SWEARING IN OF MEMBER-ELECT

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) please come forward and take the oath of office at this time.

Mr. LIPINSKI of Illinois appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter. So help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations.

BLUEPRINT FOR PROGRAM TO RALLY THE ARMIES OF COMPASSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 107–36)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Education and the Workforce, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Government Reform and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Enclosed please find the blueprint for my program to ''Rally the Armies of Compassion.'' I look forward to working with the Congress to pass reforms to support the heroic works of faith-based and community groups across America.

GEORGE BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 30, 2001.*

□ 1845

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO ENTERTAIN A MOTION TO SUSPEND RULES ON WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 31, 2001

Mr. HANSEN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be authorized to entertain a motion to suspend the rules and agree to the following concurrent resolution on Wednesday, January 31, 2001:

H. Con. Res. 14.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BIGGERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. STEARNS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

CONCERNING INTERNATIONAL FAMILY PLANNING RESTRICTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart as we acknowledge, unfortunately, that poor women and children all over the world will be unable to participate in the $425 million that this Congress passed in the Foreign Operations bill for family planning.

Unfortunately, about 10 days ago, President Bush signed an executive order that would not allow international family planning clinics to use the 400-plus million for family planning educational services as this Congress passed.

My colleagues might remember that, in that same Foreign Operations bill, we said, as a compromise, that no funds would be expended until February, 6 months after the beginning of the fiscal year.

It is unfortunate now, after much trepidation, a lot of meetings, a lot of bipartisan cooperation, that we now find some of the poorest women in countries around the world who receive funds from several countries unable to use the appropriations that this Congress provided for family planning.

People in need of health services unrelated to family planning are affected by this executive order. The executive order says that no monies from our Treasury, and it has been appropriated and approved, $425 million, can be used for health services in those countries that counsel on family planning.

We think that is wrong. We think that because we have put so much time and effort into this, and because America is the number one country in the world, that we have a responsibility to help those poorer countries who are in need of those health dollars, health dollars for diabetes, health dollars for heart disease, health dollars for a myriad of illnesses that those clinics help.

Our $400 million that was appropriated in a bipartisan way with the knowledge that those funds not be expended until February; now those funds cannot be used in those poor countries. We think it is a shame. It is called international gag rule because those countries across the world who use our dollars also get other dollars from other places to help them in their family planning efforts. We think it is unfortunate. We think President Bush has made a mistake and we hope that he will revisit this.

Vulnerable populations around the world look to America for leadership. They look to us to help them with their family planning, to help them with their childhood illnesses, to help them with their health concerns.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, we had much debate on this issue. We think it is unfortunate, now that we stand here, not to able to use funds that have been appropriated for the poorest of countries in the world, from the leaders of the free world, the citizens here in the United States.

Madam Speaker, if in fact this policy stands, can my colleagues imagine the hardships that those poor families will feel around the world, not able to use their health dollars for those illnesses, including family planning.

I hope, Madam Speaker, that we will take another look at this. I hope that President Bush will rescind that executive order. Family planning is one of the most sacred things that we have as women. God created women and created men with certain characteristics. Only women can bear children, and we want to bear them when we need them, when we want them, and when we can take care of them. That is what that appropriation did that we have in our Foreign Operations bill.

So I call on President Bush to rethink his position. There are millions of women across the world who look to America for assistance. $400 million is a small piece of the pie, but it certainly can save many lives, help many families and ensure protection for children who are poor and who need our assistance.

So, Madam Speaker, again, I ask President Bush, please rescind the executive order, lift the gag rule on international planning. We call on him today and we hope he will heed our call.

Madam Speaker, the announcement of President Bush of his intent to reinstate the so-called "Mexico City" policy represents an abandonment of women and families in need around the globe. In December, Congress voted to lift from this year's foreign spending bill the unfair restrictions imposed on international family planning providers. Keeping out of future appropriations what is often referred to as the "global gag rule" is both a moral and economic imperative.

The controversial Mexico City language specifies two major conditions that foreign nongovernmental organizations (NGO's) must meet in order to receive family planning funds from the United States. First, the NGO must not perform abortions, except in cases of forcible rape or incest, or where the mother's life is endangered if the pregnancy is carried to term. This condition refers specifically to NGO's using private funds to provide abortion services since no U.S. funds have been used to perform abortions abroad since 1973. Secondly, the NGO must not violate their country's abortion laws, or engage in any effort to change the laws of their country governing abortion. This means that participation in a rally, the lobbying of government representatives, or any advocacy efforts by an organization to either allow or even maintain legal abortions in their own countries would be grounds for the United States to rescind funding. Such a restriction is a clear violation of

the right to free speech and would be unconstitutional in the United States.

Let us intimately examine the very real and humanitarian effects of withholding funding for international family planning. Oftentimes, facilities which provide family planning information also provide the majority of health-related services to a given population. When the only health care facility in a rural community closes due to insufficient operating costs, who pays the price? The impoverished mother of seven seeking a tubal ligation to prevent future unplanned pregnancies pays the price. Young newlyweds desiring to learn about oral contraception and condom use, as well as natural family planning pays the price. A village in need of medical treatment for tuberculosis, malaria, iron-deficiency, or any other illness unrelated to reproductive issues pays the price.

