following resignation from the House of Representatives:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 13, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER GINGRICH: I hereby resign my congressional seat effective immediately so that I can assume my post in the President's Cabinet as Ambassador to the United Nations.

It has been an honor to serve in the United States Congress as New Mexico's third district representative for the past 14 years. I have been especially proud to represent the people of New Mexico whose kindnesses towards me and my family have been equalled only by the unmatched beauty of the state itself.

Sincerely,

BILL RICHARDSON,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 13, 1997.

Hon. STEPHANIE GONZALES,
Secretary of State, State Capitol, Santa Fe, NM.

DEAR STEPHANIE: I hereby resign my congressional seat effective immediately so that I can assume my post in the President's Cabinet as Ambassador to the United Nations.

It has been an honor to serve in the United States Congress as New Mexico's third district representative for the past 14 years. I have been especially proud to represent the people of New Mexico whose kindnesses towards me and my family have been equalled only by the unmatched beauty of the state itself.

Sincerely,

BILL RICHARDSON,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a copy of the official letter of resignation from the gentleman of New Mexico, Mr. RICHARDSON, will be submitted to the Secretary of State of New Mexico on this date and will be inserted into the RECORD and the Journal at this point.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 36 and that I may be allowed to include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

APPROVING THE PRESIDENTIAL FINDING REGARDING THE POPULATION PLANNING PROGRAM

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of section 518(A)(e) of an act making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for fiscal year 1997 (Public Law 104–208), I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 36) approving the Presidential finding that the limitation on obligations imposed by section 518A(a) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1997, is having a negative impact on the proper functioning of the population planning program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1022

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 36 with Mr. DREIER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the joint resolution was considered as having been read the first time.

The text of House Joint Resolution 36 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 36

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the House of Representatives and Senate approve the Presidential finding, submitted to the Congress on January 31, 1997, that the limitation on obligations imposed by section 518A(a) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1997, is having a negative impact on the proper functioning of the population planning program.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to section 518A(e) of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act for 1997, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] will control 1 hour in opposition to the joint resolution, and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] will control 1 hour in favor of the joint resolution.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD] and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to yield to other Members.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, today we are considering a resolution which would endorse a finding by the President that the delay until July 1, 1997, in the obligation of funds for international family planning ''is having a negative impact on the proper functioning'' of the program. This resolution is being considered under expedited procedures as called for in section 518A of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1997.

The decision to delay obligations for international family planning funds until July 1, but to require a vote to release the funds by March 1 of this year pursuant to a finding by the President, is the result of a compromise struck by the House leadership and the White House during negotiations on the Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act of 1997. The agreement also calls for a total funding level of $385 million for international family planning, instead of $356 million as provided in fiscal year 1996. In addition, funds are apportioned on a monthly basis of not more than 8 percent.

We are not dealing directly in this resolution with the so-called Mexico City policy, because the House has been unable to get the Senate and the White House to agree to it for the past 2 years. The Senate only voted once directly on the policy in the past Congress. On November 1, 1995, by a vote of 53 to 44, it rejected the Mexico City provisions included in the House version of the fiscal year 1996 Foreign Operations Appropriations Act. In addition, the White House threatened to veto such appropriations acts if Mexico City language was included.

The chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], offered a compromise last year which would have allowed organizations that refused to agree to abide by the Mexico City policy to receive family planning funds, but at a level not to exceed 50 percent of the total provided to each such organization in 1995. Organizations that agreed to abide by the Mexico City policy would not have been capped.

That compromise was endorsed by the House but rejected by the administration. Had it been accepted, we would not be here today and international family planning funds would be flowing without delay in obligations.

This is the second year that the obligation of funds for international family planning has been delayed. As I stated earlier, the House could not reach a compromise with the administration or the Senate on the Mexico City policy as part of the fiscal year 1996 appropriations act and, as a result, delayed obligations until July 1 of that year as well.

However, the obligation delay was explicitly intended to encourage the authorizing committee to address this issue as part of the pending authorization bill for foreign affairs. As passed by the House, the 1995 foreign aid authorization bill included Mexico City policy language. Unable to work out a compromise with the Senate and the administration, all language was dropped in the final conference report on the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this changes this year. I hope that we do not have to debate this anymore. Policy issues surrounding international family planning should be addressed by the Committee on International Relations, not the Committee on Appropriations. I urge the authorization

committee to resolve this issue so that legislative language on the Mexico City policy does not continue to have a negative impact on the proper functioning of the appropriations process.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 36, the Presidential finding on international family planning funds. As I call on my colleagues to vote for this resolution, I want to remind us all why this vote is occurring.

Our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. LIVINGSTON, has presented a long version of it and I will do a brief one. But, first, I want to commend him for the spirit of fairness in which he has enabled this resolution to come to the floor, which is in keeping with his great leadership as chair of our committee.

I also want to recognize the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who is in opposition to this resolution, has his own resolution on the floor today. I do not think I have ever served with a finer Member of Congress. He is a great champion for child survival issues and human rights issues throughout the world. I have great respect for him. Unfortunately, I disagree with him on this issue, but I want to pay homage to his commitment to child survival issues.

Mr. Chairman, we are here today because of an agreement, as our chairman mentioned, that was entered into in the fall. In order to break an impasse, President Clinton and the House of Representatives, the Republican leadership, entered into an agreement on the foreign aid bill and, indeed, the entire and continuing resolution for fiscal year 1997.

Under the agreement President Clinton agreed to a reduced level of funding for population of $38.5 million and to a 4-month delay in any obligation to have the funds. The funds would go forward now or March 1 if the President certified to Congress that the delay is having an adverse impact on international family planning programs and the House and Senate vote to approve the President's finding.

Indeed, the President's certification states that further delay will cause serious, irreversible and avoidable harm to the lives and well-being of many thousands of poor women and children throughout the world.

□ 1030

Indeed, the delay undermines U.S. efforts to promote child survival and actually increases the number of abortions worldwide. Evidence from all regions of the world show increased contraceptive use by reducing unintended pregnancies plays a major role in reducing abortions.

I join with many well-known development organizations, such as CARE, World Vision, Save the Children, and some church-related groups such as Church World Service, Lutheran World Relief, and the National Council of Churches, to name a few, in urging my colleagues to vote yes in accepting the presidential finding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take the balance of my time to make three points. What do the population funds do, how are they used; second, what they do not do, they do not promote abortions, and how do we monitor that.

U.S. support for international family planning programs emphasizes voluntary family planning as a part of an integrated approach to population and development that includes complementary activities to promote health, the status of women, child survival, and strong families.

The goals of U.S. leadership in global population are: To promote the rights of couples to determine freely and responsibly the number and spacing of their children, improving individual reproductive health, and reducing population growth rates to the levels consistent with sustainable development.

I will put more in the RECORD about the work of our international family planning efforts. Time does not permit me to go into more detail here. However, I will say that gains made from the delivery of services such as immunization, diarrheal control, and nutrition programs for children are most effective and sustainable when combined with programs for women on child spacing, maternal health services, and access to contraceptives.

In fact, in most instances throughout the developing world by sheer necessity the delivery of these programs takes place simultaneously. Inaction today not to accept the President's finding would disrupt child survival and family planning services and will end up costing us dearly both in human and financial terms.

What the population funds do not do: AID's funds are not used for abortion. As this chart indicates very clearly, since 1973, with the enactment of the Helms amendment, AID's population program has been legally prohibited from supporting or encouraging abortion as a method of family planning. I will state these prohibitions specifically, and I have the actual statutes with me at the desk if any one of our colleagues wishes to inspect them.

No USAID funds can be used to pay for the performance of abortions as a method of family planning or to motivate a person to have an abortion. No funds can be used to lobby for or against abortion. No funds can be used to purchase or distribute commodities or equipment for the purpose of inducing abortions as a method of family planning, and no funds can be used to support any biomedical research which relates in whole or in part to methods of or the performance of abortions as methods of family planning.

Strict procedures assure that no AID funds are used by contractors for abortions, and these procedures in place to ensure that no funds are used include, and I have another chart on that, legally binding contracts that include standard clauses specifically listing prohibited activities. Violators are subject to heavy fines and loss of future funding.

It also includes close technical monitoring for requiring detailed annual work plans, regular independent audits according to Federal acquisition regulations of both contractors and subcontractors.

There have been claims that all population funds will be dispersed without pro-life safeguards if this resolution passes. This is simply not so. It is essential to restart funding for these international family planning programs to promote the health and well-being of millions of families throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, I do not hesitate to characterize this vote, based on the exploding population growth we are experiencing, as vital to the future of our planet, and one that is first and foremost about providing families with the real means to lift themselves from poverty, provide for their children and live with dignity. We must not hold the poor children of the world hostage to congressional politics. Let us take a step forward today, not backward. Vote ''yes'' on the resolution.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

Mr. HYDE. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, the debate really is not about family planning, although we will hear that term a lot. This is about abortion. Family planning, properly defined, is the matter of getting pregnant or not getting pregnant. It has nothing to do with abortion. True, abortion will hold down the population gain because you are eliminating people, you are killing them, you are exterminating them. But that has not been the policy of our Government and our country. And even now we give lip service to the fact that none of these funds can be used to pay for abortions. But what happens is the money goes to an organization, or organizations, that perform abortions, that counsel for abortions, that lobby for abortions in countries as a means of family planning.

Now, that wall between abortion and family planning should remain in place. Under the legislation of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] every penny of family planning money goes to organizations engaged in family planning, properly defined. It will only be withheld from those organizations that counsel, perform, and promote abortions.

Now, the idea that none of this money can be spent for abortions, I just wish frankly people would understand that we understand money is fungible. And if you provide money for purposes A and B, you are freeing up other money for C and D. So that really is not an argument.

The Mexico City policy, which was the policy until this President assumed office—and 2 days after he was in office, he reversed it—provides that we will support lavishly and generously family planning. I am not objecting to that. But not subsidize—indirectly, or directly, in any way—abortions, and not subsidize organizations that perform abortions. That was the policy. Three hundred fifty foreign organizations agreed to its terms, including the International Planned Parenthood Federation. And they have affiliates in 57 countries. The only one that did not agree, and that is what we are fighting about here, is International Planned Parenthood Federation of London.

So I just suggest, if you think abortions are a good idea, and I do not know anybody that will admit to that, but I do know a lot of policymaking activities that amount to supporting abortion. I hope Members will vote ''no'' on the President's finding.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY], a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations and, more importantly, a leader in our country on international family planning issues.

(Mrs. LOWEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the privileged resolution to release the funds for international family planning programs on March 1. I have personally visited clinics supported by this aid, and I have seen firsthand the very critical work they are doing for our families, for women, for children, for infants.

Each year approximately 600,000 women worldwide die of pregnancy-related causes, leaving 1 million children without mothers. These are unnecessary, tragic deaths that could be avoided through access to family planning services.

Recently several of my colleagues on the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and I visited Misr El Kadima, a maternal and child health center in Cairo, Egypt. This center is a success story and is one of the many successful facilities supported by USAID worldwide.

Family planning is just one of the basic health care services provided at the center. The doctors, nurses, laboratory technicians who spoke with us provide immunizations for children, routine prenatal care, treatment for common diseases, general outpatient care, not abortion.

Some of these clinics in Egypt are 5 miles from the nearest city. If these clinics are shut down, as would happen if these funds do not go forth, what are these women going to do for these vital services? In Cairo and in the rest of the developing world, family planning services are literally a matter of life and death.

In Egypt, largely due to USAID support, contraceptive use has doubled in the last 15 years and the increase has been directly linked to decreases in infant mortality and maternal death. Over the last decade, as the rate of contraceptive use in Egypt rose, the infant mortality rate dropped 42 percent. As the doctors explained, family planning services allow families to plan and space the birth of their children.

If the funds at issue are withheld until July 1, USAID's main contract in Egypt will be suspended. This disruption would force clinics like the one that I visited to stop providing these life-savings services, and would have a devastating impact on thousands of men, women and children. So let's be clear—a ''no'' vote closes clinics that save lives.

I urge you to remember what this vote is really about. This vote isn't about abortion—the clinic that I visited in Egypt does not provide abortions nor do any United States funds go to abortion services. This vote is about releasing funds for medical services that save the lives of mothers and babies worldwide. Vote for these families. Vote for the resolution.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI].

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, family planning has clearly proven to save the lives of women and infants. Sadly, 1,600 women die every day, 1 woman every minute, of pregnancy-related causes because they do not have access to reproductive health services, including family planning. Nearly half of the women today who die from maternity-related causes would still be alive today if they could have prevented unwanted pregnancy in the first place. Nearly all would be saved if they had access to reproductive health care. By giving women the access to health services they so desperately need during their childbearing years, we will help prevent thousands of maternal deaths. The World Bank estimates improved access to family planning can reduce the number of maternal deaths that occur annually by 20 percent. In addition to that, family planning programs have also helped stop the spread of sexually transmitted diseases, including HIV. Access to contraception is not only crucial in avoiding unwanted pregnancies but in fighting the spread of the ever-growing HIV virus, and we all know these sexually transmitted diseases do not stay within borders and impose immense risk to the overall population. To delay the release of funds until July will result in increased abortions, unintended pregnancies, the further spread of AIDS, and the deaths of thousands of women. Seventeen of the 95 programs will have to be shut down, denying millions of women access to effective contraceptive services. Doctors and nurses will lose access to obstetrical care, and the treatment of sexually transmitted diseases and community health workers who teach important health intervention, including immunizations and pre- and postnatal care, will be eliminated.

Mr. Chairman, let us give women and their children more control over their childbearing and health-related decisions and families the self-sufficiency they want, the health and the hope that they deserve.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING].

Mr. BUNNING. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, the question before us today is not whether we should support international family planning and educational programs. The question today is whether or not this Nation or this body supports the use of abortion as a means of family planning.

As far as I am concerned, the terms ''family'' and ''abortion'' are totally incompatible. This Nation and this Congress cannot and should not subsidize an organization which advocates abortion or which lobbies for the legalization or expansion of abortion as a means of limiting population growth. We should not allow abortion to become our next major export.

It is true that the Helms amendment prevents the direct use of U.S. funds to pay for abortion procedures. But it does not prevent indirect funds of programs that promote the legalization or expansion of access to abortion as a means of birth control in developing nations. To do that, we must defeat this resolution and reinstate the Mexico City policy.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to defeat this resolution. Help us reinstate the Mexico City policy and show the world that we are willing to support education and other family practices, but not at the expense of the innocent unborn. Vote ''no'' on this resolution and vote ''yes'' on the Smith-Hyde-Oberstar substitute.

