

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 Arney-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 Arney-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 Arney-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

this is one more vote on abortion, I simply have to say that, because for 30 years the United States led an international effort to reduce the toll of maternal deaths and unwanted pregnancies by providing money and pregnancy assistance for family planning throughout the international arena. It did it quietly and effectively. This was a vote for poor women across the Nation.

Now we come to legislation and the closed rule, which I rise to oppose, as well as the actual resolution, that would interfere with that quiet diplomacy helping women internationally have the safety and security of being able to protect themselves and their children.

The National Council for International Health estimates that cuts in 1996 family planning funds will result in approximately 8,000 women dying during pregnancy and childbirth and 134,000 infants dying from an increased number of high-risk births.

Do my colleagues realize in this coming year there will be an estimated 4 million unwanted pregnancies without family planning that will result in 1.6 million abortions?

This is not a discussion or a vote on abortion for those of us who believe in family planning. It is for those who constantly want to remind us that this is a decisive issue. I ask them to consider the poor women of this world, those women who, unlike those in America who also suffer sometimes from lack of good services, cannot even access the information to understand how to protect their children that are there with them and yet their unborn children.

I would ask that we understand that what we did just prior to this particular rule is the right way to go, to vote for family planning, unscrambled, unattacked, and ready to be presented, as America has always done, in a kind and loving way. Let us stand up for the women across the world. Let us oppose this rule and oppose the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I am providing for the RECORD a copy of my complete statement.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and to H.R. 581. I support release of the already appropriated international family planning funds at the earliest possible date.

Family planning helps to improve the health and increase the survival rate of women and children during pregnancy, in childbirth, and in the years after. The National Council for International Health estimates that cuts in 1996 family planning funds will result in approximately 8,000 women dying during pregnancy and childbirth and 134,000 infants dying from an increased number of high risk births.

Family planning allows parents to control the number of children that they have and the timing of those births. And in so doing it allows women the opportunity to reach beyond the walls of their homes, to get an education, and to work outside of the family. A recent report of the Rockefeller Foundation argued that devoting less time to bearing children, reducing family size, and improving the health and sur-

vival of women and children results in better economic prospects in developing countries.

Representative SMITH and his supporters have attempted to mischaracterize this vote. They have misguidedly tried to recast a vote for international family planning as a vote for abortion.

What Representative SMITH neglects to consider is the fact that not a penny of these funds will be spent to either perform or promote abortion. That is against the law.

What Representative SMITH does not realize is that withholding these funds will reduce access to contraception and in so doing increase unintended and unwanted pregnancies. Experience demonstrates that as unintended pregnancies increase, so does the abortion rate.

The National Council for International Health estimates that the reduced funding will result in approximately 7 million couples in developing countries losing access to birth control methods. They estimate that 4 million unwanted pregnancies will result and that this could lead to as many as 1.6 million abortions.

What Representative SMITH does not discuss is the fact that withholding family planning funds, denies moneys to all countries even those such as Trinidad and Tobago where abortion is illegal.

My colleagues, this is not a vote on abortion. This is a vote to provide more options and opportunities for the people of developing nations around the world.

Representative SMITH's bill is not only ill advised, but it stands in violation of the spirit, if not the letter, of the compromise on international family planning funds that my Republican colleagues made with President Clinton last year.

For these reasons, I call upon each Member to signal their support for the health and welfare of women, children, and families in voting for House Joint Resolution 36 and against H.R. 581.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York. [Ms. VELAZQUEZ].

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and this bill for one basic reason: It is antiwoman and it is antifamily.

It is not enough for our women here in the United States to be harassed and intimidated and to have family clinics bombed and burned; now we are considering restricting the human rights of women in other countries to control their bodies.

International family planning assistance has been responsible for reducing maternal deaths and unwanted pregnancies. Contrary to what antiabortion forces tell you, these Federal funds cannot be used to pay for abortions. If we truly want to decrease abortions, then we should release this assistance now without restrictions.

Two hundred twenty-five million women worldwide need family planning services to allow them to make informed decisions. We should be striving to empower poor women around the world, not denying families living in poverty this survival assistance.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding me this time.

This is a vote on the rule to allow H.R. 581 to be considered by the House. This is legislation that would provide additional monies beginning March 1 for family planning, and it would front-load \$385 million, metering, which is an 8-percent-per-month payout that is in the current law, and would be continued even if the Clinton resolution is adopted by the Senate. This gets rid of metering completely. So all of the money would be available.

Importantly, this legislation will also provide important pro-life safeguards so that the entities and the organizations that we contribute to do not continue their crusade with our money in one pocket and their money in the other pocket to bring down the right-to-life laws in the various countries.

Let me again remind Members that almost 100 countries around the world protect their unborn babies from the cruelty of abortion on demand. And let me remind Members again, abortion takes the life of a baby, whether it be suction abortions or dismemberment, where the babies' arms and legs are torn off. These are unpleasant realities, but they are the reality of what abortion does to unborn babies.

We have to make the world abortion free, not provide free abortion. The pro-abortion organizations, like the International Planned Parenthood Federation, based in London, and others, are absolutely vociferously committed to providing abortion overseas on demand. It is against the cultural values and the moral values of these countries. That does not matter. Their own literature is replete with admonishments, and it pushes and promotes their organizations to try to bring down these laws regardless of what the local populace thinks.

It is the ugly American all over again when we are part of that, trying to impose our cultural values upon these particular people. Human rights ought to be for the unborn and for all people.

It seems to me that birth is an event that happens to all of us. It is not the beginning of life. Human rights are indivisible. Life is a continuum. To say that everyone after birth has human rights and those before do not is contrary to reality and science. And again, these organizations are trying to promote an antithetical view with regard to human rights.

Let me also remind my colleagues that the Organization of American States has a human rights document that recognizes the right to life from the moment of conception. These organizations are working against that basic human right, and I think we should be very careful about to whom we contribute.

This rule allows H.R. 581 to come up for a vote. It is fair. Then we can have our debate on the merits. I think that is as it should be. Vote for the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to take a moment to respond to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Frankly, I think the cruelest form of birth control is the fact that 600,000 women die in the world every year from complications, not understanding how to space their families. And it does not happen to all of us, it happens to the women in the world.

It is very important, if we want the emerging world, the developing world, to have a chance to be able to feed, to take care, to provide health care for their population. Part of that equation, without any doubt, is the ability to space and plan one's family.

To take that essential right away from the women of the world because we may believe that some organizations do not always believe what we think is the proper thing, we nonetheless know in this House that those organizations are prohibited from using any of these funds for abortion information or abortions.

What more can we say? Nobody has accused them of going ahead and using it. The fact of the matter is, what we are trying to do is save lives. It is as important as that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine, [Mr. BALDACCI].

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the closed rule we are considering that would provide for consideration of H.R. 581 introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

I believe that consideration of this legislation breaks the agreement that was reached between the President and Congress last year with respect to international family planning.

That agreement provided for a clean up or down vote on release of funds beginning on March 1 if President Clinton notified Congress that the delay in releasing the funds was having a negative impact on international family planning funds.

The agreement has resulted in a nearly 5-month delay in the release of international family planning funds and, as President Clinton has determined, has had a detrimental effect around the world.

The legislation introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] continues to draw a mistaken connection between international family planning and abortion.

As we have already heard countless times on this floor today, current U.S. law prohibits use of any U.S. funds to pay for an abortion in international family planning. Regular independent audits of USAID have found absolutely no evidence that a single penny of U.S. money has ever been misused.

The only way to reduce the number of abortions around the world is to reduce the number of unintended and unwanted pregnancies. The best way to do that is to continue to fund voluntary family planning initiatives worldwide.

One study has shown that the reduction in funds for international family planning for fiscal year 1995 to fiscal year 1997 will deny 7 million couples in

developing countries access to modern contraceptive methods. This will result in 4 million unintended pregnancies. Based on historic patterns, this will lead to almost 2 million more unplanned births and 1.6 million more abortions than would have occurred already.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule and vote against H.R. 581.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say that certainly we do not want to get the rule mixed up with the controversy of the debate.

This is a good rule to bring the debate forward, and I would hope we would all support this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON], my colleague and friend.

□ 1330

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I rise in support of the rule and in support of the legislation introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. Speaker, I think there has been a certain amount of confusion introduced regarding the real debate that we are discussing here. The legislation of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] actually increases the amount of money for family planning and makes it available earlier. It simply places some restrictions in there that are consistent with the Mexico City restrictions, restrictions that do not allow organizations that actively promote abortion services to have access to the funds.

