

have supported a significant American role in international family planning. I urge my colleagues to reaffirm that support today by voting in favor of House Joint Resolution 36.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired. Pursuant to section 581A(e) of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act for 1997, no amendment is in order and the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. SENBRENNER] having assumed the chair, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 36) approving the Presidential finding that the limitation on obligations imposed by section 581A(a) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1997, is having a negative impact on the proper functioning of the population planning program, he reported the bill back to the House.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. 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 220, nays 209, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 22]

YEAS—220

Abercrombie	Clayton	Farr
Ackerman	Clement	Fattah
Allen	Clyburn	Fawell
Andrews	Condit	Fazio
Baesler	Conyers	Filner
Baldacci	Coyne	Flake
Barrett (WI)	Cramer	Foglietta
Bass	Cummings	Foley
Becerra	Danner	Ford
Bentsen	Davis (FL)	Fowler
Bereuter	Davis (IL)	Fox
Berman	Davis (VA)	Frank (MA)
Berry	DeFazio	Franks (NJ)
Bilbray	DeGette	Frelinghuysen
Bishop	Delahunt	Frost
Blagojevich	DeLauro	Furse
Blumenauer	Dellums	Ganske
Boehlert	Deutsch	Gejdenson
Bonior	Dicks	Gekas
Borski	Dingell	Gephardt
Boswell	Dixon	Gibbons
Boucher	Doggett	Gilchrest
Boyd	Dooley	Gilman
Brown (CA)	Dunn	Gonzalez
Brown (FL)	Edwards	Gordon
Brown (OH)	Ehrlich	Green
Campbell	Engel	Greenwood
Capps	Eshoo	Gutierrez
Cardin	Etheridge	Hall (OH)
Castle	Evans	Hamilton

Harman	Matsui	Rush
Hastings (FL)	McCarthy (MO)	Sabo
Hefner	McCarthy (NY)	Sanchez
Hilliard	McDermott	Sanders
Hinchee	McGovern	Sandlin
Hinojosa	McHale	Sawyer
Hobson	McKinney	Schiff
Hooley	McNulty	Schumer
Horn	Meehan	Scott
Houghton	Meek	Serrano
Hoyer	Menendez	Shaw
Jackson (IL)	Millender-	Shays
Jackson-Lee	McDonald	Sherman
(TX)	Miller (CA)	Sisisky
Jefferson	Miller (FL)	Skaggs
Johnson (CT)	Minge	Slaughter
Johnson (WI)	Mink	Smith, Adam
Johnson, E. B.	Moakley	Smith, Snyder
Kanjorski	Molinari	Spratt
Kaptur	Moran (VA)	Stabenow
Kelly	Morella	Stark
Kennedy (MA)	Murtha	Stokes
Kennedy (RI)	Nadler	Strickland
Kennelly	Neal	Tanner
Kilpatrick	Olver	Tauscher
Kind (WI)	Owens	Thomas
Klecza	Pallone	Thompson
Klink	Pascrell	Thurman
Klug	Pastor	Tierney
Kolbe	Payne	Torres
Lampson	Pelosi	Towns
Lantos	Pickett	Turner
Lazio	Pomeroy	Upton
Leach	Porter	Velazquez
Levin	Price (NC)	Vento
Lewis (CA)	Pryce (OH)	Visclosky
Lewis (GA)	Ramstad	Waters
Lofgren	Rangel	Watt (NC)
Lowey	Regula	Waxman
Luther	Reyes	Wexler
Maloney (CT)	Rivers	Wise
Maloney (NY)	Rothman	Woolsey
Markey	Roukema	Wynn
Martinez	Roybal-Allard	Yates