□ 1045

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES], a member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs and a leader on this issue.

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

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this resolution to release on March 1 the funds that we have already agreed to provide for international planning programs.

This is not a vote on abortion. No U.S. funds can be used to lobby or perform abortions; that is already prohibited by law as so well explained by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

This is not a vote to increase funding for family planning programs. The fiscal year 1997 funding level is already

set. We did that last year as part of the foreign operations appropriations bill. This vote is merely to decide when to release the funds. We are already 5 months in arrears in providing for this money. Not a single dime has been appropriated.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues that this is a pro-family vote, a vote for women's health and survival. To continue to delay in funding will cost, simply, many, many lives. A UNICEF report has found that just meeting the existing demand for family planning in the developing world would reduce unintended pregnancies by one-fifth, thus reducing the 600,000 annual maternal deaths at least by the same amount.

The counterproductive effects of the delay on international family planning programs are detailed in the President's finding. There are country programs here in this hemisphere for which the funding delay would be especially harmful.

In Mexico some nongovernmental organization clinics will potentially close including those in Chiapas, one of the states in Mexico which has tremendous unmet needs for family planning services. Currently, USAID is supporting programs that serve 70,000 people there annually.

In Haiti this May, there will be staff layoffs of thousands of staff people that would help to service men and women who without family planning would have devastating effects.

I urge, I urge a yes vote on this resolution.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL].

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, the question before us today deals with a just and absolutely essential need in the world. I think my colleagues have made this clear. But one colleague in particular, my dear friend and a man for whom I have a great deal of respect, the gentleman from Illinois, said that abortion and family planning are not related; and of course that is right. Nobody wants abortion as a means of family planning. But that ignores one very important point, and it is true from anybody who has visited family planning centers in the United States.

Many, many women come to a family planning center because they think they are pregnant, and their first exposure to family planning is because they think they are pregnant. That is the truth in the United States; it is demonstrably even more so in the Third World. USAID has done studies on this.

In particular, in Tanzania they found that, when women came in for a legal abortion, only 19 percent had had any education exposure to, or experience with, family planning. And USAID found in Egypt that, when women came in, if they had an abortion, they left, 98 percent of them, aware of family planning. The other study is in Turkey where the realization of family planning doubled.

So if we say family planning and abortion are not related, we are really missing an important point: the woman who comes to seek assistance most often is going to a place where she believes that she can get an abortion, if that is what she needs, if that is what is legal in her country, but leaves, God willing, never to have another abortion. And that is just blocked with the Mexico City policy because the place where she would go to get the abortion counseling or the abortion services would no longer be there to offer the family planning assistance either.

So that point, I think, has been missed in the debate.

I conclude simply by saying this. My wife and I traveled to India within the last couple of months at our own expense. And we just saw a country, with 40 percent of the world's poor, 17 percent of the world's population. We are our brother's keeper, we are our sister's keeper.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN], a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition of H.J. Res. 36, for this is a thinly veiled attempt to manipulate the Members of this Chamber into releasing population control funding 4 months prior to the date stipulated in the appropriations bill. The Clinton administration seems to be under the impression that it can invoke waivers on any law or make findings such as these with no concrete evidence to support its contentions, just rhetoric. It is simply an attempt to justify breaking the compromise reached during last year's debate.

Supporters of these programs would have us believe that their objective is to save lives, that these programs are needed because the countries in Latin America and other regions are unable to sustain population growth. However, if they are truly concerned about the well-being of the people of these countries, then why do not they take the $385 million they want released and apply them toward vaccination programs or better medication to improve child survival rates or better nutrition programs?

The future of all nations is in the hands of today's children who, if given an opportunity, will become the leaders of tomorrow. Yet these population programs are directly and purposefully advocating abortion as a form of birth control, and by doing so they are helping to deprive these countries of their potential.

Abortion should never be promoted as family planning.

The United States commits a grave mistake in always assuming that it knows what is best for others. Are we to be so patronizing of our neighbors in the hemisphere and other regions to think that we know what their society needs better than they do?

It seems that the Clinton administration is not content with increasing government intervention in the affairs of U.S. citizens. Apparently, it now feels the need to run the lives of individuals in other countries, dictating what is best for women whose social, cultural, and religious backgrounds differ greatly from those of the United States.

But the problem goes beyond this argument and the promotion of abortion. These population control programs are also being interpreted as licenses to conduct widespread sterilization of women in Latin America, in the Caribbean, and in other regions. We have received numerous accounts from Central America, for example, of women who have been asked general questions about their families, their economic situation, and then about whether or not they want more children. This then is translated by those involved with the population control programs as a request for sterilization without the express consent or full knowledge of the women, and these procedures are performed. By the time these women realize what has taken place, it is far too late.

How can we possibly release the funds for such activities?

In summary: This bill is unjust, offensive, and should not be passed. I urge my colleagues to defeat this measure.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the resolution.

I do so for one overriding reason: it will save lives. In fact, it's rare that we get to cast a vote that will result in such direct, immediate, tangible and unarguable benefits.

International family planning agencies depend on this money—money which, remember, we have already appropriated.

The work of these agencies saves the lives of women not only by enabling them to prevent life-threatening pregnancies, but by providing basic health care services. Their work also helps save the lives of children who are born into such grinding poverty that they literally cannot survive. And their work helps eliminate misery by stemming the over-population that makes life unbearable in so many parts of the world.

Indeed, UNICEF has noted that ''family planning could bring more benefits to more people at less cost than any other single technology now available to the human race.'' That's an extraordinary statement, and it is no exaggeration.

Family planning also prevents abortions. The World Health Organization estimates that 40 percent of unintended pregnancies end in abortion—40 percent.

Anyone who wants to prevent abortions—and I think that includes those of us who are pro-choice—should vote for this resolution.

None of the funds being released can be used to perform abortions, and the services provided with these funds eliminate the demand for abortions. In no way can a ''yes'' vote be reasonably characterized as a pro-abortion or anti-life vote.

Indeed, we in Congress are given few such clear opportunities to be so affirmatively and truly pro-life. Vote for this resolution and give the gift of life.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] a member of the Committee on Appropriations and another champion for international family planning.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, today I am asking my colleagues to support House Joint Resolution 36, which releases funds which support family planning programs all around the world.

This vote is not about supporting abortion. Not $1 of our family planning funds can be used to perform abortions anywhere in the world. This vote is about preventing abortion. This vote is about improving the health of women and children. This vote is about saving lives. U.S. family planning aid saves the lives of women, and each year around the world 600,000 women die in childbirth.

If we fail to pass this resolution today, family planning and health clinics across the developing world will close. That means that a CARE program giving rural Bolivian women their first-ever pap smears will have to shut its doors. Cervical cancer is curable, but it must be caught early. I am a cancer survivor. I understand the importance of this kind of preventive health care. Women in this region of Bolivia do not have any other health care options. If the family planning clinic closes, more mothers will die from curable diseases such as cervical cancer.

For 30 years the United States has been an international leader in reducing the number of maternal and child deaths through its support for family planning. Today we must renew our commitment to these important priorities. We must keep the promise that was made to the President and release the funds without any qualifications or alterations.

Today's vote does not add more dollars to our family planning budget, but by voting yes to this resolution, we vote to add more days to the life of a poor mother in the Philippines, we vote for fewer unwanted pregnancies in Tajakistan. We vote for fewer abortions across the world.

Support women's health, support children's health, support family health by voting ''yes'' on this resolution.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the President's resolution on international population control funding, House Joint Resolution 36.

Federal funds, except to save the life of the mother, are prohibited to be used to kill unborn children in our country. We do this because of the millions of children who are killed each year attacks our consciences. It is an attack on our morality. Such killings increase infant mortality. We need to stop this form of infant mortality.

I have had a colleague who stated that we are our brother's keeper. From the same source that he brought that to us it says that how we treat the least of God's creations we treat him. And that is what I am standing here for, is to defend those infants, the defenseless, unprotected infants in that respect and for that reason.

Now, if we do this in our country, we should have no difficulty in doing this for the rest of the globe. Even though they are not American children, unborn children, who are being killed by abortion, they still are children, they are still creations of God. The sanctity of life is what needs protecting.

Americans should not be deceived. This vote on this resolution is not about family planning. This resolution is a manipulative maneuver to try and overturn the 1973 Helms amendment which prohibits the use of foreign aid funds to pay directly for abortions. House Joint Resolution 36 will make an additional $123 million available for organizations that perform and promote abortions.

Opponents of this resolution, of which I am included, are not against foreign aid to developing countries. We will have a chance to vote on that later. The United States should not be in the business of handing out cash to foreign countries to kill babies to get their population numbers in line.

This is not altruism; this is genocide.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2¼ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], who probably knows more about this issue than any of us in the Congress.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, the vote is not about whether we are pro-choice or pro-life on abortion. This vote is whether life for hundreds of thousands of families who choose to plan their families will include a real chance to do so, not whether or not abortion will be available to that family.

Some today will vote for both the privileged resolution and for the Smith resolution. What Mr. SMITH is saying to them is that, without the Smith resolution being part of the law, a vote for the privileged resolution is a vote for spending U.S. dollars on abortion-related activities. That is not—not—correct.

□ 1100

Since 1973, the Helms amendment has prohibited the use of U.S. dollars to perform, support, or encourage abortions overseas, and that mandate has been followed in good faith by the U.S. Government. Indeed, in order to ensure its implementation, and sensitive to the argument about the fungibility of moneys, when I was assistant administrator of AID, we instituted in the late 1970's a rigorous system to separate out U.S. moneys from other funds spent by organizations receiving American funds.

This practice has been followed assiduously by every administration of AID, as indicated by audits certifying that not $1 of American funds is being used for abortion-related activities overseas.

Further, the organizations which have received American funds and have been the subject of most controversy, in practice use either no funds from any source or in any case a negligible amount for any programs related to abortion.

So this is the question, really: When the United States is fully abiding by the Helms amendment, when the Government has taken every possible step to separate American funds so no American money is being used for abortion-related activities, and when there is no real fungibility as to U.S. dollars, do we want to stop the availability of critical funds for family planning, for voluntary family planning programs desired by millions of families in fast-growing developing countries?

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the answer for each of us is to vote for the privileged resolution.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the release of international family planning funds on March 1, 1997.

We need to clear up the confusion on this issue and focus on the importance of family planning programs. International family planning programs save the lives of thousands of women and children across the world, prevent unwanted and dangerous pregnancies and reduce the number of abortions worldwide.

Representatives from the Russian Family Planning Association recently shared information on the successes of their program. In this developing country, they are using these valuable dollars to increase access to quality family planning information and services. As a result of this program, contraceptive use has risen from 19 to 24 percent among women in just 4 years. And, between 1990 and 1994, total abortions fell from 3.6 million to 2.8 million.

Yesterday, Secretary Albright testified before our Appropriations Subcommittee. She stated:

Our voluntary family planning programs serve our broader interests by elevating the status of women, reducing the flow of refugees, protecting the environment, and promoting economic growth. As the President has determined, a further delay will cause a

tragic rise in unintended pregnancies, abortions, and maternal and child deaths.''

And, let us be clear—support for family planning programs has, to this day, been bipartisan. This program was created in 1969 by President Richard Nixon.

Let me also address some concerns that have been raised by individuals who do not want their tax dollars being used for family planning overseas. Of the two resolutions that we will vote on today, this resolution actually provides less money than does an alternative proposal that will be offered later today.

Finally, let me again reiterate that this is not an abortion issue. Current law prohibits any of these funds from being used for abortion.

I hope that today the House will continue its longstanding and bipartisan support of family planning.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT], a distinguished member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, the Clinton administration has embarked on what is no less than a worldwide crusade promoting abortion on demand at any time for any reason anywhere. I cannot condemn that policy in words strong enough.

So let me just make a quick point in the short time that I have to speak here this morning. Contrary to what some of those on the other side have said, this vote is indeed about abortion. It has always been about abortion. We simply say to foreign nongovernmental organizations, unless you agree not to perform abortions and not to violate the laws or lobby to change the laws of other countries with respect to abortion, then do not come to this country asking for tax dollars. That is what we are all saying. That is what it is all about.

I have only been in Congress for a little over 2 years now, yet I am voting today for the eighth time on the restoration of the Mexico City policy. A simple, straightforward pro-life policy initiated by President Reagan, carried on by President Bush and eagerly decimated by President Clinton in his first days in office.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this year the Congress will finally do the right thing and stop the international abortion.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this vote is so important, and it is about family planning and it is against abortion. I would say to my colleagues, to reduce abortions we must increase access to family planning. I hear that this is an abortion vote. There is no logic to it. So let me just try to set the Record straight by quoting some statistics.

We know from UNICEF that almost 600,000 women die annually during pregnancy and childbirth, including 75,000 due to unsafe abortions. We know that family planning services will improve the health and the status of women and it will help children.

We know that population experts estimate that the 35-percent cut in our family planning programs has led to an additional 4 million unintended pregnancies and 2 million additional abortions, 2 million additional abortions, as well as 134,000 more infant deaths.

The World Health Organization estimates that 40 percent of unintended pregnancies end in abortion. The World Bank estimates that improved access to family planning can reduce the number of maternal deaths annually by 20 percent. What statistics, and that is only part of it.

We had a group here from Russia, and the testimony we had was that, with United States help in Russia, contraceptive use has increased from 19 to 24 percent between 1990 and 1994, and the abortion rate has dropped 25 percent. That means the number of abortions annually has dropped by 800,000.

So I would submit that if you want to reduce abortions and you want to help children and you want to help families that you vote for this resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to say, we must keep the promise that we made. So I hope that this body will vote for the resolution.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, many of my colleagues know of Oregon's Republican Senator Mark Hatfield. He was known and is always known as a man of integrity. He never said anything he did not believe in and he always researched his information, and that is why it is important for Members to hear his words, particularly those who oppose abortion.

In a letter to Representative SMITH, Senator Hatfield said,

> I have reviewed the materials you have sent to my office in response to my request that you provide proof that U.S. funds are being spent on abortion. I do not see anything in these materials to back up your assertion.

Senator Hatfield goes on in the letter to say,

> Chris, you are contributing to an increase of abortions worldwide because of the funding restrictions you have placed. It is a proven fact that when contraceptive services are not available to women throughout the world, abortion rates increase.

