms of the Speaker and the committee and subcommittee chairmen, to ban proxy voting in committee, to open committee meetings to the public and to order first every comprehensive audit of its books.

The House for the first time ever approved a balanced budget amendment. Even though the Senate failed to pass the amendment, the House GOP committed to balance the budget by the year 2002. Six separate bills were passed to undo last year's flawed Clinton crime bill. The House passed a sweeping welfare reform bill that ends welfare as we know it by rewarding the dignity of work and self-respect over illegitimacy, family disintegration, and non contribution to society.

We provided much needed tax fairness to families so they can keep more of their hard earned money. We repealed the unfair Clinton tax hike on Social Security benefits, raised the earning limitations on seniors who work past the age of 65 so they are not punished for staying in the work force and provided tax incentive for long-term care coverage.

The Clean Water Act continues Congress' commitment to the environmental protection of our Nation's waterways while restoring common sense to environmental protection. We have undone Clinton's efforts to hollow out the military and restored some money cut out over the past 2 years to ensure military readiness and modernization. We have eliminated and prioritized our Nation's overseas interests. We continue our commitment by eliminating three Federal agencies and two dozen foreign aid programs.

The rescission package is a first step toward a less costly Government. We cut $16.4 billion in wasteful spending by eliminating unauthorized programs and consolidating duplicative programs. And we slashed our own spending in Congress by $155 million.

Mr. Speaker, I venture to say that in 40 years of Democratic control, the Congress never accomplished as much as the Republican led 104th Congress. I would suggest our friends at the DLC take a closer look at their facts.

UPCOMING INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON WOMEN

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1995

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, which I chair, held a hearing on the upcoming Fourth International Conference on Women, currently scheduled to be held in Beijing later this summer.

Numerous eloquent witnesses called attention to certain features of the draft document that this conference will almost certainly adopt. While there is much that is positive in the document, there is also a systematic denigration of marriage, childrearing, and family. As was pointed out at our hearing by Cecilia Royals of the National Institute of Womanhood, the document disparages a central life experience of 90 percent of the world's women, and attempts to turn women who emphasize family life into a new marginalized class.

I would like to put before my colleagues the testimony of another witness: Diane Knippers, president of the Institute on Religion and Democracy, and cochair of the Ecumenical Coalition on Women and Society [ECWS] Beijing team. Ms. Knipper's testimony offers several reasons for doubting the draft document's effectiveness as a tool for promoting the human rights of women.

TESTIMONY OF DIANE L. KNIPPERS

The adoption of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights in 1948 gave the world a powerful mechanism for holding nations accountable for the basic rights of all persons. Sadly, in recent years we have seen efforts to erode these basic standards as authoritarian governments argue that human rights are not universal, but are culturally relative. But another form of erosion is more subtle, more insidious, and more dangerous. It is the trend toward defining every conceivable social goal as a human right—whether or not these social goals are properly the responsibilities of governments and whether or not they are even obtainable. The result is obvious. When everything is considered a right, finally nothing can be defended as a right.

The Fourth World Conference on Women and its draft Platform for Action offer prime examples of this erosion. The adoption of this platform will undermine the pursuit of basic human rights. Even more troubling, it will also sacrifice efforts on behalf of women whose rights are the most repressed and abused in favor of the controversial social goals of Western gender feminists. This is a tragedy.

Let me cite several examples of the human rights flaws in the draft Platform for Action and the conference itself.

A. The draft Platform's commitment to universality is unsure.

Every reference to universal human rights is bracketed. If this document does not affirm universality it will mark a serious regression in the progress toward human rigths within the international community.

B. The call to address the basic rights of women is blurred and minimized in the draft Platform's context of social engineering and expansive and questionable goals.

Serious abuses of rights of women, even when mentioned in the document, are diminished in the context of grandiose plans for re-engineering society. For example, achieving for all women the basic right to vote and participate in elections is a much more urgent task than working to ensure equality of outcomes such as equal numbers of men and women in all parliaments.

Let me offer examples of abuses of women that are mentioned in the draft Platform, but diminished by the larger context. There is the urgent need to combat prostitution and pornography, particularly involving children. A recent report of a religious group which operates ministries in Thailand to young women who have been forced into prostitution tells of girls as young as 12 sold to brothels. One child said the brothel owner would beat her to make her stop crying while she was ''entertaining'' customers.

Another example is slavery, which has not been eradicated but is still practiced in nations such as Mauritania and Sudan. A recent fact-finding team organized by Christian Solidarity International reports that local officials estimate that some 1,000 women and children have been taken into slavery in the last five years from one Sudanese town alone. Team members met a 14-year-old Sudanese girl who had been kidnapped and sold into slavery when she was seven. Yet the atrocity of human slavery gets only passing mention in the 121-page Platform for Action.

