FOREIGN RELATIONS REVITALIZATION ACT OF 1995

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 2033

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, yesterday I proposed an amendment to instruct the United States delegation as to the sense of the Congress regarding the representative American perspective the United States delegation should promote at the United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women which will be held in Beijing, China from September 4 to 15, 1995. I am pleased that the amendment was adopted today by voice vote.

My amendment instructs the U.S. delegates to recognize the importance of motherhood, to uphold the traditional family as the fundamental unit of society upon which healthy cultures are built, and to define or agree with definitions of gender only as the biological classification of male and female.

Most Americans would be surprised to learn that an amendment of this nature was even necessary. Most Americans would respond that of course a U.S. delegation to an international conference would be eager to uphold the family as the fundamental unit of society and of course, that there are only two genders, male and female.

However, the delegates to the Fourth World Conference on Women have made these simple concepts an issue, and therefore, we need to be clear that our U.S. delegation represents the views of most Americans.

At the last preconference meeting, held in New York City in March 1995, one nation suggested that the word ''mother'' be removed from the platform document and replaced with ''caretaker.''

What about the traditional family? We have heard a great deal of discussion lately about families and the important role they play in the well-being of children and society. Conservatives and liberals alike are lamenting the breakdown of the American family and the dire consequences—such as increased crime, high teen pregnancy rates, drug use and lower educational performance which result from a breakdown in the family and family values.

On all sides of the political spectrum there is a growing understanding that the family is the single most important factor in combating these problems.

Finally, on the issue of gender Mr. President, this issue on its face seems ridiculous. At the March 15, 1995 Preparatory Committee meeting for the Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing, delegates prepared a draft platform. The word gender appears 184 times in that document. The use of gender had never been an issue as a majority of delegates assumed that the term did not need definition.

In response to the various questions about the definition of gender, the conference leadership floated the definition:

> Gender refers to the relationship between women and men based on socially defined roles that are assigned to one sex or the other.

Delegates pressed for bracketing the word gender until a definition could be agreed upon. Bella Abzug of the U.S. delegation in an angry speech contested the bracketing saying:

> We will not be forced back in the ''biology is destiny'' concept . . . the meaning of the word ''gender'' has evolved as differentiated from the word sex to express the reality that women's and men's roles and status are socially constructed and subject to change.

Many delegates became convinced that this move to refine gender was designed to forward an entirely different agenda, and not to further the interests of ordinary women, the primary purpose of the Conference.

When many of these delegations sought to define gender as ''male and female, the two sexes of human being'' that definition proved unacceptable to many Western nations and even the U.S. delegation did not want to be bound by a two-gender definition. The United Nations responded to these concerns by issuing a statement that said ''gender is a relative concept'' and its ''roles can vary with time and circumstance.''

It is for that reason that my amendment sought to ensure that the U.S. delegation agree with the definition of gender as the biological classification of male and female, which are the two sexes of the human being.

Mr. President, the purpose of my amendment was to ensure that those who represent the women of the United States at a world conference on women must indeed be representative of the majority of the women in America. The amendment which the Senate adopted today sends a strong message in support of motherhood and the family, and traditional values which have made America a great nation.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on S. 908, the State Department Reorganization bill:

Bob Dole, Jesse Helms, John McCain, Fred Thompson, Olympia Snowe, Jim Inhofe, Lauch Faircloth, Spence Abraham, Trent Lott, Strom Thurmond, Larry E. Craig, Don Nickles, Mitch McConnell, Bob Smith, John Ashcroft, Nancy Landon Kassebaum.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

VOTE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on S. 908, the State Department reorganization bill, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are required.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 55, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 346 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Abraham	Gorton	Murkowski
Ashcroft	Gramm	Nickles
Bennett	Grams	Packwood
Bond	Grassley	Pell
Brown	Gregg	Pressler
Burns	Hatch	Roth
Campbell	Hatfield	Santorum
Chafee	Helms	Shelby
Coats	Hutchison	Simpson
Cochran	Inhofe	Smith
Cohen	Jeffords	Snowe
Coverdell	Kassebaum	Specter
Craig	Kempthorne	Stevens
D'Amato	Kyl	Thomas
DeWine	Lott	Thompson
Dole	Lugar	Thurmond
Domenici	Mack	Warner
Faircloth	McCain	
Frist	McConnell	

NAYS—45

Akaka	Feingold	Leahy
Baucus	Feinstein	Levin
Biden	Ford	Lieberman
Bingaman	Glenn	Mikulski
Boxer	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Bradley	Harkin	Moynihan
Breaux	Heflin	Murray
Bryan	Hollings	Nunn
Bumpers	Inouye	Pryor
Byrd	Johnston	Reid
Conrad	Kennedy	Robb
Daschle	Kerrey	Rockefeller
Dodd	Kerry	Sarbanes
Dorgan	Kohl	Simon
Exon	Lautenberg	Wellstone

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 55, and the nays are 45. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Mr. HELMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I am going to give President Clinton an opportunity to micromanage the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. When he is in the mood to have some ambassadors confirmed or some treaties considered, and that sort of thing, all he has to do is send word that he no longer believes in that memorandum that was circulated by the Agency for International Development, the memorandum that said the way the administration is going to beat this bill is to ''delay, postpone, obfuscate, derail.'' Well, his minions have done that in denying an opportunity to have cloture on this bill.