He says, ''This is unacceptable to me as one who strongly opposes abortion.''

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to vote for the resolution.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentlewoman that the materials that we provided to Senator Hatfield clearly showed that the organizations were promoting, performing abortions on demand in these developing countries. No one is suggesting that they were doing it with U.S. tax dollars.

The issue here is fungibility. The money that we give to an organization frees up other money that then can be used to lobby for abortion in the developing world. Let me remind everybody in this Chamber that approximately 100 countries around the world protect the lives of their unborn children.

The International Planned Parenthood Federation has made it their mission, their goal explicitly to bring down every one of those pro-life laws. When we give to these organizations, we then empower them to be the super lobby to bring down the laws in Brazil, Peru. Poland recently flip-flopped and went from a pro-life country to a pro-abortion country.

In early February, a new law went into effect in South Africa, again a flip-flop from pro-life to pro-abortion. It is the organizations that are mounting this offensive against the unborn child. When we contribute to them, we are facilitating abortion overseas.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Health, Human Services and Labor.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First, let me say that there is absolutely no abortion issue or no abortion money involved in this debate. I have always been a supporter of the Hyde amendment. I have never supported public funding of abortion in any way. Abortion is not a legitimate family planning method. We outlawed that in 1973. In audit after audit, it has been certified that not one U.S. dollar has gone to fund abortions. Some people believe that there is fungibility, of these funds. The same argument could be used for any health services funded by U.S. money, such as child immunization or family check-up programs. Do we want to end those? Of course not. Continuing a delay in funding will effectively cut U.S. support for voluntary family planning and contraception.

Now, the Smith bill, if it is passed here, in the House is going nowhere in the Senate. Some may feel that by supporting this bill, they are simply saying that they are against abortion for organizations who use their own money for that purpose in countries where it is legal. But, in actual fact, are these people saying no to voluntary family planning, no to maternal and child health in countries that are the poorest on Earth, no to contraceptives and preventing unwanted pregnancies. The truth, unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, is that they will be saying yes, to more abortions, because the voluntary family planning services will not be there that these countries so desperately need.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. ALLEN], a Member of the freshman class.

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of House Resolution 36 in the hope that this House will recognize that international family planning funds are a good investment for America. These funds reduce unintended pregnancies, they reduce the number of maternal and infant deaths, they reduce the number of abortions.

All we are asking is that much-needed funds be released on March 1 instead of July 1. Three months. It seems like a small matter, but it is not. It is not to the women and children around the globe whose lives will be changed by our vote today.

Opponents say this is a vote to fund abortions. That is not true. This resolution preserves the existing ban on the use of Federal funds for abortions overseas. These funds have already been appropriated by this Congress. We seek no additional funds. We ask only that the gap in services not be extended.

As David Broder wrote recently, ''The women and children around the world who have the most at stake will not have a vote.'' We do. We should use it wisely.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LEWIS], a member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in opposition to President Clinton's request for the early release of family planning funds, and I urge my colleagues to instead support H.R. 581.

Let me begin by noting that H.R. 581, the proposal by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], would still allow early release of these funds, but in a much better way. For more than a decade, we had a system regarding family planning funds that worked. H.R. 581 would restore that system.

Under H.R. 581, the organizations receiving these grants must again agree to not perform abortions or undermine the laws of their host countries. I will remind my colleagues that these grants are tax dollars taken from the pockets of hard-working American families. Known as the Mexico City policy, these short set of conditions worked for a decade and was agreed to by all but 2 of the more than 300 agencies which received family planning grants. There were two exceptions: Planned Parenthood Federation of America and the International Planned Parenthood Federation.

Mr. Chairman, the International Planned Parenthood Foundation's official policy statement includes these goals: Advocate for changes in restrictive national laws, policies, practices and traditions, and campaign for policy and legislative changes to remove restrictions against safe abortions. The IPPF even advises its affiliates to operate right up to the edge of what is legal and sometimes even beyond.

So today's vote is also a test of whether we respect the sovereignty and customs of these nations. Using American tax dollars to fund organizations overseas that in some manner promote abortions not only horrifies those of us who are pro-life, it should also concern every American taxpayer and those of us in this body who believe we should respect our friends in other nations.

Sending tax dollars taken from our hard-working citizens to groups that promote abortions in foreign nations is wrong in all of these ways. President Clinton dropped the Mexico City policy 4 years ago. I believe it was a mistake, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to oppose the President's resolution and support H.R. 581.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

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

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 36.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 36 to approve the Presidential finding regarding international population planning programs. At issue is whether the money will be released on March 1, or whether it will be further delayed by 4 months, until July.

It is my determination that a delay will cause serious irreversible and unavoidable harm. In balance are the lives and the well-being of many thousands of women and children, and American credibility as the leader in family planning programs around the world.

The logic behind delaying the release of the funds as agreed to last year is convoluted to me and many of my colleagues. Wouldn't the delay in support for family planning, even by 4 months, deny safe and effective contraception to couples who depend on these programs? Has it not been documented that we will surely see a rise in unintended pregnancies and maternal deaths, and could we see a return to unsafe and unsanitary methods to terminate those pregnancies?

It seems illogical that those groups and members who oppose the proper release of these funds would indeed believe that we are actually promoting or funding abortion. We are not, and have been prohibited by law since 1973 from doing so. The fact is that a delay in funding will have the exact opposite effect of what those who would restrict these funds would have you believe. The delay in releasing these funds will result in increased abortions, increased overpopulation, and an adverse impact on the environment and our resources.

I urge this body to go about our business of releasing these important family planning funds now, as agreed to in last year's legislation.

□ 1115

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

(Mrs. KELLY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 36.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the privileged resolution, House Joint Resolution 36 and I ask that all Members do the same. Why? Because the health of women and children worldwide depends on this vote.

At issue here is maternal and infant mortality. International family planning promotes preventive health care, such as prenatal care. It is easy for us to take the availability of health care in the United States for granted, but for sake of this argument we must remember that women and children in developing countries are not so fortunate.

Furthermore, international family planning educates women and their families about sexually transmitted diseases, as well as about the dangers of HIV/AIDS. It is our obligation to humanity to use our financial support and medical knowledge to prevent the spread of these deadly diseases—diseases that often are brought into our own country and threaten our own children.

Some members of Congress will have you believe that international family planning results in abortions, but the truth is that only a lack of family planning can result in such an unfortunate conclusion. Without family planning, we abandon the world's poorest women and force them to rely on abortion as their primary method of birth control.

Let's be clear—current law prohibits the use of any U.S. foreign aid funds for abortion services, including lobbying efforts for abortion, abortion counseling, and the purchase or distribution of commodities for the purpose of inducing abortions as a method of family planning.

Obviously, this vote is not about abortion. It is about health, plain and simple—not misguided and erroneous political statements. Please support this resolution and release the already appropriated international family planning funds on March 1.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in strong support for the international family planning resolution, House Joint Resolution 36.

Mr. Chairman, at the current rate, the world's population will double from 5.8 to 11 billion people during our lifetime. Excluding China, 21 million of childbearing age in the developing world are added each year, equal to the total number of women of childbearing age in California, Texas, New York, and Florida combined.

President Nixon launched our international family planning program in 1969. That program improves the health of mothers and their children by increasing the time between births while reducing unintended pregnancies and abortion. After 30 years, this program

helped reduce the average number of children in families in the developing world from 6 to 4.

Contraceptive use has climbed from 10 percent to 35 percent, and family planning helps reduce abortion. As contraceptive use in countries such as Russia rose from 19 to 24 percent, abortion rates fell from 109 per thousand women to 76. The population council estimates that without family planning programs, there would have been 500 million more people in the world today, almost twice the population of our own Nation.

If the resolution required by the law is not passed, the Agency for International Development will have to cut vital programs in Mexico, in Haiti, Guatemala, El Salvador, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, Russia, the Ukraine, Jordan, the Philippines, Turkey, Mozambique, Uganda, and Zimbabwe. AID would also have to cut jobs with its contractors in Alabama, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

While another bill, H.R. 581, will be offered, House Joint Resolution 36 is the only measure that will be given expedited consideration in the Senate, requiring and ensuring that this vital program can continue to operate.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SAM FARR], a great environmentalist.

(Mr. FARR of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in these hallowed Halls to remind us that the debate about this money really does not affect us, but it does affect the developing countries of this world.

I have lived in one of those countries. I lived in one of the poorest barrios on earth, without any running water, without any electricity, where the birth rate was an average of 15 children per household. I was a Peace Corps volunteer in Latin America, in one of the most Catholic countries on the earth.

The women in that barrio, I was working with CARE as a Peace Corps volunteer, were requesting every day for information about family planning. They wanted to know about how to raise children and how to have a proper number of children.

I also rise today as a father. I think the learned gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] just pointed out that we are as parents whose children will be growing up in a population that will double in our lifetime, reaching the world's maximum carrying capacity, maximum carrying capacity of this globe.

If we do not provide information, just information to people about how they can properly have children, not too many, we are putting our children into a situation in a globe that is unbearable. We will not be here arguing about family planning money, we will be here arguing about Fortress America, how we will wall ourselves off from the rest of the world as supplies diminish.

Please support this resolution.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], the very distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation.

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

Proponents of this resolution have framed the issue as simply a vote on family planning, or a vote about closing family planning clinics overseas. That is not the case. It is a vote on using one-half billion dollars of U.S. taxpayer money to subsidize and to promote abortions, and to promote efforts to overturn legal and cultural barriers in countries overseas and to promote abortion in foreign countries.

The position of this House historically has been a position out of respect to the millions of women and men who in conscience are opposed to abortion, to ensure that our tax dollars do not subsidize or promote abortion.

We have repeatedly demonstrated a willingness to approve funds for family planning, but we have also ensured safeguards against the use of those family planning dollars to promote or encourage in any way or advocate abortion.

In international affairs from 1984 to 1993, 350 foreign organizations signed contracts for U.S. family planning funds, which included restrictions on the use of those funds, against using them for abortion. Only two turned down the funds, because they would not accept the House restrictions on abortion subsidy and abortion promotion.

We should not approve this resolution which will open the door once again for use of U.S. taxpayer dollars to promote abortions overseas.

I have heard the arguments. I have lived in Haiti. I have seen the face of poverty. I have seen the pain in those poor households, if you can call them households; little huts.

I think family planning advice is fair. We should support such activities. But we should not allow U.S. taxpayer dollars to be used to promote abortion, to change the laws of countries that are against abortion. We should be neutral on that issue. That is what the resolution of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and I will offer subsequent to this action does, is to provide $713 million, $170 million more than the bill before us, for international family planning, with the historic House pro-life language.

If all these groups are so committed to instructing women on reproductive freedom, control of futures, control of their family life, then they should be willing to agree that they will not promote abortion.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. [PRICE]), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, this vote presents us with three choices: We can choose between improving and worsening women's health; we can choose between increasing and decreasing child mortality; and we can choose between preventing and causing more abortions.

International family planning programs provide the only medical care many women around the world ever receive. This year those services will help prevent the deaths of as many as 8,000 mothers who die because of the complications in their pregnancies or in childbirth. Family planning services provide health care for children which dramatically increases the chances children will grow up healthy. Having children about 2 years apart in birth date can increase the survival rate by nearly 30 percent.

Finally, preventing abortions. With U.S. funding, family planning programs could prevent as many as 4 million unplanned pregnancies this year, which could prevent up to 1.6 million abortions resulting from those pregnancies. Recent studies clearly link providing family planning services and declining abortion rates in Mexico, Colombia, Hungary, Russia, the Central Asian republics.

Our job today is to sort through the information and the misinformation and all the ideological pressures surrounding this issue, and to do what we were elected to do, to do the right thing. With this vote we can improve women's health, we can improve children's lives, and we can reduce the number of abortions.

Mr. Chairman, there are not too many votes of which we can say that. This is clearly a vote of principle. We must do the right thing. Vote to release the family planning funds.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER), a member of the Committee on National Security.

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution. The Supreme Court has opined in Roe versus Wade, and its erroneous prodigy, that we have to allow the killing of preborn children. Clearly, this was a misread of the Constitution by the Court. I think this is a good example of a Court more bent on legislating than on adjudicating; that is, the Court, in Roe, was more concerned with setting public policy than in construing the Constitution.

In any event, even the Supreme Court has not opined that our Government has an obligation to provide for or encourage abortion here in America or in any other land. We should not take to this course by our own will. Mr. Chairman, can we really call abortion family planning? Can we really say

that terminating life creates strong families? Can we say that by using taxpayer dollars to finance abortion we are contributing to American interests abroad?

This is not a vote about family planning. This resolution would obligate the U.S. taxpayer to promote abortion services and facilities in foreign lands. It is this obligation that I believe the House should soundly reject. If this resolution passes, there is no question about the President's actions. He will sign it into law.

Before we release any more funds to him for so-called family planning, we must see to it that we do not do so without restrictions at least as solidly respectful of human life as those enjoyed between 1984 and 1993. The sanctity of life transcends international boundaries. It is time to say no to a careless export; that is, the notion that abortion is acceptable as a means of family planning. I urge a ''no'' vote on this resolution.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, we have to pass this resolution. I do not care how many times it is repeated, the assertion that this is about making the U.S. taxpayer money available for abortion, to promote abortion, or anything close to it, is simply not true. That is against the law, a law that is strenuously enforced.

Does anyone really believe that the way to have fewer abortions is to have more unwanted pregnancies? All evidence, all logic, is to the contrary. Let us just look at what we have been able to get done in Russia over the last several years, in which there has been roughly a one-quarter decrease in the incidence of abortion, as there has been a one-quarter increase in the availability of funds for contraception and family planning. Does anybody think there is not a connection between the two? The connection between the two has come because of our American family planning assistance program.

Mr. Chairman, fewer pregnancies come from considered family planning decisions made available with these funds and with contraception, fewer pregnancies and fewer abortions. Let us get the logic straight.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAM JOHNSON], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1130

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am strongly opposed to the President's resolution to make millions of taxpayer dollars available for international organizations to promote abortion, in spite of what they are saying.

Frankly, I am disappointed that we are taking the vote on the resolution because of a last-minute compromise in the omnibus appropriations bill. Do you know what, it was a last minute sellout at the expense of the values of the American people. But I am further outraged that the Clinton administration has been doing everything in its power to make sure that the American taxpayer dollars are made available on the international arena for abortions.