Such blatant and egregious human rights abuses are trivialized in the context of a document that takes on the grandiose aim to redefine gender roles in every society with no reference to biological differences between men and women.

C. The Platform will result in the expansion of the coercive and intrusive powers of governments and international agencies in the lives of individuals and families.

The goals of the draft Platform for Action—particularly (1) defining equality as outcome rather than opportunity and (2) obliterating any distinctive male or female roles—will lead inexorably to the expansion of the coercive power of governments. There is no question that this will contribute to anti-democratic practices. It will also undermine the rights of individuals and families (beginning with the rights of parents to train their own children).

D. Serious human rights abuses, such as religious repression, are ignored.

The most serious omission in the draft Platform is any acknowledgement of freedom of conscience or of religion for women. Throughout the document, religion is cited as a source of repression of women. There is only one brief (and still bracketed) acknowledgement of the spiritual needs of women. But nowhere in 121 pages does the document call for religious freedom for women.

Women should have the right to engage in religious practice, to change their religion, and to propagate their religious faith, particularly to their children. Women who change their religion should be free of the threat of state-imposed divorce or the threat of having their children taken from them. The irony is that this conference on women is being held in a country which currently imprisons women for practicing their faith.

E. Holding the Fourth World Conference on Women in China also serves to undermine international human rights standards.

The Ecumenical Coalition on Women and Society is calling upon the U.S. government to boycott the Beijing women's conference unless two conditions are met. The first is that Harry Wu must be freed from prison. The second is that our government must obtain assurances from the Peoples Republic of China that U.S. citizens and other UN conference participants will enjoy the basic rights of freedom of conscience, freedom of opinion and expression, and freedom of peaceful assembly as guaranteed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Women in non-governmental organizations going to Beijing are being told that they risk interrogation if they meet in groups of more than five, that they cannot meet in hotel rooms, they can't unfurl banners, they can't take in religious literature, they can't engage in corporate prayer outside a special tent, they can't take unregistered computers or fax machines into hotel rooms. How can we begin to discuss human rights in a climate in which those rights are ignored and abused? It would be unconscionable for the United States to participate in such a sham.

CONCLUSION

Women are brutally denied basic human rights in many parts of the world. Women suffer denial of educational opportunities and property rights, forced abortion and forced sterilization, genital mutilation, prostitution, rape, female infanticide, the threat of execution for apostasy or blasphemy, slavery—the list goes on and on.

The campaign to combat the truly horrible abuses of women is undermined by linking women's rights with highly questionable economic, social, and environmental theories.

The Beijing agenda goes far beyond basic rights for women. The draft Platform claims that peace and development cannot be achieved unless women represent 50 percent of all national and international political and economic agencies. How or why women are uniquely capable of bringing in this utopia is never explained.

The danger of the Beijing women's conference is that it attempts sweeping and unnecessary social change—change that will undermine rather than enhance the rights of women. The draft Platform for Action equals or surpasses the Marxist-Leninist experiment in its ambition. The draft Platform for Action calls for the most intrusive, arrogant, and radical restructuring of the social order in human history—all on the baseless assumption that this will produce a just, prosperous, and peaceful world. I'm convinced of the opposite. It is the road to tyranny and oppression for women and for men.

ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, July 5, 1995, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

U.S. environmental policy is at a crossroads. On the 25th anniversary of Earth Day, we can take great pride in the advances that have been made in environmental protection. We have succeeded in reducing the levels of lead and other dangerous pollutants from the air. Lakes and rivers once so contaminated they could catch on fire, now support large fish populations. Endangered species like the eagle and the buffalo have been saved from extinction and are now thriving.

The challenge ahead is to build on these successes, but in smarter, more cost-effective ways. The objectives of our environmental laws are almost always worthy: cleaner air; safer drinking water; protection of endangered species and so forth. The issue is whether current laws go about achieving these goals in the most sensible way.

Cleaning up the environment has become much more complicated. At the time of the first Earth Day in 1970, there was a broad consensus that the environment was a mess and that the government had to do something about it. Today that consensus is much less firm. There are competing claims about the environment's condition, strong rivalries within the environmental movement, and active opposition to environmental regulation. Furthermore, the nature of environmental regulation is changing. Whereas in the past government regulators focused on large polluters, such as the local factory, new regulations aim to curb pollution from more diffuse sources, such as runoff from farm lands.

COMMAND AND CONTROL

Most environmental programs are of a ''command and control'' variety. The federal government sets regulations which the public and private sectors must follow. For example, the Clean Air Act mandates how much pollution factories can emit and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act directs industry to dispose of hazardous waste in a certain manner.