Invariably, as the Senators know, and as one of the reporters said, the shoe is on the other foot—and that is correct. But this is an important bill, and the budget requirements of the Foreign Relations Committee cannot be met without this bill, or some bill very close to it.

The point is that there has been no cooperation extended. There has been a lot of rhetoric, and that is the end of it. Mrs. Helms raised a dumb son, maybe, but she did not raise a stupid one. I understand the name of the game. The administration and its supporters have wanted this bill to die a quiet death. It is not going to die. It is going back on the calendar, but it will return. Just as MacArthur said, I will return, the administration can count on this bill's return.

I will enjoy the Tuesdays and Thursdays when we normally have business sessions of the Foreign Relations Committee. The bill will not be killed with the administration's tactic. It is going to keep coming back and back and back until we get a vote. If the Senate votes down the bill, fine. That is fair enough. Or, if there is a move by Members of the Senate on the other side who want to present a concrete alternative, that will be fine. Or, if we can get now what we did not get before, a commitment from the Vice President of the United States—you know, the fellow who is in charge of reinvention of Government—that he and his associates will work with us, that will be fine. If the President of the United States indicates that he wants some ambassadors cleared and he wants his representatives in the Senate to cooperate in jointly producing a bill, that will be fine.

But I appreciate the Senators on the Republican side, and I appreciate my good friend, Senator PELL, for having voted for cloture in both instances today.

At a later time, I will have more to say, and I thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 908

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I have indicated at our policy luncheon that this bill will probably be brought up at a later time. But I would now ask unanimous consent that the Department of State reorganization be placed back on the calendar.

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

Mr. DOLE. Again, let me say to my colleague from North Carolina that we have indicated to him that this would be back up again. We discussed that with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, and the Senator from Rhode Island. It is an important bill. But I think in the spirit of trying to get some things done—we can get on hopefully with part of the recess—this is the best course to follow.

So I thank my colleague from North Carolina for his agreeing with that procedure.

There will be votes throughout the day.

Mr. KERRY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I would just like to say to the majority leader and to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, I respect and appreciate the decision of the majority leader with respect to the bill that was just on the floor, but I want the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee to know that the quote he read has already been disavowed. It is not the policy of the Democratic side, and that is not what we are trying to do with respect to this bill.

I would be happy to engage with the Senator further as we have previous to this to try to see if we can arrive at some kind of understanding. It is an important piece of legislation. We are not trying to avoid it altogether. But I think it was premature in its current state, and we would be happy to work with the Senator from North Carolina in an effort to see if we can come up with a reasonable bipartisan approach.

THE SENATE'S SCHEDULE

Mr. DOLE. Let me indicate to my colleagues now what we would like to do between now and the 12th of August—hopefully by the 12th, if not beyond the 12th; that is, to complete action on the energy and water appropriations, to complete action on the DOD authorization bill, to complete action on welfare reform, to complete action on the DOD appropriations bill, and I am advised by Senators STEVENS and INOUYE—we had a meeting in my office this morning—that could be done in one day. Marty was there, I might add, the Democratic leader's representative. It was not a party meeting. They said what we could do. And there is also a hope, because we have had some conversations that there may be renewed interest in getting some agreement, if possible, on reg reform, that we can either finish it before we leave for the recess, or finish it when we are back.

So I would just say in the spirit of everybody trying, I know there are going to be important amendments, and I know they want them to be debated. Everybody has that right.

According to the appropriators, the DOD appropriators, many of these amendments that are going to be taken care of in DOD authorization we will treat the same in the appropriations bill. It might speed up the process. So that would be very helpful.

I say to the Democratic leader, I do not think we have tried to pile up too much here if everything goes well and if we all cooperate on both sides. Most of these issues involved are not partisan issues. They are policy issues where you have Republicans and Democrats, particularly in DOD, maybe in this energy and water, you have Republicans and some Democrats on each side of the issues, so they are not partisan issues. There should not be any partisan roadblocks that I know of. I am not as familiar with the bills as obviously the managers are.

So we will now move to energy and water. And I will be very happy to yield to the distinguished Democratic leader if he wanted to make any comments.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I would subscribe to what the majority leader indicated. None of the legislation contemplated for completion except perhaps welfare reform—we will have to see where we are on that, but I think by and large the legislation pending is all legislation that I am hopeful we can work through.

I am not as optimistic about the degree to which we can work through these very significant amendments on DOD unless we have some understanding as to what the timeframe may be and whether or not some of these amendments could be offered as amendments to defense appropriations, but there are very serious questions here that have to be addressed. And I think Members ought to expect long days and a Saturday session in order for us to accomplish all that the leader has set out for us to accomplish in the next week and a half.

Mr. DOLE. There will be a Saturday session. I appreciate the Democrat leader mentioning that.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1996

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate business is the energy and water appropriation bill, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1905) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me indicate that we are going to try to finish this energy and water appropriations bill today. I have been advised by the managers that they think that can be done. They have resolved one of the contentious issues.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I should like to address one portion of that bill for just a few moments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, as we recommence the debate on the appropriations for energy and water, I should like to express my appreciation to the distinguished chairman of that appropriations subcommittee, the Senator from New Mexico, and his colleague, the Senator from Louisiana, for the thoughtful and generous treatment they have accorded to two projects in the State of Washington that are of great importance to that State. The subcommittee has approved and the Senate is now considering funding for the Yakima River Basin water enhancement project and the Columbia