There are no monetary differences in these two measures. Both bills release funds earlier than previous. The difference is that one prohibits funding to organizations that perform or promote abortions. The other does not.

The funds are supposed to be spent on international family planning. I cannot believe that anyone in the administration or any Member of this House, for that matter, would list abortion as a method of family planning. We should know that in 1996 the White House administration rejected a compromise which would have provided even more money for international family planning. Why did they reject it? Because it included pro-life language.

I urge this body to stand firm against the funding of abortions overseas and to vote no on this resolution.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY], who has worked very hard on this issue.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, everyone knows that family planning is about saving lives, not ending them. Almost 600,000 women die every year because they are having too many children too close together. Not only are women dying, the world population is exploding. By the year 2000, there will be 800 million teenagers on this planet, one-seventh of the entire current world population. That is 800 million people who need family planning information, or the world's population growth will literally affect the survival of the planet.

Again, let me be clear, any family planning is about saving lives. This is not a vote for abortion. It is a means of preventing abortion. While family planning sounds like a domestic issue, its impact is as far-reaching as world peace. Overpopulation leads to unrest.

Recently I met with Ambassador Wisner to India, and I asked him what is the single most important thing we could do to improve relations between our two countries. He said release this family planning money. Women are lined up for days just to receive information. It is an important vote. Vote for family planning.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT], a great member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this legislation, House Joint Resolution 36. I rise for a couple of reasons. First, I think it is morally wrong for us to export abortion under the guise of family planning. We have an option that will come up later, the Smith–Oberstar-Hyde amendment, that will allow us to have actual family planning without exporting abortions. Occasionally the Federal Government is wrong. I think it is wrong to do that.

Second, I think it is improper for us to take tax dollars from Americans, borrowed money. We are still running a deficit, so it is borrowing money from future taxpayers to send overseas to fund abortions. Again, I think the Federal Government is wrong.

If we go back in history and look at the past when we have had incorrect decisions, such as the Dred Scott decision, who of my colleagues in this Chamber would say that that was a correct decision, that African-Americans are not created equal by our Creator. No one. That was an incorrect decision by those representing our Federal Government.

In reading the history of the English-speaking peoples by Winston Churchill, I came across an incident that occurred in Boston about the same time, not long after the Dred Scott decision, where it said a Boston mob attempted to rescue a fugitive slave whose name was Anthony Burns. It took the Federal Government and a battalion of artillery, four platoons of marines, a sheriff's posse and 22 companies of the militia to line the streets so that our Government could return Anthony Burns, a slave, to the South. Who of you here agrees with that Federal decision that we made at that time? It was morally wrong. It was incorrect to take American tax dollars to support the institution of slavery.

Once again, we have a situation where the Federal Government is morally wrong, exporting abortion under the guise of family planning. I think it is very important that we vote against House Joint Resolution 36 because of the morality, because of misusing taxpayer dollars, borrowed dollars that our children will have to pay back. When you borrow a dollar today to export abortion, it takes at least $3 to pay that dollar back, 3 future dollars that our children have to use to pay back just the interest, let alone the usage and the loss because of inflation. Every dollar. That is also wrong.

So I want to encourage my colleagues to vote against this resolution and to support Smith–Oberstar-Hyde.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand how we as the leaders of the most powerful, prosperous Nation on Earth can vote to deny the poorest people on Earth their ability to control their own lives, to have some hope of one day rising out of the poverty that destroys their dreams and severely limits the lives of their children.

We will leave today for home or for travel, comfortable in the fact that we

have control over our lives. We can express our love for our spouses without the fear that it might cause even more suffering and deprivation of our families and their future. Surely we all understand that overpopulation is the most serious crisis facing the 21st century, that it is the principal cause of child labor, of the sexual exploitation of young girls in Third World countries around the world, of the cheapening of human lives. We can empower these lives, give those destitute mothers reason to dream that there may one day be hope for their children, especially for their daughters.

Not to release these funds is unconscionable when we have the ability to relieve suffering by providing voluntary information, information that will substantially reduce the number of abortions performed and will reduce the exploitation of powerless people. It is our responsibility to know the cause of poverty, to care, and, when we have the ability, to do something responsible about it. This is the right thing to do. Vote to release these funds today.

Mr. Chairman, the question before us today is not whether we should act today to release family planning funds, but whether or not we can conscientiously fail to do so.

I rise today in strong support of the President's resolution to release funds to USAID for international family planning programs. Time and time again, research shows that family planning programs work. The bottom line is that they decrease poverty and improve quality of life for families in developing countries.

We all agree that there should be fewer abortions. This is exactly what the President's proposal accomplishes. Not surprisingly, delaying the release of this money has resulted in an increase in the number of unplanned pregnancies. This will lead to an increase in the number of abortions.

Of the 585,000 maternal deaths which occur each year, 13 percent are attributed to unwanted pregnancy and illegal and unsafe abortions. According to the Population Institution, of the 22,000 children who die every day, many are the result of inadequate family planning, and insufficient time between pregnancies. The tragedy in these deaths is that they can so easily be prevented with the adequate resources to teach men and women how to prevent unwanted and unhealthy pregnancies.

A poignant example of the impacts this delay in funds has had, is seen in Haiti. Haiti is currently in the process of integrating its family planning programs into the CARE, the child health and maternal care program. If we continue to deny release of these funds this program integration will cease. By May of this year, just 3 months away, the nongovernment organizations funded by USAID will be forced to begin laying off workers leaving thousands of Haitian men and women without access to family planning, threatening their health and the health of their children.

Mr. Chairman, let's vote in the only responsible manner we can to release funds for international family planning funds, and against any attempts to apply unnecessary restrictions on their use.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON], a very distinguished doctor and a member of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I rise in opposition to House Resolution 36, which is the resolution supported by the President, and urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on that and to vote ''yes'' on House Resolution 581, the resolution introduced by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Both of these bills, the bill supported by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the one supported by the President, will release funds for family planning. So what is the debate about? It is about one simple issue. Will U.S. tax dollars go to organizations that encourage or provide abortions as a means of birth control? In spite of the rhetoric, this is the issue before us.

To those who support the President's plan, I would ask, why are you against language that says that none of these funds can be used to perform abortions as a means of birth control; do you find abortion an acceptable means of birth control? Why do you oppose language that would stipulate that these funds cannot be used to violate the laws of any foreign country with respect to abortion? Do you support using tax dollars, U.S. tax dollars to subvert the abortion laws of foreign countries?

Those who vote ''yes'' on President Clinton's bill are voting to give tax dollars to organizations that promote or provide abortion as a means of birth control. Those who vote ''no'' on President Clinton's bill and ''yes'' on Mr. SMITH's bill are saying, U.S. tax dollars can go for family planning but they cannot go to organizations that promote abortion as an acceptable means of birth control.

To spend tax dollars on international family planning is an issue for debate. However, taking money out of the pockets of hard-working Americans to pay for abortions overseas is totally unacceptable. Again, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the President's plan and vote ''yes'' on the plan of [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on the Budget, I know we are trying to get our country's financial house in order and balance the country's budget. We are also trying to save our trust funds for future and present generations and we are looking to transform the social and corporate and agricultural welfare state into a truly caring opportunity society. I can get really immersed in those issues, but as big as those issues are, they pale in comparison to the fact that one mouth can eat, two mouths can share, four mouths will sometimes go hungry, and eight mouths starve.

In the Book of Psalms, it said I had fainted unless I believed to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living. What kind of world are we seeing; what kind of world is truly living? We have too many people, too many children born into abject poverty, young children living on the streets begging, robbing, stealing, killing, being killed. Young girls and boys sold into sex slavery rings because their parents cannot keep them, they cannot care for them. The rich are getting richer and richer, and the poor are getting poorer and poorer and poorer and poorer and sicker and sicker.

As a Peace Corps volunteer, I know that some countries have grown. Their economies grow but their population outstrips their economies and they are truly becoming poorer. Indigenous Indians in this country said when they looked at the beautiful lake, it was a smile of the Great Spirit. We are losing that smile. I hope and pray we wake up. Release family planning funds now. Allow kids to have a future.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I oppose public funding of abortion, but I strongly support House Joint Resolution 36 because this is not about funding abortions. That is prohibited, clearly, in the law. This issue is about saving children. Sadly, there are millions of children across the world that wake up hungry every morning. There are millions more that live at the very edge of survival.

For one moment, just one moment, I wish every parent in this House would imagine how you would feel if you awoke this morning not knowing whether you could feed your child or children. Imagine you lived in a country that had no welfare and there were more people than jobs. For one moment imagine the emotional agony of watching your children crying from hunger or malnutrition. Imagine yourself with just enough money or resources to barely feed the children you love and that you have already brought into this world.

For millions of parents around the world, Mr. Chairman, they do not have to imagine this scenario. It is an everyday reality.

□ 1145

Regardless of the intentions, I think it would be unfair and inhumane to deny family planning services now to those parents who desperately want to feed and nurture the children that they love, just as you and I love our children.

For millions of parents, family planning is the difference between providing adequate care and food for the children they have and facing the desperation of watching all their children go hungry. Today we can make a difference for millions of children.

This issue is about protecting children, children that are struggling to survive and parents that are struggling

to support and nurture those special children. I urge support of the President's resolution.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. PAUL], a distinguished physician and a member of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 36. It is very clear to me that we should be doing nothing in the way of funding international birth control and family planning. If one were to look for the authority for this, it would be very difficult to find it written in the Constitution that that would be a proper function for U.S. taxpayers to be obligated to participate in such a program. So, very clearly, a ''no'' vote on H.R. 36 would be a correct and proper vote.

I have more problems with the second vote on H.R. 581 because if one is concerned about being a fiscal conservative and following the rules of the Constitution, one might ask how many more dollars of taxpayers' money will be used if H.R. 581 passes? The best answer I can come up with is that instead of the $215 million that the President would get if he has his way, we would add that and have $385 million. In contrast, if we did nothing, if we voted down both of these proposals, it is my opinion that then the spending would be limited to $92 million.

The question arises here, well, what is a couple of dollars doing in some program that is unconstitutional if we can get some language in there that might do some good? Being a strong right-to-life Member, member of the right-to-life caucus, I am very much aware of that and very concerned about it.

Quite frankly, if we did not spend the money we would not be arguing over whether or not the prohibition will do any good. Quite frankly, I do not believe the prohibition language accomplishes what it really intends to accomplish.

For instance, in the wording of this message it is in there that if those who receive the funds do not spend it until the next fiscal year, they would not have the restraints on it. Besides, these organizations so often are international, they are huge in scope, and if they do not use the funds for abortion these funds get shifted around.

Basically, it is very clear to me that the program should not exist. We should vote down the appropriation or keep the appropriation as low as possible. And quadrupling it, from where we are today, if we do nothing, we spend $92 million; if we pass H.R. 581, with the attempt to try to curtail the abortions, we actually quadruple it.

Quite frankly, I do not believe the language is strong enough to really prevent any of this money getting into the hands of the abortionists.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey, [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong support of the release of international family planning funds on March 1 of this year. We need to clear up the confusion on this issue and focus on the importance of family planning programs.

International family planning programs save the lives of thousands of women and children across the world, prevent unwanted and dangerous pregnancies, and reduce the number of abortions worldwide.

Representatives from the Russian family planning association recently shared information on the successes of their program. In Russia they are using these valuable dollars to increase access to quality family planning information and services. As a result of this program, contraceptive use has risen from 19 to 24 percent among women in just 4 years. And between 1990 and 1994, total abortions fell from 3.6 to 2.8 million.

Yesterday Secretary of State Madeleine Albright testified before our appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs. She stated:

> Our voluntary family planning programs serve our broader interests by elevating the status of women, reducing the flow of refugees, protecting the environment, and promoting economic growth. As the President has determined, a further delay will cause a tragic rise in unintended pregnancies, abortions and maternal and child deaths.

Let us be clear: Support for family planning programs has, to this day, been bipartisan. This program was created in 1969 by President Richard Nixon.

Let me also address some concerns that have been raised by individuals who do not want their tax dollars being used for family planning services overseas. Of the two resolutions that we will vote on today, this resolution actually provides less money than does the alternative proposal that will be offered later.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentlewoman from Wyoming, Mrs. CUBIN, a member of the Committee on Commerce.

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the resolution on the President's findings on family planning and I ask that my colleagues support the Smith-Hyde bill.

It was stated earlier, and I completely agree, that in the past international family planning has been a bipartisan issue. I suggest to my colleagues that it absolutely remains that way today.

I am pro-life but I am also very much in favor of sex education and birth control and family planning. In my opinion, it is a contradiction to be opposed to abortions and yet be opposed to birth control and family planning, and that is why I support the Smith-Hyde bill. The Smith-Hyde bill supports international family planning programs in foreign countries, but not like the President's proposal to promote abortions.

I do not believe abortion is nor should it ever be promoted as a method of family planning or for birth control. The Smith-Hyde bill is a bipartisan bill, an alternative approach to the President's shortsighted and irresponsible plan, and it actually increases funding for international family planning even beyond the President's resolution.

Now, let me repeat that. The Smith-Hyde bill will spend more money for international family planning than the President's proposal, and the Smith-Hyde bill will not allow any public money to be spent for abortions.

There are many in this Chamber like me who support family planning programs. This debate is simply not about family planning, but it is a debate about abortion being used as a method of family planning or birth control.

As I said, I am strongly pro-life and I believe that abortion is not acceptable for purposes of sex selection, birth control, or convenience. Frankly, people must begin accepting responsibility for their actions, both domestically and overseas. That is why we must have an honest debate about the use of contraceptives and sex education as responsible methods of family planning. It is time to take the issue of abortion out of the family planning debate.

The resolution on the President's finding ignores this Congress' desire to keep pro-life safeguards in place when providing international family planning funds. Let us send a clear message to the President that we do not want to send taxpayers' money to foreign countries to fund abortions.

I urge my colleagues to vote to permit a rule on a Smith-Oberstar vote and against the resolution supporting the President's finding.

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

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to take this moment to thank the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], for her leadership on this issue, and note that she had to forego going to her dear friend Ambassador Pamela Harriman's funeral, so she could carry out her duties in relation to this program this morning, and I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Chairman, I also rise in strong support for this resolution for release of funds for the Nation's international family planning programs.

Make no mistake about it, no matter what we hear on this floor, despite attempts by opponents to say differently, today's vote is about international family planning. More than that, it is a vote to release funds that have already been appropriated to a program that has already been authorized. It is also an agreement we are talking about today that has already been approved by the majority and the minority.