One of the organizations that the President of the United States would like to distribute this money to, the International Planned Parenthood Federation, has a Vision 2000 document that they have made available, and I do not know if my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have read this thing, but not only do they want to promote the availability of abortion services, they actually want to work to advocate the overturning of existing law in these countries that do not make abortion available.

I do not think it is wise use of the U.S. taxpayers' dollars to take taxpayers' money to go and give it to an organization that is going to essentially lobby to have abortion laws overturned in foreign countries. I have people in my district who have trouble making ends meet. I have people in my district who have no health insurance. We shouldn't be taking their tax dollars and giving it to an organization that is pursuing this kind of an agenda.

So we have a very reasonable rule here and a very reasonable bill that it supports, that says you can have even more family planning money but we are just not going to give it to these certain groups that pursue this certain radical, left-wing, pro-abortion agenda.

Mr. Speaker, I highly encourage all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle

to support the rule and to support the legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this rule. The need for family planning services in developing countries is urgent and the aid we provide is both valuable and worthwhile.

Our international family planning programs promote economic and social development, improve basic standards of health and actually reduce the number of abortions worldwide. Nevertheless, securing funding for these critical programs continues to be a battle. In an effort to resolve this issue and pass the omnibus appropriations bill last year, the White House and the Republican leadership reached an agreement to hold a clean vote this month on the resolution that we just passed, fortunately.

We agreed to release these funds 5 months into the fiscal year instead of 9 months. Alternate legislation was never a part of this agreement. We never agreed to give opponents of family planning one last opportunity to gut these programs. But if H.R. 581 is considered by the House today, that is exactly what will happen. Allowing consideration of this bill will raise serious concerns about our ability to negotiate in good faith during this year's budget process.

That is really the key. An agreement was made. Promises made should be promises kept. In the spirit of bipartisanship, I urge Members to defeat this rule.

The restrictions on population funds in H.R. 581 are not new to us. We have faced these program gutting provisions several times before and we will undoubtedly face them again.

Today's vote should be the one vote we just took on the resolution and that one only. Anything else is a deal breaker. Again, promises made should be promises kept. In the spirit of bipartisanship, I urge Members to defeat this rule.

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

I would like to take just a minute if I could to say that if I had my druthers, this bill would not go forward. This is an unreported bill and a closed rule, and I find that fairly egregious, particularly given the fact that we have just voted to support the President's privileged resolution.

However, we will not be calling for a vote. I simply want to voice my objection to the process by which this has happened. We are just beginning this process, and we hope we will not see it again.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out that the reason we are here is

because of deliberative democracy, a representative form of government that we have. I think that indeed instead of breaking promises, we are living up to promises here, promises to all parties who are interested in the full measure of this debate.

It is remembered, of course, that the previous item that we dealt with, that was brought forward earlier today, was unamendable, it was closed, and to round out this issue it was necessary to come forward with a second piece of legislation. This rule I think does it in a way that is entirely fair, and I believe it is in the best interests of deliberative democracy that we do this. I would also point out that there is a motion to recommit attached to it, so we have given an extra measure of fairness, we believe.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 46, I call up 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, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of H.R. 581 is as follows:

H.R. 581

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Family Planning Facilitation and Abortion Funding Restriction Act of 1997".

(b) AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC LAW 104-208.—Section 518A of subsection 101(c) of Public Law 104-208 is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by deleting, "July 1, 1997" and inserting "March 1, 1997";

(2) in subsection (c), by deleting "Such funds may be apportioned only on a monthly basis, and such monthly apportionments may not exceed 8 percent of the total available for such activities." and inserting "Subjects to the provision of subsection (b), such funds may be made available in such amounts as the President shall determine to be most conducive to the proper functioning of the population planning program."; and

(3) by adding the following new subsection: "(f) RESTRICTION ON ASSISTANCE TO FOREIGN ORGANIZATIONS THAT PERFORM OR ACTIVELY PROMOTE ABORTIONS.—

"(1) PERFORMANCE OF ABORTIONS.—

"(A) Notwithstanding any provision of law, no funds appropriated for population planning activities or other population assistance may be made available for any foreign private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organization until the organization certifies that it will not, during the period for which the funds are made available, perform abortions in any foreign country, except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the pregnancy were carried to term or in cases of forcible rape or incest.

"(B) Paragraph (a) may not be construed to apply to the treatment of injuries or illnesses caused by legal or illegal abortions or to assistance provided directly to the government of a country.

"(2) LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.—

"(A) Notwithstanding any provisions of law, no funds appropriated for population planning activities or other population assistance may be made available for any foreign private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organization until the organization certifies that it will not, during the period for which the funds are made available, violate the laws of any foreign country concerning the circumstances under which abortion is permitted, regulated, or prohibited, or engage in any activity or effort to alter the laws or governmental policies of any foreign country concerning the circumstances under which is permitted, regulated, or prohibited.

"(B) Paragraph (a) shall not apply to activities in opposition to coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization.

"(3) The prohibitions of this subsection apply to funds made available to a foreign organization either directly or as a subcontractor or subgrantee, and the required certifications apply to activities in which the organization engages either directly or through a subcontractor or subgrantee."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). Pursuant to House Resolution 46, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and a Member opposed each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, during the last session of Congress, the House voted six times to restrict aid to foreign organizations that perform or promote abortions overseas. We also voted to restrict aid to the U.N. Population Fund unless the UNFPA, the U.N. Population Fund, ended its participation in the forced abortion program in the People's Republic of China.

Mr. Speaker, there is evidence, I think, looking at today's vote and talking to a large number of Members, that there still are a large number of Members who are still committed to the sanctity and preciousness of human life and said that they would vote yes—yes.

I happen to disagree that that was the way to go, but we now have H.R. 581 on the floor and there is an opportunity to manifest ourselves and put on the record very clearly and unambiguously that we want to release the funds for family planning, we want to release the \$385 million that otherwise would wait until July 1, but we want to do it with principle. We want to make sure that the money only goes to those organizations that will erect a wall of separation between family planning, which is preventive, and abortion, which takes the life of a baby.

Mr. Speaker, I think more and more Members in the partial birth abortion debate that we had last year began what I truly believe to be an awakening about the gruesomeness of abortion. Abortion takes the life of a baby, whether it be dismemberment of an un-

born child's body or chemical poisoning by way of injection or the suction machines which decimate the infant, abortion is violence. It kills babies. Whether it be illegal or legal abortions, the net effect on the child is always the same, one dead baby.

I think our aim in Congress and our aim in humanitarian efforts ought to be to eradicate abortion, to make the world abortion free. Family planning certainly plays a part in that. That is why my legislation and Mr. OBERSTAR's legislation and Mr. HYDE's legislation, H.R. 581, makes it very clear that we front-load the family planning money.

There is no waiting for it. The Clinton administration can have every dime, \$385 million, and that is a lot of money, to be used for family planning on March 1. The President will actually get more in our legislation, not more in the cycle of the appropriations, but more quicker as a result of this legislation if he accepts this rather than the resolution just passed.

What is the Mexico City policy? Just let me remind my colleagues that yes, there is such an amendment known as the Helms amendment. It says that we will not directly fund abortion overseas. But we found in the early 1980's, and I have been here for 17 years, I would remind my colleagues, we found in the early 1980's that that law was not preventing the promotion and performance overseas of abortion by these international organizations. They very simply took our money which we were providing, put it in one pocket, provided an accounting saying that if they did not spend it, then it freed up megadollars in their other pocket to be used for the performance of abortion.

Paper and accounting tricks does not, if you are talking about human life being destroyed, really does not cut it. We are fooling ourselves if we think we are mitigating the promotion of abortion with this approach. It has not worked. It is only half a loaf. We need, if we are serious about making the world abortion free and not promoting abortion, take that other step and reestablish the Mexico City policy.

In sum, what the Mexico City policy will do is say we will not contribute to those organizations that perform abortion except in cases of rape, incest, and life of the mother. It also says that we will not provide moneys to those organizations that lobby for or against abortion. It is abortion neutral in that regard.

If you are doing family planning, you should not also be wearing that other hat of being the abortionist organization in that given country. This is very, very significant, Mr. Chairman, in light of what these groups are actually doing on the ground day in and day out.

In the last debate I pointed out that there is a document, and this is one of many, but this document in particular is the abortion manifesto of the family planning groups. It is called Vision 2000: A Strategic Plan. This Vision 2000,

adopted in 1992 and agreed to by the 140 Planned Parenthood affiliates around the world, states, and I quote, and it says it throughout the document but this is one direct quote: The IPPF will "bring pressure on governments and campaign for policy and legislative change to remove restrictions against abortions."