NAYS—209

Aderholt	Ehlers	Lipinski
Archer	Emerson	Livingston
Armey	English	LoBiondo
Bachus	Ensign	Lucas
Baker	Everett	Manton
Ballenger	Ewing	Manzullo
Barcia	Forbes	Mascara
Barr	Gallegly	McCollum
Barrett (NE)	Gillmor	McCrery
Bartlett	Gingrich	McDade
Barton	Goode	McHugh
Bateman	Goodlatte	McInnis
Bilirakis	Goodling	McIntosh
Bliley	Goss	McIntyre
Blunt	Graham	McKeon
Boehner	Granger	Metcalfe
Bonilla	Gutknecht	Mica
Bono	Hall (TX)	Mollohan
Brady	Hansen	Moran (KS)
Bryant	Hastert	Myrick
Bunning	Hastings (WA)	Nethercutt
Burr	Hayworth	Neumann
Burton	Hefley	Ney
Buyer	Herger	Northup
Callahan	Hill	Norwood
Calvert	Hilleary	Nussle
Camp	Hoekstra	Oberstar
Canady	Holden	Ortiz
Cannon	Hostettler	Oxley
Chabot	Hulshof	Packard
Chambliss	Hunter	Pappas
Chenoweth	Hutchinson	Parker
Christensen	Hyde	Paul
Coble	Inglis	Paxon
Coburn	Istook	Pease
Collins	Jenkins	Peterson (MN)
Combest	John	Peterson (PA)
Cook	Johnson, Sam	Petri
Cooksey	Jones	Pickering
Costello	Kasich	Pitts
Cox	Kildee	Pombo
Crane	Kim	Portman
Crapo	King (NY)	Poshard
Cubin	Kingston	Quinn
Cunningham	Knollenberg	Radanovich
Deal	Kucinich	Rahall
DeLay	LaFalce	Riggs
Diaz-Balart	LaHood	Riley
Dickey	Largent	Roemer
Doolittle	Latham	Rogan
Doyle	LaTourette	Rogers
Dreier	Lewis (KY)	Rohrabacher
Duncan	Linder	Ros-Lehtinen

Royce	Smith (OR)	Thune
Ryun	Smith (TX)	Tiahrt
Salmon	Smith, Linda	Trafilant
Sanford	Snowbarger	Walsh
Saxton	Solomon	Wamp
Scarborough	Souder	Watkins
Schaefer, Dan	Spence	Watts (OK)
Schaffer, Bob	Stearns	Weldon (FL)
Sensenbrenner	Stenholm	Weldon (PA)
Sessions	Stump	Weller
Shadegg	Stupak	Weygand
Shimkus	Sununu	White
Shuster	Talent	Whitfield
Skeen	Tauzin	Wicker
Skelton	Taylor (MS)	Wolf
Smith (MI)	Taylor (NC)	Young (FL)
Smith (NJ)	Thornberry	

NOT VOTING—4

Carson	Obey
Clay	Young (AK)

□ 1303

Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. OWENS changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SENBRENNER). The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval is in violation of the rules of the House.

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE FROM FEBRUARY 13, 1997, TO FEBRUARY 25, 1997, AND FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE FROM FEBRUARY 13, 1997, TO FEBRUARY 24, 1997

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 21) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 21

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).* That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, February 13, 1997, it stand adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 25, 1997, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, which ever occurs first; and that when the Senate adjourns or recesses at the close of business on Thursday, February 13, 1997, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader, or his designee, in accordance with this concurrent resolution, it stand recessed or adjourned until 11:30 a.m. on Monday, February 24, 1997, or such time on that day as may be specified by the Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, which ever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### FAMILY PLANNING FACILITATION AND ABORTION FUNDING RESTRICTION ACT OF 1997

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 46 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 46

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution, it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 581) to amend Public Law 104-208 to provide that the President may make funds appropriated for population planning and other population assistance available on March 1, 1997, subject to restrictions on assistance to foreign organizations that perform or actively promote abortions. The bill shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by Representative Smith of New Jersey or his designee and a Member opposed to the bill. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, as we know from the previous debate, we are here today as a result of an agreement reached last year between the Congress and the White House concerning international family planning assistance. The agreement signed into law stated that no family planning funds would be released until July 1997 unless the President determined that the delay was having a negative impact on the program.