International family planning programs work. They work to promote sustainable development. As Secretary of State Madeleine Albright said just this week, and as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] just mentioned, I too was struck by Secretary Albright's words when she noted that these efforts concerning family planning further promote U.S. foreign policy objectives by improving the status of women, reducing the flow of immigration, protecting our environment and, finally, promoting economic growth, which this is very much about.

I would add, too, that these family planning efforts truly do save lives, lives that otherwise might be lost to infection and to starvation, and we have to say it, yes, to abortion. To pretend otherwise is to ignore reality.

I urge my colleagues today, whatever thoughts on other debates where we do disagree, to vote today for the President's resolution.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the very distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong opposition to the first resolution and in strong support of the Smith-Oberstar-Hyde resolution.

Second, I want to make clear to people who are listening, I strongly support family planning. I am not one, there may be some who are opposed to family planning, I strongly support family planning and think it is very important.

Third, the Smith-Hyde resolution moves the money out faster and, in some respects, actually more, because by moving it out faster the level is actually higher.

Fourth, I will tell the people that are undecided on this issue there are more than enough groups in this country and in this world who are strong proponents and supporters of family planning who can use not only the money in this bill but double or triple the amount. So there are enough family planning groups that can take the money that are not connected with abortion and are not involved in controversial activities.

We went through the same thing in Romania several years ago when this battle came and the House then sided for family planning but not for family planning groups that are involved in abortion. So I will say that the Smith resolution puts more money out faster, and there are more than enough family planning groups that are strong proponents of family planning who are not involved in abortion, to use the money under Smith-Hyde but to use double that money.

Had my will been done, I would have increased the amount of money for family planning in the Smith-Hyde thing, although we were prohibited from doing that because family planning is important but not family planning to groups who are connected with abortion, which in many respects in China is one of the most criminal violations of human rights.

□ 1200

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of releasing the already appropriated funds for family planning on March 1.

With the growing program of overpopulation around the world, access to international family planning is crucial. About 1.3 billion people subsist on $1 a day, 1.5 billion people lack access to clean drinking water, 120 million people are actively looking for work, and 700 million people are classified as underemployed, working long hours in jobs that often fail to come close to supporting their basic needs. For many of these people, health care is neither affordable nor even available.

It is clearly in our national interest to address these changes and to contribute to international stability and economic growth. It is a more cost effective investment to address these problems proactively rather than later when they erupt into an international crisis.

For health reasons alone, quality family planning deserves our full support. Only through the use of family planning funds have women and couples in poor countries had access to contraceptives, prenatal care, and a link to modern health care services. International family planning has improved women's health and allowed generations of children to grow in safer, more suitable environments.

Mr. Chairman, I insert for the RECORD two articles which appeared in the Houston Chronicle in support of this motion.

[From the Houston (TX) Chronicle, Feb. 7, 1997]

CONGRESS SHOULD RELEASE WORLD FAMILY PLANNING FUNDS

Most American couples take for granted their ability to delay starting their families after marriage. They decide when or whether to have more children after a baby's arrival. Or a couple may choose to have no children at all. These are choices that many parents in the developing world do not have.

The link between access to contraception and healthier babies, better educated children wealthier families and population control is a solid one. Recognizing this connection, the United States has a long tradition of providing poor people the world over with the means of controlling the size of their families and appropriately spacing their children. American family planning aid is credited with reducing birth rates in 60 countries and lowering the average number of children per family from six to three.

Now, conservative legislators, persuaded by anti-abortion lobbyists, have tied these highly successful programs to the abortion debate. Charging—mistakenly—during last year's budget debate that U.S. family planning aid helps support abortion services abroad, abortion opponents cut the programs' funding by 35 percent and mandated that 1997 funds could not be spent until July, nine months into the fiscal year. After that, spending is restricted to only 8 percent per month of the remaining $385 million allocation.

These funds, by law, cannot be used to provide or promote abortions, and they should be released immediately. Abortion opponents are working at cross purposes here since a lack of contraception undoubtedly will increase unintended pregnancies, which logically could result in an increase in abortions.

Furthermore, the action has hurt family planning programs without regard to a country's position on abortion.

For example, in Trinidad and Tobago, where abortion is illegal, U.S. planning funding has dried up.

Access to reliable contraception and family counseling services act as deterrents to abortion. Meanwhile, poor parents who can direct the destinies of their families have the ability to improve the quality of life for the children they do have. Congress should act now to mitigate the damage that this funding disruption has already caused.

[From the Houston (TX) Chronicle, Jan. 31, 1997]

CONGRESS IGNORING SERIOUS POPULATION PROBLEM

(By Werner Fornos)

For those who question that the world has an overpopulation problem—and yes, there are a few—here are a few facts to keep in mind.

1.3 billion people subsist on about one dollar a day. 1.5 billion people lack access to clean drinking water. 120 million people are actively looking for work. 700 million people are classified as underemployed, working long hours, often at back breaking jobs that fail to even come close to meeting their most basic needs.

These facts are just the beginning.

In 1993, some 16.5 million people died from infectious diseases. That was one-third of all deaths worldwide that year, or slightly more than all deaths from cancer and heart disease combined.

A recent report concluded that a resurgence of diseases once thought to have been eradicated stems from a deadly mix of exploding populations, rampant poverty, severe environmental degradation, inadequate health care and misuse of antibiotics.

And still there are skeptics, people who insist that there's no world population problem. Unfortunately, some of those skeptics are in the U.S. Congress, and they have more than little influence. Not enough influence to terminate the U.S. international family planning program, or at least not yet. But, enough to place that program in serious jeopardy.

The 104th Congress last year appropriated $385 million for population assistance, but the skeptics added a few bizarre twists: None of it can be spent until July 1—nine months into the fiscal year that began last Oct. 1—and then at a rate of 8 percent of the total per month. For the 1997 fiscal year, which ends Sept. 30, this would result in a 76 percent reduction.

That's not exactly the way appropriations are made in Washington. But it clearly indicates that some of our lawmakers with sufficient clout have made up their minds to do away with U.S. population spending overseas.

And that is just about the most untimely notion the national legislature of the last remaining superpower could possibly have. World population is closing in on 5.9 billion

and it is growing at nearly 90 million a year. Virtually all of that growth is in the poorest countries of the world, and it is seriously hampering any reasonable chance many of them will have for emerging from a cycle of poverty, malnutrition, unemployment and social discrimination.

An escape hatch was built into the 1997 international population budget. The President will submit findings to Congress to show that the nine-month moratorium will be harmful to family planning efforts for developing countries. If his findings are accepted by both houses of Congress, the appropriation will be released as early as March 1, rather than July 1.

As this century draws to a close, there is sufficient technology to vastly reduce world population growth. It is possible to insure that world population stabilizes at 8 billion or even less, rather than 12 billion and possibly more.

Virtually every developing country with a problem of rapid population growth recognizes that fact and wants to reduce it. Virtually every industrialized country is trying to do its part to help. But the Congress of the United States, the last remaining superpower has enough recalcitrants to place its present and future overseas population efforts in doubt.

It is a situation the new 105th Congress can correct by voting in February to disperse international family planning funds by March 1. Then the United States can take its rightful place in the forefront of stabilizing world population in helping to lead our global neighbors toward a 21st century of progress, peace and prosperity.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER], a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I want to first say, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] said, that I believe there is a role for international family planning, and as we look around the world we can see that need.

I strongly have concerns about the fungibility and the maneuverability of funds not only directly but indirectly from fund-raising concerns on abortion, and I have a deep heartfelt concern that American dollars should not be used to kill innocent little children around the world. But also this bill is based on a false premise, and those Members and the general public who are still trying to make up their minds on this bill should realize that Congress has been very generous to international population programs.

Let us get some of the facts straight. The amount the administration already has to spend in fiscal year 1997 in international population programs, even if this resolution does not pass, is over $400 million. Not $1 million, not $10 million, not $100 million, not $200 million, over $400 million.

This is about 25 percent of the entire U.S. budget for developmental assistance to poor countries around the world. It is substantially more than the $300 million we spend on child survival programs which pay for vaccinations and medicines and save hundreds of thousands of children from dying from easily treatable diseases.

The money we spend on international population control is about twice as much as the $200 million we spend on assistance for narcotics control. It is about 4 times the amount we spend for microcredit programs, which empower poor people, mostly women, by allowing them to start small businesses.

In this $400 million for population control is literally hundreds of times more than we contribute to other urgent needs such as the U.N. Fund for Torture Victims. Yet the administration still tries to make us think that population programs are underfunded.

They do this by constantly pointing to the fact that under the funding compromise adopted last year, only about $92 million of the fiscal year 1997 population funding can be spent in this fiscal year beginning in July. But they refuse to talk about the additional $284 million in the carryover funds from fiscal year 1996 which is still available in fiscal year 1997, and they somehow forget to mention the additional $43 million Congress has appropriated for contributions to the U.N. Population Fund.

Mr. Chairman, this is a total of $420 million. If we reject this resolution, the total stays at $420 million. Population programs will still have one of their best years in history. Not only is a no vote on the Clinton resolution the right vote for those who respect life, it is also the only vote consistent with fiscal responsibility and a balance of priorities and how we approach international funding.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCGOVERN], a member of the freshman class.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, throughout my district in Massachusetts, I have spoken out quite clearly that one of my top priorities is protecting the health and the lives of children, mothers, and pregnant women. But, Mr. Chairman, my concern for the health of women and children does not stop at the borders of my district. It extends to all women and all children around the globe.

Over the past 30 years, U.S. support for international family planning has been one of the great success stories of our development programs. What do U.S. international family planning programs do? They protect the health, welfare, and survival of women and children. They reduce the spread of sexually transmitted diseases like HIV/AIDS. They reduce poverty. They reduce the pressure of human population on the environment. And they dramatically reduce the rate of abortion worldwide.

Mr. Chairman, the cuts and delays in releasing current U.S. funds have already caused harm to many of these programs. I urge all my colleagues to support the President's finding and to release these desperately needed funds now.

Mr. Chairman, USAID international family planning programs have earned the support and respect from a broad spectrum of U.S. and international nongovernmental organizations [NGOs], along with such international agencies as UNICEF.

The NGOs represent a diverse array of interests, such as religious institutions, environmental groups, population and development organizations, legal and educational associations, and women's and children's advocates. From the National Audubon Society to the Religious Action Center on Reformed Judaism, from CARE to the Emory University School of Public Health, all have urged the release of these already appropriated USAID funds for international family planning.

The issues that bring together such an annual coalition of interests reflect how successful U.S. international family planning programs have been over the past three decades. It also reflects how very real is the harm to women's and children's lives that has already been caused by recent cuts in funding levels and the current delay in releasing appropriated moneys for these programs.

For example, in Bolivia, a CARE program designed to give rural Bolivian women access to pap smears for the first time ever will be terminated if funding is delayed any further. When diagnosed early, cervical cancer can usually be treated effectively. Bolivia is plagued with the highest maternal mortality rate of any country in Latin America. Without the benefits of early detection through pap smears, rates of women's deaths in Bolivia will likely remain high.

In the Philippines, the USAID program in natural family planning, which is carried out by the Georgetown University Institute for Reproductive Health, would come to an abrupt halt in the Philippines. Because the contract is up for renewal in June 1997, the funding delay would close this project down completely.

In Zambia, more than 100,000 women in Lusaka, Zambia's capital, receive family planning support through USAID. Should funding be delayed to this project, key reproductive health care training will be scaled back dramatically, meaning that condom distribution in this country will be reduced significantly. As a result, hundreds of new HIV cases will occur in this urban capital that already suffers from a high HIV infection rate. The cutbacks in service training will also cause thousands of couples to lose family planning information services. This in turn will increase the incidence of unwanted pregnancies and ultimately abortions in Zambia. Sadly, unsafe abortion has been among the top causes of hospital admission in Lusaka.

As these cases only begin to illustrate, family planning programs are truly development success stories. And by making widespread the use of contraceptives, they are also one of the most successful means of reducing abortion rates worldwide. Indeed, making family services available to all who want them should be the common ground on which both sides of the abortion debate can agree.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD the following two attachments from the U.S. Agency for International Development, dated January 31, 1997, which outline some of the impacts of the fiscal year 1997 funding delay on specific country programs.

THE IMPACT OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1997 FUNDING DELAY ON COUNTRY PROGRAMS

The following country programs are among those that would be most severely affected by not being able to receive FY97 population funds until July 1 or later:

Bolivia—Defer ongoing population assistance to the National Social Security Medical System, jeopardizing services to 20 percent of Bolivia's population. Reduce support to local organizations providing family planning services to 30 percent of Bolivia's rural population.

Haiti—Layoff staff of NGOs serving thousands of poor Haitian couples. Delay and possibly cancel integration of family planning into CARE's maternal and child health care program.

Mexico—Curtail USAID-funded training of family planning service providers in the public sector and potentially close some NGO clinics, including in Chiapas, one of Mexico's poorest states.

Guatemala—Reduce services of largest private family planning provider and close rural health promoter program.

El Salvador—Continue cutbacks and downgrading of services of the leading NGO family planning provider.

Dominican Republic—Reduce services of leading NGO family planning providers and lose opportunities for initiatives to increase male involvement in family planning.

Russia—Suspend funding for two of the largest organizations providing assistance, jeopardizing programs to train family planning service providers and provide 1.7 million couples with access to modern family planning services as an alternative to abortion.

Ukraine—Suspend planned extension to major cities of training for service providers in clinical reproductive health, contraceptive counseling and prevention of sexually transmitted diseases.

The Philippines—Defer a number of programs to train health personnel in natural family planning, introduce voluntary surgical contraception at 200 sites, and work with the commercial sector on provision of oral contraceptives.

Egypt—Suspend USAID's principal mechanism to provide technical and financial support for the national family planning program, a disruption that would affect thousands of clients now served.

Jordan—Suspend establishment of model family planning centers and information campaigns on availability of family planning, affecting 500,000 couples who are current and expected users.

Turkey—Suspend training of nurses and midwives, increasing the shortage of trained providers of family planning and related health services.

Mozambique—Reduce training and other family planning service delivery activities in four focus provinces with a combined population of over 6 million.

Uganda—Suspend or curtail a number of training and family planning service delivery programs.

Zimbabwe—Suspend deliveries of USAID-funded contraceptives, resulting in stockouts for clinics and community-based distributors.