This is the abortion lobby in the developing world. We ought to be very careful about to whom we contribute if that is what they are doing, if we care about abortion promotion. If we do not care about it, if we think that is fine and dandy, then you should not be for our bill but if you do care about abortion promotion, look at the consequences, giving money to these organizations means that, yes, they provide family planning, but they also promote abortion very, very aggressively.

Let me also point out that this particular policy known as the Mexico City policy, where did it get its name, at a conference on population at Mexico City in 1984, has worked, and worked extremely well. During the 9 years that it was in operation, more than 350 family planning organizations and providers accepted the Mexico City clauses and said that they would divest themselves of abortion and be exclusively family planners.

That is what we are all about here, honesty, transparency, no hidden agendas. If family planning is your game, that is what you get the money for, that is what your organization should be all about. But these organizations like to fudge that line of demarcation and say that abortion is just family planning after a conception has occurred and they try again to make no distinction, or very little distinction, between the two.

I urge Members, because this will be the beginning of a long fight in the 105th Congress on this. Yes, the Clinton resolution passed today. That will not be the end of it, I can assure you. We will be back on the authorizing bills, we will be back on the appropriations bills when the fiscal 1998 and the 1999 funds come up, and again we are going to continue with this 1997 effort as well. I hope that by the end of this Congress, every Member of this Chamber whether they are pro-abortion or pro-life will be fully aware of what these organizations are doing.

The Trojan horse is this. They say they are all about family planning, they get into the country, they start networking, their real agenda is abortion. They say it in Vision 2000. I urge Members to become acquainted with it intimately so that they know to whom we are giving. They are acting as surrogates for the Clinton administration in bringing down the right-to-life laws.

We need to stand up for those innocent children in these developing countries, provide humanitarian aid. And I take a back seat to no one on providing child survival aid and all kinds of other aid. I offered the amendments in the mid-1980's to provide money for immu-

nizations, oral dehydration, and other kinds of helps. That is what it is all about. Family planning is a part of that, but not when it is linked with abortion.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Ms. PELOSI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the bill but with the highest respect for the maker of the legislation. I want to reiterate what I said earlier on the debate on the privileged resolution, that I have the highest regard for the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and he is quite correct. He takes a back seat to no one on child survival issues in this Congress.

□ 1345

In fact he and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] have been the champions for poor children throughout the world. On this issue, though, of whether the Mexico City language should apply to international family planning, I respectfully disagree with him, and I emphasize the word "respectfully."

With that, Mr. Speaker, I will take some time later to make my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Ms. WATERS], the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, and the fact is that Ms. MAXINE WATERS is a great leader on these international family planning issues.

Ms. WATERS. I thank the gentleman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for yielding time to me on this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 581.

This bill would reinstate a gag rule on foreign organizations that receive U.S. family planning funds. It would forbid them from discussing abortion with women even if the procedure is legal in their own country and if the organization uses its own money, not U.S. funds, to provide counseling.

If this bill were to pass, countries which immensely benefit from U.S. planning aid, such as India, Bolivia, Jordan, and South Africa, where abortion is legal, by the way, could be disqualified from obtaining U.S. funds for contraceptives simply for complying with their own country's law on abortion.

Thus, an Indian or South African woman seeking advice on family planning would not be told of all of her options.

This is unacceptable.

Further, there is no evidence that the so-called Mexico City policy has decreased abortion at all.

The real issue at stake here is maternal and child health. If the United States continues to decrease international family planning funding,

money which has been slashed and whose disbursement has been delayed, we will be hurting millions of men and women who seek or rely on modern contraception to delay or postpone childbirth. We are punishing responsible people.

In funding year 1996, funds were effectively cut by 85 percent, and this is at a time when, internationally, 1 in 6 women of reproductive age are still in need of contraception to postpone or avoid future childbearing. Almost 600,000 women die during pregnancy and childbirth each year; 75 percent of these women die from attempting to abort an unwanted pregnancy themselves.

That is why family planning is so crucial. It saves lives.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to stop pretending that restricting discussion on abortion will stop it altogether. We need to continue to work with people to prevent unwanted and unsafe pregnancies in the first place.

I ask my colleagues to please reject the Smith bill.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Smith resolution.

The Mexico City restrictions which this bill would impose will have a devastating impact on international family planning services throughout the world.

Here we go again. Every time we discuss international family planning, Mr. SMITH offers these restrictions. I certainly respect his views, and we have worked on many other issues together; however, his insistence on imposing these restrictions held up the foreign operations appropriations bill last year and could derail our efforts to get life-saving family planning money released this year.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] claims this resolution is not antifamily planning, just antiabortion. That just does not make sense. Currently no U.S. dollars are spent on abortion services overseas. In fact it has been illegal since 1973. These restrictions are stringently enforced by USAID.

In addition, as has been stated today on this floor time and time again, family planning services reduce the number of abortions worldwide. The Smith resolution will not stop abortions. It will only increase them.

One of the most important forms of aid that we provide to other countries is family planning assistance. We have heard countless stories today about the critical work done throughout the world by international family planning programs. These programs improve the health and well-being of men, women and children, they strengthen the economy, protect the environment, enhance the quality of life in developing nations, and most importantly save lives.

The Smith resolution is dangerous and extreme. It would defund family

planning organizations that perform legal abortions with their own money, not United States money. It would also impose a gag rule on U.S. based organizations and nongovernmental organizations that provide U.S. family planning overseas.

I would like to explain that to my colleagues. Doctors from USAID have told me personally about the horribly chilling effect of the gag rule. They have interviewed doctors in small villages who turned away women from botched illegal abortions bleeding to death, and they were afraid to refer this woman. They did so because they feared losing their U.S. funding if they helped the women or even gave her the name of another doctor.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Smith resolution. It is an extreme piece of legislation that no matter how it is disguised, it is ultimately intended to end U.S. family planning overseas.

A vote for the Smith resolution is a vote against sensible, cost effective family planning programs. My colleagues, it is a vote against lifesaving services.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, just let me remind Members that, when Mr. Clinton sent up his 1994 rewrite of the Foreign Assistance Act, he intended and it was in the bill to absolutely repeal the Helms amendment so that direct funding would be used to pay for abortions overseas. So the administration on numerous occasions has signaled that they are every bit in favor of promoting abortion overseas.

As I said earlier in debate when they failed in that effort, we did not do plan 2, and that was to enlist the support of surrogates, namely groups like International Planned Parenthood Federation, based in London, and others to promote abortion for that under this subterfuge of saying that it is not our money. Well, we are giving to a group that is again promoting aggressively the abortion on demand.

And just to show how far down it gets, we recently came across a manual that was put out in the Dominican Republic by the affiliate of the IPPF, which is based in London, and it said this. It is called the Sex Education Manual, and the chapter on abortion makes it clear to the teachers at the end of the lesson that the students should, quote, become aware of the need to change the Dominican Republic's legislation on abortion.

So not only do they lobby legislators and governments and health officials again, and we empowered this group to be the bully on the block, but they also get into the schools and try to indoctrinate these children to bring down their right-to-life laws, and this is being replicated in every one of these countries.

Mr. Speaker, I have a copy of the manual if anybody wants to see it.

Let me also point out and use this chart to do so that the legislation that is pending before the House will provide more family planning money than the resolution just passed, not more over the cycle of an appropriations, but more up front. And that is very important. The Clinton finding earlier this month essentially said that, if the money does not come now, it is money denied, and that means terrible things will happen.

Mr. Speaker, if that be true, then the more up front the better. Our legislation, the Smith-Oberstar bill, provides \$410 million in fiscal year 1997 for family planning. Three hundred and eighty-five is for the family planning account, 25 for the United Nations Population Fund. The administration's request, 240 in fiscal year 1997. So we push out the door with our legislation more money for family planning. It is in the bill.

Please, I urge Members and friends just to read it.

The previous speaker said that the intent of what we are trying to do is to defund family planning. Nothing could be further from the truth. The plain language of the bill makes it clear we are putting more money, not less.

The argument was made back in 1984; I will never forget it, when the Mexico City policy was first put into effect, that the nongovernmental organizations, the NGO's, would never accept it. Well, friends, 350 and upward of 380 family planning organizations signed on the dotted line and said they would divest themselves from abortion and just do family planning. Only the International Planned Parenthood Federation of London and only Planned Parenthood Federation of America stood out and said we are so committed, so obsessed with promotion abortion overseas that we would lose the money rather than take the money and divest themselves of abortion.

So this will be a vote on abortion today. It is pro-family planning, and it is indeed both pro-life and pro-family planning.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this bill, which would seriously harm our international family planning programs. I strongly support family planning. I voted for the previous resolution that will release the funds for family planning without condition because I believe that these funds will improve women's health, reduce poverty, and protect our global environment. But I will not vote for this bill.