We have now debated and voted on a privileged resolution to release those funds as the law calls for. Having considered the Army-Gephardt resolution, we have another option to expedite this funding. That is H.R. 5881, the Smith resolution, as it is called. The rule for the Smith bill is very straightforward. It is a closed rule with 1 hour of debate equally divided between proponents and opponents of the bill. The rule also provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

While the rule is closed, it was the opinion of the Committee on Rules that a closed rule was appropriate for this alternative to the Army-Gephardt resolution, which was completely unamendable. I think we all agree on the need for a U.S. role in promoting legitimate family planning services. There are strong humanitarian, economic, and environmental reasons for this. How taxpayer dollars will be uti-

lized to support these programs, however, is where the controversy lies.

I tend to agree with many Members who feel that it makes sense regardless of your view on the issue of abortion, to ensure that precious U.S. taxpayer dollars are not used either directly or indirectly to promote or perform abortions. The Smith resolution would expedite the release of the family planning funds, just like the Army-Gephardt resolution. In addition, it would reinstate the Mexico City policy, as we call it, which worked honorably for 12 years during the Reagan and Bush administrations.

This policy, as my colleagues will recall, simply states that U.S. funds will not, repeat, not go to nongovernmental organizations that either promote or perform abortions. That is the issue. I would urge my colleagues to support this rule.

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

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

I rise in strong opposition to the rule. The legislation that is made in order by this rule is just another transparent attempt to tack abortion restrictions onto legislation which is peripheral at best to the issue of abortion. We are talking today about family planning programs, family planning, not abortion. This is a critical distinction because effective family planning greatly reduces or even eliminates the demand for abortion.

Anyone who opposes abortion should be an ardent supporter of family planning. The bill we will consider on this rule proposes to reinstate the Mexico City policy and deny critical family planning funding to international organizations that reserve the right to provide abortions or abortion counseling with their own funds.

□ 1315

No one is suggesting that U.S. funding will go toward abortions in other nations. We have had these prohibitions against such use of U.S. funds in place since 1973.

The bill proposes to restrict access to family planning in order to reduce abortions. If reduction is the goal, this bill will be an utter failure because studies have proved, time and time again, that access to family planning reduces abortion.

In Russia, where for decades abortion was the primary form of birth control, contraception first became widely available in 1991. Between 1989 and 1995, abortions in Russia dropped from 4.43 million a year to 2.7 million a year, a 60 percent decrease. That should be compelling to anyone.

Why would anyone who wants to decrease abortions want to restrict access to family planning? How can they justify probably defunding organizations like the one in Russia? These statistics are repeated all over the world, in South Korea, Chile, and Hungary.

Family planning has a wide range of other benefits as well. By spacing births, women and families can improve infant survival and ensure that they have the resources to support their children. Spacing births at least 2 years apart could prevent an average of one in four infant deaths.

Finally, someone must speak for the millions of women around the world who desperately want access to family planning. Pregnancy and childbirth are still a very risky proposition for women in many parts of the globe that often lack electricity, hot running water, medical equipment, or trained personnel.

In Africa, women have a 1-in-16 chance of death from pregnancy and childbirth during their lifetime, and over 585,000 women in this world die every year from complications of pregnancy and birth. For each woman who dies, 100 others suffer from associated illnesses and permanent disabilities, including sterility.

If we could meet just the existing demands for family planning services, we could reduce the number of maternal deaths and injuries in the world by up to 20 percent. Many of these are women with families, who leave their children motherless. We cannot, in conscience, abandon them by cutting off what may be their only access to birth control information.

This bill would impose personal beliefs on family planning organizations throughout the world. How dare we, blessed as we are with practically information overload, the best health care system in the world, attempt to deny the only source of information services to families in the developing world?

Who are we to dictate the terms under which these groups provide essential services across the globe? We would be outraged, and rightly so, if the legislative body of any nation had the audacity to impose its will over organizations operating legally in our country by dictating the terms under which they would continue to receive the financial support they need to operate.

It is inhumane to restrict access to family planning in areas where it is desperately needed. We must not expose more women and families to the risks associated with unintended pregnancies. I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule and against the Smith bill.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes 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, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for her kindness and her leadership and the gentlewoman from California.

Although I did not want to rise to the floor of the House today to say that