THE IMPACT OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1997 FUNDING DELAY ON USAID TECHNICAL LEADERSHIP THROUGH WORLDWIDE PROGRAMS

The following worldwide programs are among those that would be most severely affected if FY97 population funding is not available until July 1 or later:

Service delivery—Critical service delivery programs supported through US-based private voluntary organizations (PVOs), including CARE, Pathfinder International, and AVSC, would have to suspend or even shut down key activities. AVSC, for example, would shut 70 percent of the family planning service sites it supports in Nepal

Natural family planning—USAID's planned new agreement with Georgetown University could not begin soon enough to prevent suspension of programs serving over 700,000 annually, including in Bolivia, the Philippines, and Ecuador.

Contraceptive supplies—There could be serious contraceptive shortages in a number of countries in FY98—Up to 50 million condom, 4.8 million cycles of oral pills, and 500,000 intra-uterine devices (IUDs)—as well as loss of U.S. jobs.

Training—Training of over 4,500 family planning service providers in 10 or more countries would be deferred indefinitely.

Information and communications—Information campaigns on family planning and maternal and child health designed to reach millions of couples in Bolivia, Ukraine, the Philippines, Kenya, and other countries would be slowed.

Research—Initiation of a large-scale clinical trial for a new female-controlled barrier method would be deferred, and work on other current contraceptive leads would be slowed, delaying introduction of new and improved methods.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Rockefeller Foundation recently published this report. It is called High Stakes: The United States Global Population and Our Common Future. It is important that we consider what the stakes are in this debate because the stakes are indeed high.

Mr. Chairman, the stakes are about women dying. They are about mothers dying. Every day 1,600 women die of pregnancy-related causes because they do not have access to reproductive health services, including family planning. Around the world, 250 women will die for lack of family planning services during the course of this debate; 585,000 women die for these reasons every year around the world.

What they die of is called most frequently postpartum hemorrhage. It happens most frequently when poor women have undergone many closely spaced births, and when these women die, they die because when they have their pregnancies they are too young, they are too old, their children come too closely together or they have too many children, and when they die they leave behind vulnerable orphans.

It is indeed a tragedy. The stakes are about children dying. Every year 7 million infants die on this planet because their mothers were not healthy enough for their pregnancies, or they lacked obstetric care, when the children most likely to die are those children who are born too closely spaced together, into families that are too poor and to women who lack access to family planning services.

We have heard a lot of talk this morning in this debate about abortion, and speaker after speaker on the other side of this debate have walked to the podium and talked about this program as if it enhances the number of abortions in the world. Nothing, nothing, could be further from the truth. Each year in this world 50 million women have abortions performed; 20 million of those abortions are in unsafe conditions.

Mr. Chairman, when I decided to speak out on this issue, I felt I needed to understand how this program works and to see it operating on the ground. A few weeks ago I traveled to La Paz, Bolivia, a country in which abortion has never been legal and a country until just recently, because of this program, family planning services were not available at all. I went into the Andean Mountains and I met with the Aymara Indians and I met with them in little clinics and little hospitals around the country, and I spoke to them about their efforts to go out and talk to their neighbors, door to door, using these funds, meager funds, to promote family planning services.

What I found out is that just 8 years ago, the health ministry of Bolivia did a survey for health planning purposes. They did not have in mind a study about abortion or family planning services. They just wanted to know how their hospitals were being utilized. What they discovered, to everyone's amazement, is that 50 percent, half, of the beds in the country, the poorest country in the Western Hemisphere next to Haiti, in Bolivia, 50 percent of the beds were occupied by women who were suffering the results of botched and illegal abortions.

Abortion is not legal there. What has changed that, what has reduced the number of abortions in poor countries like Bolivia and in poor countries all over the world has been this program. This family planning program is what reduces abortions. And not one penny, let us say this over and over again, not one penny, not one dime of these funds are used to perform abortions, to counsel that abortion is an option, to promote abortion, not one penny of this money is used for that.

In those few instances where these funds are provided to an organization, a hospital, a government organization, a nongovernment organization that does exist and operate in a country where abortion is legal, these funds are strictly segregated. These organizations sign contracts that they will use none of this money for abortion-related services, and, in fact, they do not. We are here to prevent abortions.

We can define our interest in this issue in terms of the humanitarian issues I have just talked about, women dying and children dying and preventing abortion, or we can think of our more narrow national interest, the interest of the United States.

It took 10,000 generations for the world's population to reach 2 billion, and that happened just about when I was born, in 1950. Yet in the second half of this century, the population has increased from 2 billion to 5.5 billion. Look where it is headed. It is headed above 10 billion world population by midway through the next century.

The population in the industrialized countries has stabilized. But in countries that are underdeveloped, and the

poorest nations, India, Bangladesh, sub-Saharan Africa, the Middle East, Mexico, the population is exploding and it is exploding out of control.

Unsustainable population growth leads to increased demands for energy, and in the Third World that energy is produced by burning coal, dirty coal. Our scientists are clear about the fact that world population explosion means much more greenhouse gases being distributed to the atmosphere, it means global warming. Unchecked population growth in the Third World means depletion of water resources. It means famine, it means suffering. It pushes populations to clear rain forests. It pushes populations to go out and graze on land that cannot sustain cattle, and that leads to expansion of the deserts worldwide.

We all have a stake in the global environment.

When population explosion results in crushing poverty, people will work for next to nothing. What this chart illustrates is the growth in job seekers, the labor force in the industrialized countries, which is relatively stable, versus developing countries. What you see is an exponential growth rate in countries that are undeveloped and nonindustrialized. And so what happens?

What happens is what we have seen happen in the last decade or two. American workers are competing to produce products that are made overseas by people who will work for 25 cents a day or a dollar a day, and we cannot compete for those jobs. So in our very, very self-interest, for the workers of this country, for the future workers of this country, it is our job to prevent this great economic leveler, population explosion, from making us economically uncompetitive.

When the local economies cannot provide jobs, poor people migrate. They migrate to the industrial nations. Legal and illegal migration to this country is coming from Latin America, Asia, and Africa. Whether we define our interests as humanitarians committed to saving women and children from dying, or whether we define them more narrowly as protecting our Nation from global environmental degradation and job loss from a wave of migration, legal and illegal, this resolution is the right thing to do.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support it.

□ 1215

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds in order to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD] for his very comprehensive statement, indeed a definitive statement, on what is at stake here on the floor today. It is about family planning, it is about the individual lives of poor women and children and families throughout the world, it is about population and our environment, it is about the economies of the world, and I commend the gentleman for his courageous leadership and on his clear presentation for us.

I wanted to make a couple comments about what I have heard—is my time up?

Mr. Chairman, I will have to seek more time, but first I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the President's recommendation to release the already appropriated international family planning funds. Mr. Chairman, America's family planning program reduces unintended pregnancies in developing countries; 40 percent of those unintended pregnancies end in abortion. So, crippling our family planning program clearly leads to more abortions.

America's family planning dollars help poor women to protect themselves from deadly disease, to regulate childbearing when they want to do so. So indeed the release of these funds saves the lives of women and children. But this decision is about more, because unchecked global population growth affects all us in many ways.

Population pressures cause irreparable environmental degradation in fragile areas, and the growing numbers of the unemployed in developing nations threaten the economic and political stability of the entire globe.

So I urge my colleagues in the House to vote for the President's resolution to release the funds on March 1.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] who is co-chair of the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, progress in family planning is one of the great success stories of the world. It is where we are making progress throughout the developing world. I am proud of the role my country has played in this progress. This is one of the bright stars of American foreign policy.

I respect the conscientious and religious objections of those who oppose abortion, but I cannot imagine what the world thinks of this debate that drags abortion into a family planning matter. We must not see abortion in issues that allow us to cut off our noses to spite our faces. Family planning and contraception in the developing world impact three issues of awesome importance: maternal health, children's health and AIDS.

In the early century, graveyards showed more women dying at an earlier age than men. We have turned that around almost exclusively because of family planning. Let us do for the world what we have done for our country. Let this money go.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, the very distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] for yielding this time to me.

I had decided that I would not come to the microphone today to speak on this issue. This is an issue that has been cast upon my subcommittee, that is not an entitlement of ours. It is the responsibility of the Committee on International Relations to handle this issue. But in the absence of a bill being passed through the House and through the Senate and signed by the President, it has become the responsibility of my subcommittee to handle it.

Last year during the process, we went to great lengths to try to compromise, which is what this body is all about, a body of compromise. I am prolife, and I do not apologize for that. But at the same time I recognized what the pro-choice people were talking about.

In an attempt to make this issue go away, to make it fair, to give both sides a half-full glass, we adopted what was perceived as the Callahan amendment, and I spoke to many of my colleagues about this, and I even took the liberty of calling to my office with the assistance of a former Member of ours, Charlie Wilson, the leaders of the family planning community.

Mr. Chairman, they could not find one thing wrong with the Callahan amendment and they would not accept it because the right-to-life side had accepted it. Had they accepted it, they would have more money available, not for abortions, but for family planning. But they did not want to accept it because of the fact that the other side did accept it. That is the only reason they ever gave, the only logical explanation.

So in a desperate attempt, I talked with Secretary of State Christopher, and he agreed that it sounded fair to him. But nevertheless, the President sent messages that he was going to veto the entire foreign operations bill if the language we had proposed was in there.

So I put in a call to the President of the United States to ask for the opportunity to come to him and ask him to find one thing that was wrong with it. And the President, whereas in the past when he needed me, on situations like Bosnia, on situations like Haiti, when he summoned me to the White House and begged for my support and I ultimately gave it to him, refused to return my call.

And as a result of my inability to explain to the President to remove his veto threat and solve this issue for a long period of time, and to provide funding for family planning and at the same time to recognize the rights of the unborn, we are here today.

So we reconstructed the language at the insistence of Mr. Panetta, even though Mr. Panetta agreed that maybe I was right. But in order to allow the government to continue to operate in order to get the Government running and pass the bill that we had to pass, we agreed to this, knowing it would come back.

So as a result of that, I intend to vote ''no'' on the request of the President, and I intend to vote ''yes'' on the Chris Smith amendment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER].

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

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the measure before us.

Rapid population growth and movement are the primary causes of worldwide environmental degradation, dwindling natural resources, urban poverty, malnutrition, and social unrest that in too many cases leads directly to conflict approaching the level of war. At the same time, more than 90 percent of the annual population increase of 100 million people is in the developing world.

This debate is really about giving the people of the world the information and resources that Americans take for granted. As the Houston Chronicle has pointed out, most Americans make responsible and informed choices about when and whether to have children. These are choices that many parents in the developing world do not realize they have.

The number of people added to the world's population each year is increasing, especially in the world's poorest countries that are least equipped to deal with this growth. It is in our national interest and in the global interest to support voluntary international family planning. Efforts to slow population growth, elevate the status of women, reduce poverty, and promote sustainable development will lead to a more stable world.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make some points of clarification because I think there is some confusion among Members about certain points.

Let me make it clear the President's resolution does not subsidize, promote, allow, perform, or in any way condone abortion.

Second of all, there is no more money in the Smith resolution. The money is the same in the Smith resolution as it is in the President's proposal. The money is the same.

Third of all, I once again want to call to our colleagues' attention that all I have said first about this resolution not promoting or having anything to do with abortion is a matter of U.S. law according to the Helms amendment.

I have the provisions for our colleagues to see, blown up on a bulletin board or in handouts, on the very statutes; and also I have for them the safeguards to prove and demonstrate how this law is implemented.

In closing I want to say one thing, and I say this with the greatest respect for the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], the chair of our subcommittee on which I am ranking. The President has acted in good faith on this issue. He entered into an agreement, he entered into an agreement which called for less money, delayed the funding, in order to be able to have this House vote at this time up or down, to accept his certification that this delay in funding, et cetera, was a hindrance to promoting our international family planning goals.

In further proof of the President's good faith, I call to our attention a statement by the President in May 1996 where he accepted the Congress' request to strike from legislation, provisions that would have allowed the President to go forth with this spending with his own certification and without a vote of Congress. Congress said, we put that in by mistake; the President said, okay, I will take it out and then we will proceed.

So I urge our colleagues to look carefully at these provisions which safeguard any ideals that they have about abortion, but also uphold our principle of promoting family planning internationally.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of our time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], whose credentials are unsurpassed in the area of child survival. He truly lives and acts by the words of the gospel of Matthew, rendering to the least of our brethren as if he were rendering to God.

(Mr. HALL of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for yielding this time to me and for her very kind remarks.

There is probably nobody more pro-life in the Democratic Party than I am. If my voting record is not 100 percent, then it has got to be pretty close. I was the author of the conscience clause on abortion which was included in the Democratic platform, and I spoke of that issue at the convention.

I feel myself in a position today that is unusual for me, for I find myself opposing the views of the pro-life position. I support Mexico City policy, but I believe that the pro-life forces have gone too far in their effort to make the release of funds a pro-life issue, and this vote would hurt millions of women and children. Because of massive cuts to international family planning and very restrictive language that has held up other funds related to it, the pro-life forces have caused great damage, in my opinion, to poor communities all over the world.

I am for family planning, which is prenatal care and education to women, and breast-feeding and proper nutrition, and spacing of children and other child survival activities. I am against abortion. And there is a difference between family planning and abortion, but sometimes around here we do not separate the two of them from the discussion.

In quoting a letter from CARE and Save the Children, they have again stated current law, and I quote: ''In keeping with the Helms amendment, no U.S. funds are used to pay for abortion, nor do our organizations use private money to pay for abortions.'' That is the law and has been for some time.

World Vision, an organization that I have great respect for, is for releasing these funds. World Vision is a Christian organization, and they are pro-life.

□ 1230

I have traveled with them in many parts of the world to visit the poor, I have seen their work, and I have always been very inspired. When they speak on this issue, I listen.

Along with CARE, Save the Children, World Vision, they wrote many of us, and I am quoting from a letter that they wrote to me:

> Based upon our knowledge and operational experience, we can assure you that this is not an ideological or partisan issue, but a serious health concern for women, children and families. In addition to more maternal and child deaths, reduced access to family planning services will result in more unintended pregnancies, leading to more, rather than fewer, abortions. By voting to release already limited family planning funds, you will be voting to prevent more of these tragedies from happening.