The supporters of this bill claim that our family planning efforts increase the number of abortions. This is simply not true. By law and by practice, U.S. funds cannot be used to provide abor-

tion services either in the United States or abroad. AID has implemented procedures that carefully monitor the spending of these funds, and independent audits confirm that not \$1 of U.S. funds is used to perform abortions.

I disagree personally with this policy, but it is the policy and the law nonetheless.

The real problem with this bill is that, by saying to clinics that they may not use other funds to perform abortions, it will force many health clinics which will not accept such conditions to close for lack of funding. These closed clinics will no longer help women receive prenatal care, will no longer prevent more women from dying during childbirth, will no longer help prevent unintended pregnancies and therefore will no longer help reduce the number of abortions. The number of abortions will increase, not decrease, if this bill were to pass.

So if my colleagues support family planning and want these clinics to remain open, then they must oppose this completely unnecessary bill and vote against it.

This bill is really about family planning, about closing family planning clinics and not about preventing the use of Federal funds from being spent on abortions, which is already against the law, which does not happen. This is an unnecessary, pernicious, and harmful bill that will simply result in more unwanted pregnancies, more fatalities among women, and more abortions.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH].

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I come forward today to express my strong support for a bipartisan alternative to President Clinton's resolution. The President's resolution will release an additional \$123 million for population control programs for fiscal year 1997 without any pro-life safeguards, and that is what our debate is all about. We need pro-life safeguards.

My colleagues, we object to giving the administration more money to spend this year unless the White House agrees to ensure that these family planning funds will not support organizations which perform or promote abortion.

Mr. Speaker, abortion should not and need not be interjected into the population assistance program as the Clinton administration has done. The President's resolution does not increase funding for international family planning. Rather, what it does is permit the U.S. Agency for International Development to begin spending certain appropriated funds for population control at a date earlier than was established by law last fall. This will result in the promotion and performance of abortion overseas.

□ 1400

I urge my colleagues to support the Smith bill, which will provide international family planning funds with

pro-life safeguards. The Smith bill will increase U.S. spending for international family planning programs in 1997, which is what we all want, by nearly \$300 million, bringing the total 1997 spending on these programs to \$713 million. It will ensure that foreign nongovernmental organizations receiving U.S. funds are not performing or promoting abortions in developing countries, except in cases of rape, incest, or the eminent endangerment of the mother's life.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot be fooled, and none of us can be fooled, by the false claims of many international population groups who state that this is not an abortion issue. It is.

We must be firm and stipulate that no population funds will go to foreign, nongovernmental organizations that, No. 1, perform abortions except in the case of rape, incest, or the imminent endangerment of the mother's physical health; No. 2, violate the laws of any foreign country with respect to abortion; No. 3, engage in any activity or effort to alter the laws or governmental policies of any foreign country with respect to abortion.

My position on abortion has been clear and consistent. I oppose it, except in certain very specific cases. The White House privileged resolution will debase the whole medical profession, it debases our system of law, and indeed it debases our very notion of the concept of life.

Our system of laws, our American heritage, is based on the idea that people have certain God-given rights. Those rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Those rights existed before laws were established. In fact, it is because those rights existed that laws were established in order to protect those rights.

First and foremost among those rights is the right to life.

As lawmakers we have a responsibility to protect the lives of our citizens, in this case, the very youngest, most vulnerable of American citizens. We must also protect those sacred lives in foreign countries where we are having a direct impact on their international family planning programs.

I urge my colleagues to do the right thing. I urge my colleagues to stand against this hideous, repugnant practice.

If President Clinton believes, as he says, that abortion should not be promoted as family planning and that international family planning programs need more funding this year, he should abandon the rigid stance he has taken in negotiations to date and accept the terms by Congress.

Let us stand up for a good principle and support additional international family planning dollars which will go to organizations which will not perform or promote abortion as a method of family planning.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CAPPS], a Member of the freshman class.

Mr. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the United States as a former teacher of religion,

and I want to speak plainly about H.R. 581. Religious people representing a variety of traditions and denominations have very strong feelings on this subject. They know that the number of unwanted pregnancies is too high. They also know that the estimated 25 billion unsafe and illegal abortions annually is a moral issue that must be addressed. Therefore, there is a strong consensus that there should be voluntary access to family planning services. The evidence confirms that family planning prevents unwanted pregnancies.

Mr. Speaker, people of faith affirm that human life, human reproduction are intended by God to be a blessing for the world. Responsible stewardship of human reproduction dictates that each child is a blessing for that child, his or her family and the world. Giving people the tools to take responsibility for their own reproductive health is vital to achieving this goal.

H.R. 581 will devastate these programs. This bill will severely inhibit comprehensive reproductive health services by shutting down many foreign NGO's that provide these services. Because of this the Mexico City-H.R. 581 restrictions will result in more abortions around the world, not fewer.

This bill also runs contrary to a fundamental sense of stewardship. As retired Senator Mark Hatfield from Oregon said, I quote, "Anti-abortion speech will not reduce the number of unintended pregnancies as swiftly or as surely as our support for voluntary family planning."

Fully supporting international family planning programs is one of the most humane, moral, and ethical positions that we as a Nation can take. I vote "no" on H.R. 581.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ADERHOLT].

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 581, a bill that would literally save the lives of countless children throughout the world. I commend my colleague from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] for introducing this important bill which would prevent international family planning funds from being used for abortion.

I want to make this point very clear. Abortion is not family planning. I have heard many of my colleagues say that this debate is not about abortion, but rather about saving lives. How ironic. We have heard many say that this funding for family planning is essential. Congressman SMITH's bill allows even more funding for family planning, so long as the funds are not used to promote abortion.

The question we will vote on in a few minutes is quite simply whether you oppose taxpayers' funds being used to promote abortion in foreign countries or whether you oppose it, pure and simple. I am proud to stand today with those who oppose it and to support life.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Smith bill.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHERMAN], also a Member of the freshman class.

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, my predecessor, Congressman Tony Beilenson, served here for 20 years, and was one of the leading advocates of international family planning. In recognition of his legacy, my first speech on this floor is again in favor of international family planning, and in opposition to unwarranted restrictions on family planning that would be imposed by this proposal.

International family planning brings together so many things that both I and many of my colleagues, and I think the vast majority of those in my district, care about. We care about the environment, and unless we do something to control the international population explosion, virtually all of our other environmental controls will simply be like taking a few buckets out of the ocean. We care about the dignity of women. Women in Third World countries acquire additional status, dignity and rights when they gain control of their own bodies and are afforded a full range of reproductive freedom.

The other side has made this a debate on the choice issue. I do not think that it is. But to the extent that a no vote is an opportunity to say that we believe in a woman's right to choose, we have another good reason to vote against this proposal.

This vote is a chance for us to stand for peace and development in the Third World, which can occur only if we deal with the population explosion which so tragically affects so many underdeveloped countries. It is a chance for us to deal with the illegal immigration problem. With our support, Mexico has been able to cut its population growth rate by over one-third through effective international family planning assistance. We need to continue that effort.

Finally, it is important that this Government operate as efficiently as possible. We need to contract with the international family planning agencies that are most effected. We should not impose some sort of political correctness test and say that we will not contract with this agency or that agency, and end up instead going to a less effective family planning organization.

So whether it is control of illegal immigration, enhancing our environment, working toward government efficiency, defending a woman's right to choose, promoting the dignity of women, or seeking peace and prosperity for the underdeveloped portion of the world, a vote against this alternative is called for.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS].

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 581, and I congratulate the sponsors, and especially the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], for leading the effort on this bill, for presenting us with a responsible and viable alternative to House Joint Resolution 36.

H.R. 581 allows AID to begin spending international family planning funds on March 1, and the bill deletes the restriction which releases these funds only on a monthly basis. Proponents of the previous bill would certainly support those provisions.

So the debate is on the reinstatement of the Mexico City policy that this bill mandates. The Mexico City language is straightforward, and I quote: "No funds appropriated for population planning activities may be made available for any foreign, private, nongovernmental or multilateral organization until the organization certifies it will not perform abortions in any foreign country except where the life of the mother would be endangered or in cases of forcible rape or incest."

From 1985 to 1993, this language protected the American taxpayer from having their tax payments spent on abortion. For 8 years this language assured our great Nation would not directly or indirectly support or promote abortion as a method of family planning throughout the world. With all of the world's great crying needs, we should not be spending our scarce foreign aid dollars to subsidize and promote abortions.