If the United States is serious about its resolve to enhance the democracies, economies, health and education infrastructures, and human living conditions in the developing world, then it must acknowledge the interdependence of these sectors in a country's development. Why should we realistically expect to witness significant increases in economic growth within the trade, banking, or manufacturing industries when much of a country's population remains formally uneducated without access to basic medical services and information?

The difficult process of international development requires a comprehensive approach, congressional funds appropriated for this purpose have a proven track record of effectiveness, but are in need of continued support. NGO's and health care facilities provide invaluable services that a developing nation's government is often unable to provide for financial reasons. Understand unequivocally that no U.S. federal funds provide abortion services in this country or abroad. Let us never again allow this fact to be blurred within our discussions and debates with supporters of the global gag rule.

The removal of the Mexico City language from the Foreign Operations appropriations bill was a declaration by the United States that it is truly committed to the democratic principles upon which the nation was conceived. The bill reaffirms our proactive concern for impoverished and underserved people throughout the globe. It is my sincere hope that the new administration will demonstrate the compassion and moral leadership of the United States by retaining as a top priority the health and well being of women, children, and families worldwide.

IN HONOR OF F. WHITTEN PETES, SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HANSEN. Madam Speaker, today I rise in tribute to the Honorable F. Whitten Peters, the outgoing Secretary of the Air Force, who recently left office to return to private life.

In his 4 years as Under Secretary, Acting Secretary and Secretary, Whit Peters led America's Air Force during a period of unprecedented change. Under his inspired leadership, the Air Force evolved from the garrison force that won the Cold War to the Expeditionary Aerospace Force that dominated the skies over Kosovo and Serbia, deterred conflict around the globe, and delivered comfort to the afflicted in over 100 nations during the last year alone.

With unflagging energy and unfailing good humor, Secretary Peters has attached and overcome a broad array of resource problems affecting the Air Force. Colleagues on both sides of the aisle will well remember his work with us to secure additional resources for aircraft spare parts. He labored tirelessly to ensure that aircraft maintainers had the tools and equipment required to perform their important duties. And he made revolutionary use of Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve members to augment members of the Regular Air Force in keeping our aircraft flying. As a result of these and many other significant initiatives, the Air Force arrested a decade-long decline in aircraft readiness.

With similar vigor and success, Secretary Peters has led the development of the Air Force as the service leader in the national security space arena. Today, the United States Air Force provides over 85 percent of the national security space funding and 90 percent of the people who perform the national security space mission.

More important, under Secretary Peters' deft guidance, the Air Force made national security space assets more responsive and more relevant to our national defense than ever before. He built pioneering partnerships between NASA, the National Reconnaissance Office, and the Air Force to rapidly exploit emerging technologies that will move vital intelligence information to field commanders in minutes rather than months.

But, even with the most daunting challenges of global crises, emerging technologies and constrained resources, the 700,000 men and women of America's Air Force have always been his most important concern. His unceasing efforts on their behalf in the halls of this building resulted in a better quality of life and better compensation for every Air Force member. As a result, the Air Force exceeded its recruiting goals in 2000 and is ahead of schedule for 2001.

When Whit Peters came to the Office of the Secretary, he had inherited declining retention rates among the troops at all levels. But his efforts have paid off. For the first 3 months of this fiscal year, first-term airmen are re-enlisting at rates above the Air Force's goal, a goal that is already higher than the goal of any other service. And the Air Force's pilot shortage has been cut by a third in just over a year.

My colleagues, today the Air Force is better, much better, America is stronger, and the world is safer because of the dedication, sacrifice and hard work of Secretary Whit Peters. I know my colleagues will join me in wishing him good luck and Godspeed as he returns to private life.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

HISTORIC DAY FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. Madam Speaker, today was an historic day for the United States because our President, George W. Bush, announced a new office for faith-based initiatives.

Many of us have worked for many years, as has President Bush and the State of Texas, in many of these initiatives and are very excited about what the President has done. There have been many people toiling away in our inner cities, in our rural areas, and other places trying to extend a helping hand to the poor, yet often ignored in the public arena, while many groups who have been less effective have been able to get the funds.

Nobody is arguing that there are not well-meaning people in multiple bureaucracies of the Federal Government and of State and local governments. But we also know that many of the most life-changing experiences, many of the most effective programs, have actually occurred at the neighborhood level, the grassroots level, from people who live in those communities, who work in those communities, who are deeply invested; they leverage the funds, and yet they are not eligible when we have different programs.

□ 1900

We have had a number of amendments through this House, some of which have died in the Senate, some of which were vetoed, and some of which are law in the charitable choice provisions.

President Bush has gone one step farther. Not only has he said that he favors these charitable choice provisions in allowing, under rigid conditions, nobody can proselytize, nobody can try to push their religious faiths on somebody else, but for Christians who want to do service for others, to try to extend those dollars, whether it be in housing, in juvenile justice, whether it be in certain after-school programs, whether it be helping the homeless, whether it be helping people with AIDS, that Christian and Muslim and Hindu and Buddhist and Jewish organizations can now apply for those grants.

In addition to what he has done at the legislative proposal level, he has asked the executive branch agencies to analyze their programs internally to see where they have reached out, to see what has worked and what has not worked and where they might expand that.