I agree with them. In our effort to legislate around here, sometimes we become extreme and we become purists, and we hurt the people we are trying to help. This should not be an issue between pro-choice and pro-life forces. Rather, this is an issue of justice and fairness, in my opinion. Vote ''yes'' on this resolution.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, if I could inquire, am I correct that there is no more time other than the time that remains to my side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana has 12 minutes remaining; the gentlewoman from California has yielded the balance of her time to the gentleman from Ohio, and that time has expired, so the gentleman from Louisiana has 12 minutes remaining.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, could I inquire, do we have any more time left?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was in error. The gentlewoman from California has 30 seconds remaining and the gentleman from Louisiana has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to close and would certainly ask the gentlewoman to expend her time.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] for his leadership and for his fine statement from the heart and from the head to our colleagues. I want to thank Members on both sides of the aisle for what I believe is the fine tenor of the debate today.

International family planning is an issue of grave importance, and once again I appeal to our colleagues not to hold the poor children of the world hostage to the politics of the House of Representatives. Let us take a step forward and vote ''yes'' on the privileged resolution and approve the President's findings regarding international family planning.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. In sharing the expression by the gentlewoman from California about the tenor of the debate, I think it has been a fine debate.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], a member of the Committee on International Relations and an outstanding expert on this issue.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my very good friend [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, just to respond briefly, nobody is holding any funds or money hostage. This is all about fundamental human rights and protecting the precious unborn children while simultaneously providing family planning.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make it very clear that the House will today consider two diametrically opposed pieces of legislation on family planning. While each is designed to release fiscal year 1997 family planning funds by March 1, that is where the similarity ends.

The Clinton resolution, introduced by request by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY]—and I would note for the RECORD that Mr. ARMEY does not support the resolution—is strongly pro-abortion in its effect. Make no mistake about it, the consequence of approving the Clinton resolution is a fat payday for abortion providers. So please be fully aware of the unavoidable fact that if you vote for House Joint Resolution 36, you further empower, strengthen, and tangibly aid and abet the abortion industry overseas.

Know that a ''yes'' vote on House Joint Resolution 36 pours hundreds of millions of U.S. taxpayer dollars into organizations that have made the toppling of pro-life laws and policies in the developing countries their mission and their explicit goal. And know that once that they have succeeded in overturning those laws that protect the unborn child, once they have eviscerated the constitutional protections that are currently in place, these are the same folks who jump in with both feet to set up the abortion mills.

Who we subsidize, Mr. Chairman, not just what we subsidize, but who we subsidize does matter. It should matter greatly to each of us not just what an organization does with our specific donation, but the rest of their agenda as well. It is a package deal. This is especially important because money is fungible. What we give to a group immediately frees up other non-U.S. funds that can be used and in this case are used for performing and aggressively promoting abortion.

In recent months the Clinton administration has said that it does not promote abortion overseas. Oh, if that were only true. During Mr. Clinton's first term, my colleagues know and I know that his office pushed hard for an international right to abortion. At the 1994 U.N. Population Conference in Cairo, and especially at the preparatory meetings, known as PrepComs, leading up to the conference, the administration mounted a full court press for an international right to abortion.

A State Department March 1994 action cable sent to every U.S. ambassador and mission abroad prior to that meeting instructed our envoys to lobby their host governments with these instructions:

> The United States believes that access to abortion is a fundamental right. The United States delegation will be working for stronger language on the importance of access to abortion services overseas.

In a speech at the second PrepCom for the Cairo Conference, Tim Wirth said much the same thing, how they were going to be pushing abortion. And in a keynote address at the 1994 meeting of the Population Cooperating Agencies, Brian Atwood, the administrator of AID, said, and I quote,

> While obstacles cannot be removed overnight, this administration will continue to stand for the principle of reproductive choice, including access to abortion.

I say to my colleagues of the House, those so-called obstacles that Mr. Atwood was referring to are right-to-life laws and constitutional provisions that protect unborn children in approximately 100 countries in the developing world. Virtually all of Central and South America protect their kids from abortion. These are construed by the administration to be obstacles.

These abortion power plays, these overt pro-abortion initiatives, so far have been largely repudiated by the developing world, but they have had some successes. Poland and South Africa recently flip-flopped and went from pro-life to pro-abortion. So there is now a dual strategy: When the overt strategy failed, another strategy was employed.

For the last 4 years the administration has relied on a parallel track, a more sophisticated covert means designed to accomplish that end. They have used surrogates, nongovernmental organizations like the International Planned Parenthood Federation based in London, and the Pathfinder Fund and others to do the lion's share of the dirty work to nullify pro-life laws and to set up abortion mills the world over.

This past Tuesday I asked our very distinguished Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright, an official for whom I have great respect, whether she was aware of the 1992 International Planned Parenthood Federation abortion manifesto called Vision 2000, a global strategic plan that Planned Parenthood adopted and have been implementing ever since to promote abortion in every corner of the world. The Secretary, known for her candor, admitted she never heard of it.

IPPF, by the way, has received more than $70 million from the U.S. taxpayers, courtesy of this administration, so it seems to me that the Secretary of State and all of us should know what IPPF is all about. Again, it is not just what they do with ''our'' money, it is what their agenda is all about.

I urge Members to look at this document. This is their marching orders in the developing world. Do not just say our money is not going to be used. Other money then gets used to bring down these right-to-life laws. Let me just quote briefly from it.

The Vision 2000 strategic plan says, and I quote, that they will ''bring pressure on governments and campaign for policy and legislative change to remove restrictions against abortion.'' Can anything be more clear? Pressure governments. Campaign for abortion on demand. And we are providing many, many millions of dollars to this group.

Fred Sai, who is the former chairman of International Planned Parenthood, put it very succinctly when they passed this IPPF strategic plan. He said,

> Now, for the first time, the IPPF strategic plan, Vision 2000, which was unanimously adopted at the Members' Assembly in Delhi, outlines activities at both the Secretariat and FPA level to further IPPF's explicit goal of increasing the right of access to abortion.

Who we support and subsidize does matter.

IPPF has an elaborate plan and plans of action, as they call them, to promote abortion in every country of the world, including Central and South America where, again, they protect their unborn children. They have plans to decimate the pro-life laws in Africa, the Muslim countries in the Middle East, and several Asian countries who also legally protect their children from the abortionist's knife.

A vote for the Clinton resolution empowers the abortion industry to continue and expand these efforts to eradicate pro-life laws. Eliminate a law in Poland and a whole generation of kids are put at risk. Eliminate a law that protects them in South Africa or any other country, and an entire generation of kids are put at risk of abortion on demand.

I would respectfully submit that the only responsible pro-life action today is a ''no'' vote on the Clinton resolution and a ''yes'' vote on H.R. 581, the Smith–Oberstar-Hyde bill.

I truly believe that if we stand on the human rights principle of safeguarding human life today, the administration will ultimately do the right thing, provide family planning money, but do so with pro-life safeguards.

I was very encouraged by the statement made this past December by Phyllis Oakley, assistant secretary for population, when she appeared before my subcommittee. I chair the International Operations and Human Rights Subcommittee. Secretary Oakley, who is the point person for population for the administration said, and I quote:

The United States does not promote abortion and does not support the performance of abortion.'' She said, ''That is clear. We have stated it over and over again. I can assure you that remains our fundamental policy.

I therefore respectfully submit that the competing resolutions before the House today put Secretary Oakley's statement concerning this fundamental policy to the test. If the administration persists in promoting abortion by way of surrogates, the Clinton denials of promoting abortion will be exposed as wholly disingenuous and untrue.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''yes'' vote on H.R. 581 as introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] and myself. This pro-life, pro-family planning bill releases the entire $385 million appropriated for fiscal year 1997 on March 1 for family planning, but, again, it does it with the pro-life safeguards.

As a matter of fact, in fiscal year 1997 the administration will have significantly more to spend on family planning with our bill, not with the bill before you or the resolution, but with our bill.

Total cash on hand for population in fiscal year 1997, as this chart shows you, with carryover funds from 1996, will be $713 million with our bill. It will be only $543 million with the Clinton resolution. That is clear; that is undeniable. Yes, the money will be spent eventually, but the issue that the Clinton administration is making is that money delayed is money denied. We will frontload the whole thing, giving you the entire pot of money for family planning, but do so with pro-life safeguards.

I think it is very, very significant for Members to know that these safeguards are nothing new; they were in effect. People have talked about the Helms amendment today. The Helms amendment in the 1980's was found to be infirm. Yes, it stopped direct funding, but there were loopholes. The pro-abortion groups simply took their own money, which was freed up by our contributions, and used it for abortion promotion.

Let me just again say that the pro-life safeguards of the Mexico City policy were in effect during the Reagan and Bush years as a way to fully fund family planning without promoting abortion. The Mexico City policy is both pro-family planning—and we make it clear in our bill—and pro-life.

Specifically, the safeguards say this: We will condition funds only to those organizations that will not perform abortions except in the cases of rape, incest, and life of the mother. We restrict funds to those organizations that will not lobby, that will not become the network in Peru or Brazil or any of these other countries bringing down their pro-life laws.

□ 1245

Mr. Chairman, they are extensions of U.S. foreign policy. We give money to them. When they are talking to a legislator in one of these countries they do not say, ''Are you doing that with U.S. money or are you doing that with your own money?'' They are an extension of our policy. Since we are the megacontributors and donators to them, what they do reflects directly upon us here in the United States.

If Members want to promote abortions, say it. This Mexico City policy makes it very clear that there ought to be a wall of separation between the two.

Let me also point out that during the years that the policy was in place, in excess of 350 family planning organizations, including Planned Parenthood affiliates in 57 States or countries, accepted the conditions. Some of the more extreme pro-abortionists in IPPF went ballistic over that, and even censured IPPF Western Hemisphere for doing that. But I believe they showed that they wanted to do family planning. They did not want to be part of this big push for abortion. Vote ''no'' on the Clinton resolution, and please vote ''yes'' on H.R. 581.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, the world's population is growing by 90 million every year—that is the equivalent of adding the entire population of Mexico every year. Family planning is critical for the survival of the planet and the people on it. Overpopulation leads to the suffering of women and innocent children, poverty, and war.

There is an unfortunate tendency in this country to reduce important debates concerning reproductive issues to the labels ''pro-choice'' and ''pro-life.'' We will ill serve the citizens of this country and the world if we allow this vote today to fall victim to these labels.

First, there is evidence that without family planning, the number of abortions increases.

And second, today what we are really doing is voting to ensure that there will continue to be humane and responsible efforts through voluntary family planning services so that the people who live on this planet can live with decency and dignity.

The United States has a moral obligation to lead the effort to control population responsibly. And I believe, therefore, that the moral vote today is a vote for the President's resolution.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

(Mr. LEWIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to add my voice to those that have spoken today in support of international family planning.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question that funding for family planning has promoted the health and survival of women and children in developing nations. The United States has taken a leading role in promoting child survival in the world, decreasing maternal and infant mortality, and ending the spread of deadly disease, including the AIDS virus. And, yes, Mr. Speaker, we have helped reduce the practice of abortion through this program. Today, abortion is widespread in many nations—Russian women have on average 7 to 8 abortions in a lifetime. Family planning is helping to reverse this epidemic—to end the trend, not to begin it.

We have heard it said on this floor today, and I will say it again: not one penny of family planning aid goes to support abortions. Not one penny. This vote is not about supporting abortions abroad—it is about ending them. It is about about saving the lives of women and children. It is about saving the lives of women who, in many cases, are children.

Family planning is helping to end the spread of the AIDS disease—a disease who know no borders. It is helping couples in developing nations reduce the size of their families so they can stay out of poverty, become educated, survive, and thrive. Family planning has limited the number of births in the developing world on average from 6 to 3.

And to my colleagues who suggest that family planning funds will support abortions, let me say, and let me beg of you—there is enough misinformation about family planning in the world today. There is enough disease. Enough people have died. Enough women and children have suffered. Family planning from the United States is provided for one purpose and one purpose only: to end the spread of misinformation about family planning—to end the death, poverty, and disease that comes from the spread of myths and lies.

Family planning does not support abortions, It saves lives. I urge my colleagues to support the release of family planning funds—funding which has already been appropriated and approved. Do it now. Do it today. The lives of women and children depend upon it.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the opportunity to reiterate my position on what has been referred to as the Mexico City policy—a policy regarding the appropriation of taxpayer funds for the population assistance activities of any foreign private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organization.

My position on taxpayer-financed family planning has been well established over the course of the previous two Congresses. I believe in family planning programs. I believe they help women and children. I also believe, however, in placing restrictions on how taxpayer dollars are used in pursuit of family planning. Simply put, I believe that the use of taxpayer dollars to pay for or promote abortion is inappropriate, except under circumstances of rape or incest, or to protect the life of the mother.

The Mexico City policy—that taxpayer funds intended for international family planning should not be directed to organizations that

perform or promote abortion, except in the instances of rape, incest, or to protect the life of the mother—has been raised several times in recent years. I continue to support the main thrust of that policy, and I continue to hold to the view that our government ought to be neutral on the difficult question of abortion. I take the libertarian view that government ought not to be involved in this most difficult and personal of decisions, and will continue to support legislation which is consistent with that view.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, the Clinton administration has embarked on what is no less than a worldwide crusade promoting abortion on demand at any time for any reason anywhere. I cannot condemn that policy in words strong enough.

So let me just make a quick point in the short time that I have to speak this morning. Contrary to what some of those on the other side have said, this vote is indeed about abortion. It has always been about abortion. We simply say to foreign nongovernmental organizations: Unless you agree not to perform abortions, and not to violate the laws, and lobby to change the laws, of other countries with respect to abortion, then don't come to this country asking for tax dollars. That is all we are saying.

I have only been in Congress for a little more than two years yet I am voting today for the eighth time on the restoration of the Mexico City policy—a simple, straight-forward pro-life policy initiated by President Reagan carried on by President Bush and eagerly decimated by President Clinton in his first days in office. I hope that this year, the Congress will finally bring this debate to an end and do the right thing Let's stop the international abortion crusade today.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Gephardt-Armey resolution and support the administration in releasing family planning funds immediately.

Family planning works, it is a proven policy that has helped to stabilize the world's population.

There are only two ways to reduce unwanted pregnancies: sexual abstinence and safe and effective contraception.

By not releasing these funds now and by continuing to keep delaying the funds, which the administration has already certified is causing irreparable harm to family planning efforts around the world, we are harming efforts to get that message out and are, in turn, contributing to the increase of unsafe abortions rather than reducing them.