This regulatory approach can be credited with improving environmental quality over the last 25 years. The question now is whether it is the correct approach for the 21st Century. The current regulatory system offers the advantages of uniformity, administrative efficiency, and predictability, but it has drawbacks as well.

First, ''command and control'' can be too inflexible. It takes a one-size-fits-all approach to regulation. For example, the Safe Drinking Water Act requires all localities to test for a broad menu of contaminants even if there is little or no chance that a community's water system has been exposed to certain contaminants. Localities cannot pursue innovative alternatives that could achieve the same level of water quality at lower cost.

Second, the current system can be very expensive. Pollution controls, for example, cost an estimated $26 billion per year. Protecting the environment will cost money—and in many cases, that money is well spent—but I am concerned we are not getting the best return on the dollar. Some programs don't work as well as they should. The Superfund program, for example, was designed to clean up the nation's most hazardous waste sites, but too much funding has been wasted in overhead and litigation costs. Other laws mandate, at great cost, compliance from state and local governments or private enterprises, often without any financial assistance from the federal government.

Third, the ''command and control'' approach can be too complex. Our environmental statutes have evolved into a cumbersome system that tends to over-specify compliance strategies and mandate extensive reporting requirements.

NEW APPROACH

We need to rethink how we regulate the environment. This does not mean repealing current standards, but rather defining a sensible role for the federal government. There continues to be a federal role in protecting the environment. Many environmental problems, such as water and air pollution, cross state and even international borders, and, consequently, demand a national response. Furthermore, most Americans want federal leadership on environmental issues.

I believe the following principles should, where appropriate, guide future environmental policy with the objective of making regulation more flexible, less costly and less complex.

First, we should work to find market-based solutions to environmental problems. Such an approach might entail providing incentives to private business or local governments to meet or exceed environmental standards; or creating a system of marketable pollution permits. Market-driven solutions offer the promise of achieving environmental objectives in a way that is more cost-effective and less disruptive to industry.

Second, we should encourage cooperation between the federal government and the regulated community. Environmental regulation will always involve some tension between the two, but the federal government can take steps to minimize such conflict by working cooperatively with businesses, landowners and other private interests to find solutions.

Third, we should give more discretion to state and local governments in managing environmental problems. The federal government has the expertise to set national standards for environmental protection and compliance strategies. State and local governments, however, are often closer to the problems, and may have better ideas about solving them in innovative, cost-effective ways.

Fourth, we should allocate federal resources to the most pressing environmental problems, particularly in an era of tight federal budgets. Too many federal dollars are wasted on programs of marginal social or economic benefit. Federal agencies should conduct risk assessment, based on scientific evidence, and cost-benefit analysis before implementing new regulations.

CONCLUSION

Protecting the environment today demands something more than the standard regulatory prohibitions. The environmental movement has taught us the responsibility of protecting our own natural heritage. We now must reshape our efforts with a new openness to what works and what does not work in environmental protection.

IN SUPPORT OF SISTER CITIES

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1995

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the United States Information Agency and their continued funding of the Sister Cities International Program. The USIA is responsible for our Government's overseas academic and cultural programs. They conduct a variety of activities to promote democratic and free market values and to foster international understanding of U.S. policies. The Sister Cities Program is a vital part of this effort. I am proud to demonstrate my support for this worthwhile cause, and as a former mayor, Alexandria, VA, I am pleased to submit for the RECORD the attached letter from the U.S. Conference of Mayors International Affairs Committee.

SISTER CITIES INTERNATIONAL,
June 17, 1995.

An Open Letter to Congress:

We, the undersigned Mayors of The U.S. Conference of Mayors' International Affairs Committee, urge our elected Representatives and Senators in the United States Congress to preserve important United States Information Agency (USIA) supported programs such as Sister Cities International that enable us to build bridges with communities overseas.

Through programs supported by the USIA, diverse elements from our communities-business, working people, educators, and many individuals and organizations-have forged strong economic and cultural ties with their international counterparts. These vibrant programs have afforded us the opportunity to create people to people relationships which have brought countless contributions to our communities.

The special relationships developed as a result of these international partnerships reap tangible returns for the modest resources that are used to sustain them. Across the United States, substantial construction projects, special trade relationships, provided direct access to foreign markets for American goods and services, and increased tourism are just a few of the ways they have boosted our local economies and enhanced international understanding.

The lives of our citizens and their children, in their homes and in their classrooms, are enriched by interacting with people from our sister cities. It is important for the people of our communities to gain a better understanding of just how interdependent our world is. For some of our citizens this may be the only exposure they will ever receive to people who live in other countries.

We are united in our belief that for many reasons our communities are strengthened when we are internationally engaged. We