The world looks to America for moral leadership. The world looks to America for justice for the weak and the disenfranchised. We should respond to this call for leadership, not by promoting abortion in the poorest nations of the world, but by helping them develop the economic and political infrastructure that encourages development and progress. Abortion does neither.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on H.R. 581.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

(Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against the Smith legislation. Since 1973, no U.S. dollars for international family planning programs have been used for abortions. Not one. And it is not true that the Smith amendment will not impact women seeking family planning services, although the money provided is the same in both resolutions. Cutting off certain clinics because of how they use their own money does impact women.

In rural parts of the world it is not like Washington. There is only one health clinic. There is only one choice. Women there are lucky to have in fact one health clinic providing family planning services. They do not have a choice of clinics.

This vote is not about abortion, it is about family planning. By any measure, increased access to family planning decreases the number of abortions. The use of effective contraception has increased markedly throughout the world in the last 30 years. The percentage of couples in developing nations using family planning has increased from 10 to 50 percent, but we still have a long way to go. Nearly 230 million women worldwide, roughly one in six of reproductive age, are still in need of modern contraceptive methods in order to plan their families.

As the 20th century draws to a close, by the year 2000, some 800 million people, one-seventh of the world's population, will be teenagers in 4 years. While this reflects the incredible achievement of cutting down child mortality by half since 1950, it also has enormous implications for future population growth.

The U.N. predicts that in the next 50 years, world population, in just 50 years, will grow by 3.6 billion, the current population of Asia. Providing women with the power to control the number of children they have and to space them apart is good for women and children and for our world, and I urge opposition to the Smith amendment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Smith resolution, H.R. 581, which would reinstate the so-called Mexico City policy. I find the restrictive resolution to be superfluous.

We all know that in the 1973 Helms amendment, which prohibits any U.S. funds for abortion in international family planning, it is part of the permanent foreign aid statute. Furthermore, there is no evidence that any recipient of the U.S. funds has ever violated the terms of this Helms amendment.

This unnecessary layering of already restrictive law can only work to harm women and children worldwide by denying them the various health services provided by international family planning organizations.

The effects of the Mexico City policy are far-reaching and negative. According to UNICEF, every year 600,000 women die of pregnancy-related causes; 75,000 of these deaths are associated with self-induced, unsafe abortion. Is this the result we want?

In addition, the Mexico City policy serves as a threat, a gag order, that results in failure to assist women in need. For example, if a woman is suffering from a life threatening infection that is the consequence of a self-induced abortion, members of an international family planning organization might fear that treating such a woman would result in loss of funds. Is this the result we want?

To say that family planning is abortion is to trivialize a complex and crit-

ical issue. Family planning is prenatal care. Family planning is child nutrition. Family planning is followup and preventive care, and the education provided by family planning is often what enables children to survive their first year and what enables women to survive their pregnancy.

□ 1415

Do not impose this gag order. Provide the world with family planning education that works to eliminate the need for abortion. Let us defeat the Smith resolution.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN], chairman of the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade of the Committee on International Relations.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, the Clinton administration keeps telling us that we do not need to worry about how many hundreds of millions of dollars go to organizations that perform abortion overseas or that lobby for pro-abortion laws, because we already have laws on the books that forbid these organizations from using the actual U.S. taxpayer dollars to pay for the abortions or for the pro-abortion lobbying.

But this simply ignores the fact that money is fungible. When we give these pro-abortion organizations \$1 million, we instantly free up other money that they are free to use for whatever they want, including more abortions and more abortion lobbying. None of us would run our personal lives the way the Clinton administration wants us to run our government.

If one of us had a friend who was doing something of which we deeply disapproved, perhaps this friend had a drug habit, and asked us to give or lend him \$100 a month to buy drugs, of course, we would have to refuse. But then suppose that friend said, all right, I understand that you disapprove of drugs, but suppose you give me \$100 a month to help pay my rent. I promise not to use your \$100 for the drugs. I will apply your \$100 toward my rent, and that will free up my \$100 to buy drugs. We would still have to refuse, of course, because we would know that by giving the \$100 we would be enabling and empowering the friend to buy drugs.

Mr. Speaker, this is exactly the same way that the groups that perform and promote abortions go about their ways. If we give them an extra \$123 million and they remain in the abortion business, it does not make any difference whether they give us a piece of paper that says "We used your money to buy contraceptives and our money to perform abortions." By subsidizing and enabling and empowering these groups, we subsidize, empower, and enable all of their activities, including abortions.

The Clinton administration is, in effect, urging Congress to spend U.S. taxpayers' money and not worry too much

about the consequences. But we cannot ignore the way the world works. I urge my colleagues to support the Smith amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to make one point. In the earlier debate it was pointed out that World Vision wants to release these funds. I think it should be made very clear, World Vision is a group that I strongly support. They are into helping to alleviate suffering brought about by famine.

Let me read a letter dated February 7 from the president of World Vision, and it reads as follows: "Our organization supports the release of funds with the so-called Mexico City policy, which prevents U.S. Government funding from subsidizing foreign organizations which perform or promote abortion as a method of family planning, and lobbying to ease or diminish anti-abortion laws—either in the United States or in foreign countries."

"We believe," the World Vision letter goes on to say, and it is signed by Robert Seiple, "We believe these pro-life safeguards are important to protect the integrity of our efforts and those of many other humanitarian aid organizations."

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the full letter be made part of the RECORD, but I would point out that World Vision supports this legislation, they support the Mexico city policy.

The letter referred to is as follows:

WORLD VISION,

Washington, DC, February 7, 1997.

Hon. JOSEPH R. PITTS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PITTS: World Vision has not changed its position on abortion. I am writing to reiterate our position to you and other members of Congress following a January 31 letter regarding the release of funding for international family planning services. I signed the letter, along with the presidents of CARE and Save the Children.

Since it was established in 1950, World Vision has always and will continue to oppose abortion as a means of birth control. Abortion runs contrary to our core beliefs as a Christian organization. All of World Vision's efforts, both in the United States and in more than 100 countries around the world, seek to save, extend and enhance life. Toward our goals of enhancing and extending life, World Vision supports programs in developing nations to save children's lives. These programs include immunizations, disease prevention and treatment and efforts to improve nutrition. In addition, we encourage efforts to educate parents about maternal health, to avoid high-risk pregnancies and to advocate birth spacing.

These strategies help to avoid risky and unplanned pregnancies both to protect the life of the mother and to prevent women from resorting to abortion as a means of birth control. As President of World Vision, I have visited many of the programs in some of the most difficult places in the world. I have met with women in Africa, Asia and Latin America and other regions of the world who personally have benefited from these services.

We believe these pro-life safeguards are important to protect the integrity of our ef-

forts and those of many other humanitarian aid organizations. Serious health concerns for women, children and families are at stake, including unintended pregnancies which will likely increase, not reduce, the number of abortions performed on women in developing nations.

Should you have any questions on this issue, or on World Vision's position on abortion, please contact Ken Casey, Senior Vice President, in Seattle at 206-815-1000.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. SEIPLE,

President.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], a cosponsor of our legislation, H.R. 581.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is put-up-or-shut-up time for those who are advocating funding for family planning without abortions. This resolution reinstates a policy that has been in effect for the past nearly a decade. Three hundred fifty organizations worldwide have accepted funds from our Government with the restrictions on abortion that we have included, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and I have included in this language, which is the so-called Mexico City policy.

To be very clear and very simple in stating the case, in order to receive U.S. population control funds, foreign nongovernmental organizations must agree not to perform abortion, except in cases of rape, incest, or where the life of the mother is in danger; second, not to violate the laws of any foreign country with respect to abortion; or, third, not to engage in any activity or effort to alter the laws or governmental policies of any foreign country with respect to abortion.

If they really believe what they say, that they do not use abortion as a method of family planning, they do not advocate abortion, they do not perform abortions as a method of family planning, then why can they simply not agree to that language? It is straightforward, it is simple, very clear, makes a wall of separation between the reprehensible practice of abortion and, on the other hand, helping women who are in difficult circumstances in any part of the world, particularly in third world countries, to gain some measure of control over their lives.

Mr. Speaker, we have for years demonstrated the willingness of this Congress to approve funds for family planning, provided that none of those funds are used to perform abortion. In the international arena we have followed the same policy. This language that we include in our legislation, H.R. 581, makes it very clear that family planning funds may be available, but that they cannot be used to perform abortion.

There are organizations that are very intent on using abortion, counseling for abortion, working to change the laws of foreign countries on abortion. We should not use U.S. taxpayer dollars for that purpose.

I hear the arguments on the other side about the need for women to have access to family planning information, plan their lives and plan their pregnancies. That is fine. But it should not go hand in hand with abortion.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much my colleague yielding. I think, as he knows, I have long been a vote in this House interested in preserving life. I feel very strongly that we ought to do all that we can to see that abortion is not used as a tool.

