

planning organizations. Then, as now, I fully supported the end result but then, as now, I do not think that threatening to withhold our U.N. dues, our U.N. back dues, was the proper tactic.

Mr. Speaker, this is President Bush's view as well. Yesterday, the President's spokesman stated while the United States is disappointed with the results of the Human Rights Commission election, the President feels strongly that this issue should not be linked to the payment of our arrears to the U.N. and other international organizations.

The United States has been and continues to be a beacon of hope for defending the human rights and freedoms of all people, and this is the promise of the United Nations. I am afraid that the Hyde-Lantos amendment would only further undermine the operations of the U.N. and our ability to provide leadership. Despite my support for the bill, I reluctantly oppose the rule, and ask my colleagues to vote no on this unnecessarily restrictive rule. Should the rule pass, I ask my colleagues to vote no on the Hyde-Lantos amendment.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise as a member of the Committee on International Relations but I would like to express my disappointment that of my amendments that were offered to the Committee on Rules, none of them were approved. That was a great disappointment to me.

I will vote for the rule, recognizing the fact that it is hard to accommodate everyone, but nevertheless it is very clear that I have been an outspoken opponent of the United Nations, and the amendments that we will be discussing will really not deal with the essence of whether or not we should be involved as we are in foreign interventionism. I think we are tinkering on the edges and will not do much to improve the bill even if some of the amendments are passed, some of which I will support.

I do think there are some serious things that we must consider. One is the issue of national sovereignty. To support H.R. 1646, one has to vote to give up some of our national sovereignty to the United Nations. There is \$844 million for peacekeeping missions. We know now that we live in an age when we go to war not by declaration of the U.S. Congress but we go to war under U.N. resolutions. When we vote for this bill, and if this bill is supported, that concept of giving up our sovereignty and going to war under U.N. resolutions is supported.

I would like to have struck from the bill all the money for population control. I will support the Mexican City language, but it really does not do that much. All funds are fungible, and if we provide hundreds of millions of dollars for population control and say please do not use it for abortion, it is just shifting some funds around. So there is no real prohibition on the use of American taxpayers' money for abortion if we do not strike all of these funds.

The United Nations have already laid plans for an international tax. This January it was proposed that the U.N. would like to put a tax on all currency transactions to raise \$1.5 billion. This is abhorrent. This should be abhorrent to all of us. It should be abhorrent to all Americans that we would have an international tax imposed by the United Nations.

Already the United Nations is involved in tax collecting. In Bosnia right now, in Serbia, the U.N. has as one of their functions collecting taxes on goods coming into the country. There was a demonstration not too long ago by the Serbs objecting to this. The idea that U.N. soldiers, paid by the American taxpayers, are now tax collectors in Bosnia should arouse our concern.

The only way, since we do not have the amendments to reject outright some of this wasteful and harmful funding, the only way we who believe that our sovereignty is being challenged is to reject 1646. I see no other way to address this subject, because it is not in our best interest to go along with this.

The way the bill is written right now, we will support the Kyoto Treaty, and the International Criminal Court is also something that we should be contending with.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this rule. I am disappointed that the Hastings-Allen amendment was not made in order. Our amendment would establish a special coordinator for Korea to negotiate the end of the North Korean missile program. We can negotiate away the North Korean missile threat, but only if we sit down at the table to discuss the subject. President Bush has refused to do so.

In denying the House a vote on our amendment, Republicans show they have no interest in getting rid of North Korean missiles. Why? Apparently because those missiles are needed to justify the President's extravagant, unworkable missile defense scheme.

It is far easier to defend against a missile that is never built than against a missile that has been launched. There is a new, improved climate on the Korean Peninsula. The North Koreans have voluntarily continued their moratorium on testing. It is a shame on this

bill we cannot even vote for a special coordinator to negotiate an end to the North Korean missile threat.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) for yielding me this time. I appreciate his great leadership in this body on so many issues.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this restrictive rule. The rule should be open and allow for debate of all the issues that could be brought to this floor, because it is extremely important.

Later today I will be speaking about an issue that does not reflect the best of our decisions in the deals that we have made. I am referring to the Hyde-Lantos-Sweeney amendment. This amendment will hold hostage United States payments to the United Nations.

In 1999, under the Helms-Biden agreement, we negotiated a deal with the United Nations. They have held up their end of the bargain. We have not. Because the U.N. has voted the U.S. off the Human Rights Commission, we are deciding that we can break our agreement, that we can break our contract.

This is wrong, and I think we would be ashamed if our children acted in this manner.

Today I am supporting the Bush administration, because they support the funding of the United Nations. If we pass the Hyde-Lantos-Sweeney amendment, it will be the first loss of the Bush administration on Capitol Hill.

I would like to quote from Ari Fleisher, representing the Bush administration. "While the United States is disappointed with the results of the Human Rights Commission election, the President feels strongly that this issue should not be linked to the payment of our arrears to the United Nations and other international interests."

If we pass this amendment, we will be sending a message to the world that our word cannot be trusted and that if we do not get what we want, we can break our deal. As I am sure my colleagues will agree, this is not the message we want to send to the world community.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule, with great disappointment that the Committee on Rules did not make in order a very important amendment that I had offered. While I understand the restrictions that face the Committee on Rules in selecting a workable number of amendments under tight time constraints, I regret that the committee did not see fit to report my amendment which addresses a very critical and legitimate issue.