But could either the gentleman or our chairman answer this question for me: We do provide, from Federal coffers, a sizeable number of dollars across the country to the several States in the United States that has to do with family planning. Does the gentleman know if we require similar language and limitation upon those funds that flow to the several States of the United States?

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, yes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, foreign nongovernmental organizations are not governed by the same laws that domestic nongovernmental organizations are.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I understand that.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Mexico City provisions were litigated. Planned Parenthood brought a suit, and they were found to be completely constitutional. Let me make a point.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, does that answer my question? Does it say that we do not allow—

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. No, we do not, because it would be construed to be unconstitutional. Otherwise, we would like to do it.

Mr. LEWIS of California. So we are essentially saying to foreign countries, you will follow a line of logic that is unconstitutional?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. We are saying where we can protect an unborn child and a generation of unborn children from aggressive lobbying by a non-governmental organization, we are going to do it. If we cannot save all of the kids, we try to save some.

To say we have to have some kind of equal policy, just because we like to say everything is the same everywhere, that to me is not productive. When we can save a child in Kenya or we can save a child in Central or South America from an assault on the law that protects them, we ought to do it.

Let me also point out to the gentleman, if the gentleman from Minnesota will continue yielding, we are talking about discretionary funding. This is not entitlement funding. We in

this Congress appropriate every year certain amounts of money to be used for this purpose. It should not be the NGOs to dictate to us that, we will not take your money unless we do this, that, and the other thing. We should put simple conditions and say, do family planning; do not permit abortions.

Mr. LEWIS of California. If the gentleman will continue to yield further, I would suggest for those who are concerned about life that we might very well consider similar limitations upon discretionary monies in this country that flow to States if they are not responding similarly, if we are serious about those limitations. I appreciate my colleague yielding to me.

Mr. OBERSTAR. As the gentleman well knows, under the Medicaid language for years that we have debated on this floor, we have had several dozen votes, maybe several hundred votes on this issue over the last 22 years that I have served here, we have imposed this restrictive language that none of the funds may be used to perform abortions.

Mr. LEWIS of California. The gentleman's last comment raises just one more point. I would certainly hope that those of us who are concerned about the life question would know that sometimes we defeat our purpose by having several hundred votes, it seems, a session, on this same issue. Many Members are reacting very strongly to that, including this Member.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If the gentleman from Minnesota will continue to yield, the only way, because if language is silent on the Labor-HHS bill or the Federal employees health benefits program or any other program, it pays for abortion. It is incumbent upon us, those of us who do not want our tax dollars being used to subsidize abortion or the performance of it, to offer amendments. Otherwise it is used to pay for it. There is no blanket prohibition.

Mr. LEWIS of California. As my colleague can see by the vote today, sometimes that is self-defeating.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. We will be back.

Mr. OBERSTAR. To further respond to my dear friend, the gentleman from California, we would not have dozens or hundreds of votes on this subject if, in initiating programs, those who advocate family planning would stick to their last, and stick to what they believe in, and say these funds are only used for counseling, they are not used for changing people's minds about abortion, performing abortion, or advocating abortion. That is all we are asking.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I appreciate my colleague.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California, [Mr. LEWIS] was quite correct in his line of questioning. Indeed, the Mexico City language, if it were applied in the United States, would be

unconstitutional. What we are saying with this Mexico City language, otherwise known as the gag rule, is that we will apply unconstitutional prohibitions to organizations which receive international family planning funds from the United States.

Let me be clear: No funds, and I am going to read them, because this is the existing law, and for Members who voted for the President's finding in the previous resolution, I want them to understand very clearly why the Mexico City language indeed is a gag rule, indeed is unconstitutional, and as other Members of this body have said earlier, is unnecessary.

First of all, I direct the Members' attention to the chart. Current prohibitions on use of AID funds for abortion-related activities cannot be used to pay for the performance of abortions as a method of family planning or to motivate or coerce any other person to have an abortion.

USAID funds cannot be used to lobby for or against abortion.

These funds cannot be used to purchase or distribute commodities or equipment for the purpose of inducing abortion as a method of family planning, and these funds cannot be used to support any biomedical research which relates, in whole or in part, to methods of or the performance of abortion as a method of family planning.

To make sure that this Helms language is enforced, there are very stringent safeguards in place which again I want to call to our colleagues' attention.

Strict procedures assure that no USAID funds are used for abortions, including legally binding contracts. USAID funds are provided in the context of legally binding contracts and grant agreements that include standard clauses, specifically listing prohibited activities. Violators are subject to heavy fines and loss of future AID funding.

USAID closely monitors how its funds are used through requiring detailed annual work plans, numerous detailed reports on all project activities, site visits, management reviews, and review and concurrence on project publications, and regular audits. Contracts and agreements with foreign or private organizations are subject to regular, independent audits, as defined by the Federal acquisition regulation system. USAID grantees are required to maintain extensive documentation of expenditures of foreign subcontractors who are subject to audit.

I go into this level of detail to emphasize once again that what we have proposed here today and what this House approved has nothing to do with abortion, and that the Mexico City language again would be unconstitutional in the United States. Why should we subject our grantees abroad to that gag rule, which as I say again, is unconstitutional in our country.

A couple of more points that I want to make, because comments that were

made here on the floor beg for clarification.

□ 1430

It has been repeated over and over again, certain critics of the International Planned Parenthood Federation and of government funding of international family planning programs have recently, they are stepping up this campaign citing IPPF, International Planned Parenthood Federation, as promoting abortion around the world. Let me state, the International Planned Parenthood Federation does not accept or promote abortion as a method of family planning. IPPF believes that contraception is the first line of defense against unwanted pregnancy. Access to family planning service is the most effective way to reduce abortions and the mortality caused by them. I have more information on that if Members have questions about that.

Another point that I want to reference the Smith bill, again with the greatest respect for the gentleman, in his bill, the Mexico City language, the gag rule, states that, notwithstanding any provisions of the bill, no funds appropriated for population planning activities may be used by an organization to engage in any activity or effort to alter the laws or governmental policies of any foreign countries governing the circumstances under which is permitted, regulated or prohibited.

Among other things, that is what this language does, which would change current law if it were passed and signed into law, which the President will not sign. So we have an exercise in futility at this hour of the day, and I will try to be brief. But I believe that it is necessary to protect the vote of our Members who voted in favor of the President's finding earlier.

Why are we subjecting organizations engaged in family planning internationally to conditions and standards which first of all are unconstitutional in the United States but do not apply here either? Our colleagues used the termed fungibility. If you give your money for this, it frees up your other money to do that. That is exactly what happens every time we grant a contract or a grant.

Are we subjecting the defense community to the scrutiny of its spending on what it does with its own money because they receive defense contracts from the Federal Government? The list could go on and on. It just does not seem fair to me that we should gag organizations from using their own funds for their own purposes. And if that includes making information available to women, it has nothing to do with the Federal funds that we vote in this body, and it does nothing with the constitutional approach that we take to our grantees in the United States.

What is further at issue here is this subjects that same scrutiny to the subcontractors, to these international family planning organizations. So all of this presents a gag, a hindrance, an

unnecessary encumbrance. I urge our colleagues to follow this issue closely and to reject it on this vote today, as I have said over and over again. The highest regard for the maker of the motion, this gag rule has no place in our country. It should not have any place in our funding for international family planning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOBSON). The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] reserves the balance of his time and reserves the right to close.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this legislation, which would kill American support for the international family planning programs.

I oppose this bill for several reasons. First, it is a bill to correct a problem which does not exist. Right now, no American aid, I repeat, no American aid pays for abortions overseas.

Since 1973, Mr. Speaker, it has been illegal for American aid dollars to support abortion services in any way.

I also oppose this bill because the attempt to reinstate the Mexico City policy will have a chilling effect on family planning services. We know that the other body will not pass this legislation, and the President has vowed to veto it. This bill will only continue the current delay in services which will lead to real human misery and environmental degradation.

I want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that to delay is to devastate. Listen to what the National Council for International Health has had to say on this matter. They say: Last year's reduced aid for family planning is resulting in 7 million couples losing contraceptive services.

That is 7 million couples.

This will result in 4 million unwanted pregnancies. It could mean 1.6 million abortions and 8,000 maternal deaths. Passage of the Smith bill would make this worse.

Oppose this bill. Oppose further restrictions to family planning. Let us release urgently needed American aid.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD].

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

If the other Members of the body are like myself, they are receiving calls from their constituents who are regrettably very confused about this issue. They are calling and saying, do not vote for the President's resolution because it promotes abortion and vote for this Smith bill because it stops abortion.

And of course nothing could be further from the truth. What this is about is very simple. This is about somewhere in sub-Saharan Africa where the population rates are just crushingly explosive, there is a little clinic somewhere and that little clinic is attached to a hospital. And the clinic provides birth control so that women do not become pregnant and do not have to have abortions. But maybe 100 miles away from that hospital, abortion is legal. A woman comes in with her own money, not American taxpayers' money, and might avail herself for whatever her reasons may be of a legal abortion.

My friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] wants to say, then let us not give that hospital any money even to run its family planning clinic. The result of that is very, very straightforward. That little clinic out in the hinterland somewhere will not have any IUD, will not have any birth control pills. More women by the thousands will become pregnant. And where will they end up? They will end up back at that hospital, and they will be doing more abortions there than ever before.

It is time we got logical about this issue. If you are against abortion, if you want to see the number of abortions on this planet decrease, then you have to be for family planning and you have to trust the women of the world to make the right decisions.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, Mexico City is nothing more than an international form of gag rule on providers, severely restricting the way legitimate helpful organizations use their own funds. Restricting use of money will not decrease the number of abortions performed in developing countries. Rather, lack of access to family planning facilities will likely lead to an increase in unwanted pregnancies and therefore more abortions.

We have seen in our own country how simple family planning education can work to solve problems of overpopulation and reduce the number of unplanned pregnancies. Again, family planning means education. It is not a means of doling out abortion dollars across the globe.

This gag rule has no place in this debate, and I urge my colleagues not to give in to these tactics. I urge a vote against the Smith bill.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, to thank our colleagues on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the issue for this, I think, productive debate this afternoon. All of the participation, the full participation of Members, I think, has been very helpful to us. But I want to use my remaining moments to thank and acknowledge the staff for their hard work on this issue. From the staff of the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY], Matt Traub and Sharon Levin; Lissa Topel from the

staff of the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO]; Kara Haas, Judy Borger, Mark Kirk, Terri McCullough, Leslie Patykewich, from my own staff, Carolyn Bartholomew; and from the subcommittee, Mark Murray, Scott Lilley. As always the staff is the great untold story of Congress. They are a tremendous resource to us. They work so hard, and I wanted to give them this recognition on a day when we are debating this very, very important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I just say once again, let us not hold the children, the poor children of the world hostage to congressional politics. Vote "no" on the Smith amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say again, nobody is holding this policy or family planning hostage to congressional politics. This has everything to do with the deep-seated and very strongly held belief that every human life is precious, born and unborn. We cannot and should never facilitate a policy that puts the unborn at risk of being killed by abortion on demand.

Let me also make the point, a clarification: We have heard on the other side how this is somehow a gag rule. The gag rule is a word that was coined during the title X debate dealing with abortion counseling. Abortion counseling is not covered by the Mexico City policy. It was not during the years that it was in effect, and I am amazed how that disinformation continues to persist both in the media as well as by Members who have been offering up positions on the other side of this issue.

Let me also point out, we do not concede that Mexico City policy would be unconstitutional if applied to United States domestic organizations. But a decision was made in the Reagan administration years ago, and it was fully litigated, that foreign nongovernmental organizations would be the ones that would be affected, and it was upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Finally, let me say that H.R. 581 is pro-life but it is also pro-family planning. One of the speakers on the other side was bemoaning the delay. OK, let us end the delay. Let us get all \$385 million plus the 25 million for the UNFPA out the door by March 1. Only the Smith-Oberstar-Hyde bill does that. So if money delayed is money denied, our bill gets the money there sooner rather than later. But it does so in a principled way. It says that we are for family planning but we are not for abortion.

Let me also point out again who we subsidize does matter. We should not compartmentalize our view and say if they do this with our money that is OK and who gives a darn what else they do with the rest of their money. Abortion is child abuse. It kills babies. It is a violent act. Let us face that reality.

The partial birth abortion ban fight last year at least began forcing all of

us to look at abortion for what it truly is and at the methods of abortion for the cruelty that they represent toward children.

Who we subsidize does matter. The IPPF based in London, International Planned Parenthood Federation, has a strategic plan. They make no bones about it. It is right here in black and white. They want abortion on demand in every country of the world. They have action plans for every country of the world. Vote yes on H.R. 581.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 581, a resolution which would prevent American international family planning funds from being used to actively support abortion as a preferred method of family planning.

The majority of my constituents and I believe that the taking of a life is totally unacceptable, and we do not support funding for organizations which support abortion services. Taking a life is a deplorable act, one which carries grave consequences in our justice system. How do we reconcile our system of punishing murderers with providing funding to foreign organizations which support abortion?

H.R. 581 also includes provisions which would ensure that American aid will not support organizations which work to modify existing policies regarding abortion in foreign nations, as well as organizations which disobey foreign nations' laws relating to abortion.

Family planning is the goal of these funds, and there are alternate methods of family planning which do not condemn a life. By supporting H.R. 581, the United States can still be at the vanguard of family planning programs without advocating abortion as an option.

I urge my colleagues to lend their support for H.R. 581. Everyone knows that the taking of a life is wrong, let us not show the world that the United States not only accepts murder as a form of family planning but actively funds organizations who support it.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support Congressman SMITH's bill to make sure that agencies receiving international family planning funds do not use these funds to promote abortion. Many Americans believe that their taxes do not support abortion overseas, but they have been terribly misled. Their money is distributed generously to groups who actively encourage abortion, seek to overturn foreign countries abortion laws, and support programs which are tainted by forced abortion and sterilization of women policies.

Although I do question the necessity of releasing these funds early, what is really at issue here is how the Clinton administration chooses to distribute these funds. In 1993, President Clinton overturned the Reagan-Bush era policy which prohibited U.S. financial support for international organizations that either promote or perform abortions as a means of birth control. I find it morally unjust to require U.S. taxpayers to support the global proliferation of abortion.

Instead of filling clinics overseas with abortion-related equipment, the United States should stock the shelves with lifesaving drugs which will help to save the 2.1 million children—according to UNICEF—who die each year from vaccine-preventable diseases.

The Smith legislation would allow the release of family planning funds early, as the administration has requested. However, it

would stop rewarding international organizations that promote and perform abortions with American taxpayer dollars—which is exactly why the President has threatened to veto the Smith bill and thereby eliminate any possibility of an early release of these funds.

Yes, the administration has never hidden its support for both international family-planning services and abortion. The two are clearly not the same. I urge my colleagues to support the Smith bill and make that distinction absolutely clear.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, as a strong supporter of family planning initiatives, I would like to emphasize my support for the U.S. International Family Planning Program. This program has been extremely effective in protecting the health and lives of women and children in underdeveloped and developing countries throughout the world.

Today, I will be voting for H.R. 581 which was introduced by Representative CHRIS SMITH. For those who claim to be true supporters of our family planning efforts overseas, I believe this is the correct vote to cast. H.R. 581 will release the full \$385 million in international family planning money on March 1, 1997—bringing the total fiscal year 1997 spending on these programs to \$713 million. In other words, this bill will provide nearly \$200 million more in funding than the resolution which was passed by the House earlier today (H.J. Res. 36). In addition, it will ensure that this Federal funding is used only for contraceptive family planning and health care services, not abortion.

As a supporter of family planning, whether it be international or national initiatives, I believe we need to examine how the United States can best support true family planning efforts. Clearly, if we are talking only about family planning and contraception, rather than abortion, then the Smith bill before us would provide substantially more funding for health care services and have a greater impact on low-income women and children abroad. Supporting H.R. 581 will ensure that we provide the maximum amount of international family planning money available, while at the same time ensuring that U.S. tax dollars are not used to provide or promote abortion.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" on this important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 46, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. 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 231, nays 194, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 23]

YEAS—231

Aderholt	Gillmor	Oberstar
Archer	Goode	Ortiz
Armey	Goodlatte	Oxley
Bachus	Goodling	Packard
Baker	Goss	Pappas
Ballenger	Graham	Parker
Barcia	Granger	Paxon
Barr	Gutknecht	Pease
Barrett (NE)	Hall (OH)	Peterson (MN)
Bartlett	Hall (TX)	Peterson (PA)
Barton	Hamilton	Petri
Bateman	Hansen	Pickering
Bereuter	Hastert	Pitts
Berry	Hastings (WA)	Pombo
Bilbray	Hayworth	Porter
Bilirakis	Hefley	Portman
Bliley	Herger	Poshard
Blunt	Hill	Quinn
Boehner	Hilleary	Radanovich
Bonilla	Hoekstra	Rahall
Bonior	Holden	Regula
Bono	Hostettler	Riggs
Borski	Hulshof	Riley
Brady	Hunter	Roemer
Bryant	Hutchinson	Rogan
Bunning	Hyde	Rogers
Burr	Inglis	Rohrabacher
Burton	Istook	Ros-Lehtinen
Buyer	Jenkins	Royce
Callahan	John	Ryun
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Salmon
Camp	Jones	Sanford
Canady	Kanjorski	Saxton
Cannon	Kasich	Scarborough
Chabot	Kildee	Schaefer, Dan
Chambliss	Kim	Schaffer, Bob
Chenoweth	King (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Christensen	Kingston	Sessions
Coble	Klink	Shadegg
Coburn	Knollenberg	Shaw
Collins	Kucinich	Shimkus
Combest	LaHood	Shuster
Cook	Largent	Skeen
Cooksey	Latham	Skelton
Costello	LaTourette	Smith (MI)
Cox	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Cramer	Lewis (KY)	Smith (OR)
Crane	Linder	Smith (TX)
Crapo	Lipinski	Smith, Linda
Cubin	Livingston	Snowbarger
Cunningham	LoBiondo	Solomon
Danner	Lucas	Souder
Davis (VA)	Manton	Spence
Deal	Manzullo	Stearns
DeLay	Mascara	Stenholm
Diaz-Balart	McCollum	Stump
Dickey	McCrery	Stupak
Doolittle	McDade	Sununu
Doyle	McHugh	Talent
Dreier	McInnis	Tauzin
Duncan	McIntosh	Taylor (MS)
Dunn	McIntyre	Taylor (NC)
Ehlers	McKeon	Thornberry
Ehrlich	McNulty	Thune
Emerson	Metcalf	Tiahrt
English	Mica	Walsh
Ensign	Miller (FL)	Wamp
Everett	Moakley	Watkins
Ewing	Mollohan	Watts (OK)
Foley	Moran (KS)	Weldon (FL)
Forbes	Murtha	Weldon (PA)
Fowler	Myrick	Weller
Fox	Nethercutt	Weygand
Galleghy	Neumann	Whitfield
Ganske	Ney	Wicker
Gekas	Northup	Wolf
Gibbons	Norwood	Young (FL)

NAYS—194

Abercrombie	Baessler	Becerra
Ackerman	Baldacci	Bentsen
Allen	Barrett (WI)	Berman
Andrews	Bass	Bishop

Blagojevich	Hefner	Pastor
Blumenauer	Hilliard	Paul
Boehlert	Hinchey	Payne
Boswell	Hinojosa	Pelosi
Boucher	Hobson	Pickett
Boyd	Hooley	Pomeroy
Brown (CA)	Horn	Price (NC)
Brown (FL)	Houghton	Pryce (OH)
Brown (OH)	Hoyer	Ramstad
Campbell	Jackson (IL)	Rangel
Capps	Jackson-Lee	Reyes
Cardin	(TX)	Rivers
Castle	Jefferson	Rothman
Clayton	Johnson (CT)	Roukema
Clement	Johnson (WI)	Roybal-Allard
Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Condit	Kaptur	Sabo
Conyers	Kelly	Sanchez
Coyne	Kennedy (MA)	Sanders
Cummings	Kennedy (RI)	Sandlin
Davis (FL)	Kennelly	Sawyer
Davis (IL)	Kilpatrick	Schiff
DeFazio	Kind (WI)	Schumer
DeGette	Klezka	Scott
Delahunt	Klug	Serrano
DeLauro	Kolbe	Shays
Dellums	Lampson	Sherman
Deutsch	Lantos	Sisisky
Dicks	Lazio	Skaggs
Dingell	Leach	Slaughter
Dixon	Levin	Smith, Adam
Doggett	Lewis (GA)	Snyder
Dooley	Lofgren	Spratt
Edwards	Stabenow	Lowey
Engel	Luther	Stark
Eshoo	Maloney (CT)	Stokes
Etheridge	Maloney (NY)	Strickland
Evans	Markey	Tanner
Farr	Martinez	Tauscher
Fattah	Matsui	Thomas
Fawell	McCarthy (MO)	Thompson
Fazio	McCarthy (NY)	Thurman
Filner	McDermott	Tierney
Flake	McGovern	Torres
Foglietta	McHale	Towns
Ford	McKinney	Trafficant
Frank (MA)	Meehan	Turner
Franks (NJ)	Meek	Upton
Frelinghuysen	Menendez	Velazquez
Frost	Millender-	Vento
Furse	McDonald	Visclosky
Gejdenson	Miller (CA)	Waters
Gephardt	Minge	Watt (NC)
Gilchrest	Molinari	Waxman
Gilman	Moran (VA)	Wexler
Gonzalez	Morella	White
Gordon	Nadler	Wise
Green	Neal	Woolsey
Greenwood	Olver	Wynn
Gutierrez	Owens	Yates
Harman	Pallone	
Hastings (FL)	Pascrell	

NOT VOTING—7

Carson	Mink	Young (AK)
Clay	Nussle	
LaFalce	Obey	

□ 1502

The Clerk announced the following pair:

Mr. LAFALCE for with Mrs. CARSON against.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado, HUNTER, McDADE and EHRLICH changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING APPRECIATION FOR THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF AMBASSADOR PAMELA C. HARRIMAN

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on International Relations be dis-

charged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 49) expressing appreciation for the life and service of Ambassador Pamela C. Harriman, and I ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCINNIS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for an explanation of the resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding. I have just been informed by the leadership that there will be no further votes today.

Mr. Speaker, it is with both sadness and gratefulness that I ask the House to adopt this resolution concerning the recent passing away of a great American, Ambassador Pamela C. Harriman. Her sudden death last week left all Americans bereft of a truly dedicated public servant, a woman of wide learning and interest and a great patriot. It is only fitting that on this day that our Nation pays tribute to Ambassador Harriman, that we too mark her passing and remember her life.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that all of our Members will join with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO] and myself, acting on behalf of our Committee on International Relations, in putting the House of Representatives on record in appreciation of Ambassador Pamela Harriman's life.

We should bear in mind that as a wife she provided her wisdom and solace during the last years of his life to one of the great statesmen of this century, New York's Governor Averell Harriman. We should also take note of her contribution to the Allied victory over Nazism in Europe through her earliest exploits in the field of diplomacy, helping to unite as allies the nations of France, Great Britain, and the United States. In her capacity as a United States Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to France, Pamela Harriman gave the last measure of her life to serving our Nation, her adopted country. She brought to this task all of her skills and experience in keeping the ties between our Nation and France strong despite many troublesome disagreements between our nations. She was very much a hands-on Ambassador, working long hours, devoting substantial energy to this task.

Although this resolution has not been formally considered in our Committee on International Relations, we did have a discussion on the matter on February 4 at our committee's organizational meeting which happened to occur on the day of Ambassador Harriman's passing away. At that meeting, our committee agreed to a unanimous consent request propounded by the gen-

tleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO] setting out essentially the wording and noting our support for moving a resolution noting such sentiments on the floor. I wish to commend the gentleman from Illinois for his strong interest in making certain that this matter was considered in a timely and an appropriate manner.

Mr. Speaker, for all of these reasons, I believe that support of this resolution is merited, and I hope that all of the Members will join with us in recognizing Pamela Harriman as a distinguished stateswoman and a great American.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I want to join the distinguished chairman of the House International Relations Committee in expressing appreciation for the life of a great public servant, Ambassador Pamela C. Harriman.

She became an American by choice and devoted herself to the betterment of her adopted country. As the Ambassador of the United States to France, she worked tirelessly to build closer relations between the United States and its oldest ally. She was a renowned woman of grace, wit, charm, intellect, and boundless energy.

On this day of a memorial service at the National Cathedral for Ambassador Harriman, it is altogether fitting that the House of Representatives take up and pass this resolution commemorating a great American. I join the chairman in congratulating the distinguished gentleman from Illinois for sponsoring this resolution.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMILTON. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great American Ambassador, Pamela C. Harriman. Sadly, Ambassador Harriman passed away earlier this month in Paris. Throughout her life she worked tirelessly in service to her adopted country, the United States. Most recently she served as U.S. Ambassador to France, from 1993 to early 1997, where she helped strengthen Franco-American ties while expertly handling such difficult and complex issues as NATO expansion, the Middle East peace process, the role of the U.N. and multilateral trade.

How appropriate for Ambassador Harriman's career to take her to Paris, for as a young woman she endeavored to strengthen ties between Great Britain, the United States and France in the Allies fight against Nazi aggression. Before assuming her diplomatic duties in Paris, Pamela Harriman sought to enrich the lives of all Americans through her many efforts in the fields of politics and arts. She was also the wife and friend of Governor Averell Harriman, one of our country's great statesmen.