In fact, the former chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator Hatfield, a strong pro-life advocate, unequivocally disagreed with the proponents of the Smith resolution and said that there was no evidence to support the claim that U.S. funding was being used to provide or promote abortion. The distinguished Senator went on to say that efforts to impede the release of family planning funds was not reducing abortions, rather it would increase and contribute to unsafe abortions.

This vote is not about abortion, U.S. law already prohibits the funding of and promotion of abortion.

We have already accepted a 35-percent cut in family planning funding which in of itself is a significant hit. But it was a bipartisan agreement and now we must all honor that agreement.

By releasing the family planning funds now, millions of women and family will have access to family planning counseling prenatal care and preventative health care.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to support the Armey-Gephardt resolution and vote to immediately release these critical funds.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the President's request to release $123 million in foreign aid to support an international pro-abortion agenda.

I have one question for my colleagues today. Why in the world should we ask the American taxpayer to provide funding for abortions administered overseas when we don't provide Federal funding for abortions in the United States? It makes no sense at all.

We know that in many areas of the world, the population is growing out of control and that something must be done to control this massive problem. However, a ''no'' vote on the Presidents resolution will not jeopardize our status as a world leader in this area. It will simply confirm that abortion is not an acceptable form of birth control.

This body has made it clear on several occasions that we are willing to provide funds for international family planning programs if the participants will simply promise not to use abortion or lobby for the use of abortion.

Many of the international organizations that benefit from this funding are taking part in highly questionable practices.

We know that the International Planned Parenthood Federation in London has a history of cooperating with the one-child abortion policies in China. This organization has also been involved in active lobbying to convince developing nations in Africa, Asia and the Americas to overturn their abortion laws. Is this something we need to pay for? I don't think so.

The question before us today is not whether we should support international family planning and education programs.

The question today is whether or not this nation, and this body, supports the use of abortion as a means of family planning.

As far as I am concerned, the term ''family'' and ''abortion'' are totally incompatible.

This Nation and this Congress cannot and should not subsidize programs and organizations which advocate abortion or which lobby for the legalization or expansion of abortion as a means of limiting population growth.

We should not allow abortion to become the next major U.S. export.

It is true that the Helms amendment prevents the direct use of U.S. funds to pay for abortion procedures, but it does not prevent indirect funding of programs that promote the legalization or expansion of access to abortion as a means of birth control in developing nations. To do that we must defeat the resolution and reinstate the Mexico City policy.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this resolution; help us reinstate the Mexico City policy and show the world that we are willing to support education and other family planning practices but not at the expense of the innocent unborn.

Vote ''no'' on this resolution and vote ''yes'' on Smith-Hyde-Oberstar.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support House Joint Resolution 36 to endorse the Presidential finding and release international family planning funds on March 1.

Family planning programs are common sense. Democrats and Republicans ought to put partisan differences aside and come together to support population assistance. Mr. GEPHARDT and Mr. ARMEY have set an excellent example of bipartisanship by cosponsoring this important bill.

U.S. population assistance aid is critical to our world's future. The high rates of population growth in developing countries affect Americans through its impact on the environment, immigration, and the economy. Unintended pregnancies threaten the society of developing countries as well: it can put economic development at risk, it damages the health and economic status of families, and increases the abortion rate.

Mr. Chairman, I urge this Congress to support family planning services. It is not a pro-choice or pro-life issue; it is a pro-family issue. This vote today is very important. If we don't vote to release the funds on March 1, we will reduce this year's total population assistance program funding by $123 million. At least 17 worldwide programs will need to defer, suspend, or terminate family planning health care services. The consequences of the delay would be enormous; there would be more unintended pregnancies, more abortions, and more maternal and infant deaths, and more economic and environmental strain on families and societies.

Opponents of this legislation argue that we should place extreme restrictions on health care providers who receive U.S. aid. I oppose this draconian policy: denying families the right to plan their childbearing is wrong. Access to birth control is good for children, good for families, good for the environment, and good for the society. I urge my colleagues to vote to support House Joint Resolution 36 and release the previously appropriated family planning assistance funds on March 1.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to state my absolute opposition to the President's proposal to send taxpayer dollars overseas to promote abortions. We simply cannot allow the administration to continue its policy of ignoring the fundamental rights of the unborn.

The argument has been made that family planning funds serve to decrease the number of abortions performed in developing countries. If this is the case and if we are to ensure that family planning programs respect the basic right to life, then the President should not object to the pro-life safeguards on four separate occasions in the last Congress, standing up emphatically for the rights of the unborn. The President's refusal to accept these reasonable safeguards is proof of the underlying abortion agenda of this administration and the international groups which support a similar position.

I urge this body to say no to a plan that exports abortion policies to developing countries. The right thing to do is to support the alternative resolution, offered by Representative CHRIS SMITH, which reinstates the Reagan-Bush Mexico City policy protecting the unborn.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of House Joint Resolution 36, which approves the President's finding that withholding family planning funds has a negative impact on international population programs.

These funds are crucial to the health of women worldwide, and represent the single most effective means our country uses to reduce the worldwide rate of abortion.

A recent Rockefeller Foundation report amply demonstrates the importance and success of America's three-decade commitment

to family planning programs: in countries where such programs are active, contraceptive usage rates among women have increased from 10 to 50 percent. This has resulted in lowering the average number of children borne by women in these nations from six to three, helping millions of women evade poverty and maintain their health. According to a UNICEF report, family planning programs, by helping women avoid risky pregnancies, can prevent up to 100,000 of the 600,000 annual maternal deaths. It's no wonder organizations like CARE and Save the Children strongly support this resolution.

I also stand in firm opposition to the Smith-Oberstar alternative resolution, which would reinstate the Mexico City gag order and delay the release of already appropriated family planning funds 4 additional months. I hope my colleagues will not be fooled by this antifamily planning resolution. Under current law, no U.S. funds can be used to perform or lobby for abortions. For the past 24 years, no one has produced any evidence that one penny of this funding has ever been used for abortion. In fact, the Smith bill will, in the words of passionate abortion opponent Senator Mark Hatfield, ''contribute to an increase of abortions worldwide.'' By some estimates, the Smith bill could result in an additional 1.6 million abortions worldwide.

Furthermore, this resolution, if approved, will merely release funds which have already been appropriated—it will not, as opponents of family planning have suggested, add a single penny to our foreign aid spending.

Mr. Speaker, this bill doesn't provide any new spending. It will help save the lives and health of millions of women and keep many more children from becoming orphans. And it will decrease the number of abortions performed worldwide. I strongly urge my colleagues to pass this pro-family, pro-woman resolution.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to House Joint Resolution 36, approving President Clinton's findings regarding international population planning programs and instead urge my colleagues to join me in supporting House Resolution 581, the Family Planning Facilitation and Abortion Funding Restriction Act. House Joint Resolution 36 would not just allow for the early release of an additional $123 million in fiscal year 1997 for international family planning organizations. It would also allow these groups to perform abortions and promote and lobby for abortion as a family planning option within their home country.

As an alternative, I join Congressmen SMITH, HYDE, and OBERSTAR in supporting international family planning while also ensuring that organizations that use Americans' tax dollars agree not to either promote or perform abortions overseas. Simply put, abortion is not a method of family planning.

Behind the smoke and mirrors of today's debate is the fact that supporting the President's resolution (H.J. Res. 36) will result in the promotion and performance of abortions overseas. As an alternative, I ask my colleagues to join me instead in supporting a bipartisan alternative, the Smith-Oberstar-Hyde bill (H.R. 581) that will release an additional $292.6 million in U.S. funds for international family planning programs in fiscal year 1997—bringing the total fiscal year 1997 spending on these programs to $713 million. But more important, the bill will ensure that foreign nongovernmental organizations receiving U.S. funds are not performing or promoting abortions in developing countries except in the cases of rape, incest, or when the life of the mother is in danger.

The restrictions on abortion in the Smith-Hyde-Oberstar alternative are not without precedent. The 1994 International Conference on Population and Development held in Cairo reiterated that ''in no case should abortion be promoted as a method of family planning.'' Furthermore, from 1984 to 1993, the United States Government supported international family planning programs with these pro-life measures known as the Mexico City policy. Under this policy, over 350 family-planning groups received funding. We should renew our commitment by voting for House Resolution 581.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting true family planning and not abortion. Vote for the Family Planning Facilitation and Abortion Funding Restriction Act. Voting for the President's resolution is not just agreeing with his finding that delaying family planning dollars has had a negative effect. It also gives the green light to the promotion and performance of abortions overseas.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, today I rise to speak in support of House Joint Resolution 36 which allows for the early release of international family assistance funding. As my colleagues know, the administration and the Republican leadership made an agreement last September to allow the funding for international family assistance to go forward in July, with the possibility of release of the funds in March if the President certifies to Congress that the delay is having an adverse impact on the family planning program and both Chambers pass legislation to approve the early release. Last week, the President sent his certification to us.

According to the President's report, delaying the release of funds undermines U.S. efforts to promote child survival and actually increases the number of abortions worldwide. Evidence from all regions of the world shows that increased contraceptive use, by reducing unintended pregnancies, plays a major role in reducing abortions. Reductions in the rate of abortion as a result of increased contraceptive use have been documented in countries such as Russia, the central Asian republics, Mexico, and Colombia. In Russia alone, an increase of only 5 percent in contraceptive use over 4 years led to a decrease of 30 percent in the annual abortion rate. Why turn back this progress?

One would think that abortion opponents would rush to support family planning assistance since it reduces the number of abortions. Unfortunately, this is not the case, considering the permission by the Rules Committee to include consideration of House Resolution 581 which would allow early release of funds with unnecessary and onerous restrictions on the assistance. Contrary to what the supporters of House Resolution 581 claim, current law prohibits the use of any foreign aid funds for abortion or for motivating anyone to seek an abortion. The U.S. agency for international development has followed this policy for years and has strict procedures in place to ensure compliance.

Family planning has proven effective in preventing abortions, maternal and child deaths. If we delay support for family planning by even 4 months, denying safe and effective contraception to couples who depend on these programs, we will see a rise in unintended pregnancies and maternal deaths and a tragic recourse to unsafe and unsanitary methods to terminate those pregnancies.

This vote is about family planning and releasing delayed fiscal year 1997 funds; no new or additional funds are involved. This vote directly affects the life prospects of countless women and children in developing nations. I strongly urge my colleagues to support House Joint Resolution 36 and vote ''no'' on House Resolution 581.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman. I rise to support the release of family planning funds, that have been held hostage to unwarranted anti-choice forces in the Congress for more than 4 months now.

We here today are on a rescue mission. For if we fail to pass this resolution, the funds will be held hostage until July 1, 9 months into the fiscal year. This is unacceptable.

This is not about spending more money or new money. It is about the previously allocated international family planning funds that have not been released. The President has certified that this delay is harming our efforts to reduce unintended pregnancies abroad. These funds must be released now.

Releasing these funds will improve women's health, reduce poverty, and protect our global environment.

International family planning promotes preventive health care such as prenatal care, helps women to plan and space their pregnancies farther apart, and prevents unintended pregnancies that may threaten women's health and the health of their babies.

Do our programs work? As David Broder commented in the Washington Post, ''the success of the program is undeniable.'' Studies have shown for the past three decades the percentage of women using contraception in foreign countries that receive this type of assistance has risen from 10 percent to 50 percent, and the average number of children they have borne has been reduced from six to three.

Some say that our international family planning efforts increase abortion. This is absolutely false. No U.S. dollars are used to provide abortion services either in the United States or abroad. In fact, it has been illegal to use U.S. funds to provide abortion services abroad since 1973. I happen to disagree with this policy, but it is the policy nonetheless.

Family planning does not increase abortions, it reduces them. Senator Mark Hatfield recognizes this, World Vision recognizes this, and I believe that even most people in this Chamber recognize this. But you cannot claim to support family planning and vote against this resolution. Only passage of this resolution will lead to release of the international family planning funds.

Let there be no mistake about it, this is a vote about choice, but it is not a vote about abortion.

It is about a choice between supporting family planning or opposing it.

It is about a choice between protecting women's lives or harming them.

In fact, this is about a choice between right and wrong, and quite seriously about a choice between life and death.

I urge my colleagues to choose wisely, to protect women's lives, and to support this resolution.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, today I voted in support of House Joint Resolution 36, a resolution to release funds for international family planning on March 1, 1997, which passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 220–209 on February 13, 1997. I made this decision after careful consideration and deliberation. Former U.S. Senator Mark Hatfield of Oregon, who is pro-life, sent a letter last fall to Representative CHRIS SMITH expressing his concern about the detrimental effect of the delay in funding for these programs.

> * * * Chris [Smith (R–NJ), author of H.R. 581], you are contributing to an increase of abortions worldwide because of the funding restrictions on which you insisted in last year's funding bill. It is a proven fact that when contraceptive services are not available to women throughout the world, abortion rates increase. We have seen it in the former Soviet Union where women had no access to family planning and relied on abortion as their primary birth control method. Some women had between eight and twelve abortions during their lifetimes. This is unacceptable to me as someone who is strongly opposed to abortion.

Based on this statement and other information from pro-life Members of Congress, including Representative TONY HALL, I voted in support of House Joint Resolution 36, a resolution to release international family planning funds on March 1, 1997. Since it is my objective to decrease the number of abortions, this pro-life vote is the only vote I could conscientiously cast. Those Agency for International Development [AID] international family planning funds are prohibited by law from being used for abortion services. This prohibition is carefully monitored by AID and by independent audits.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I also voted in support of H.R. 581, the Chris Smith resolution, which would release funds as early as March 1 as long as recipients abide by the Mexico City policy, which prohibits these funds from going to organizations that also provide abortion services. I have been a long time supporter of the Mexico City policy. I also support family planning which reduces abortion—and oppose the use of Federal funds for abortion except to save the life of an indigent mother. However, since President Clinton waits for H.R. 581 with his veto pen thus giving the legislation virtually no chance of becoming law, I had to support House Joint Resolution 36 in order to provide funding for family planning services that are proven to prevent abortion.

KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the resolution, House Joint Resolution 36, to release international family planning funds beginning March 1, as recommended by the President, and to oppose H.R. 581, which would place restrictions on international family programs that already exist in Federal law.

The release of funds contained in House Joint Resolution 36 has been delayed 5 months, and a report by the administration states that further delay will cause serious, irreversible, and avoidable harm to family planning programs. The report further indicates that a delay of 4 months will increase the incidence of unintended pregnancies, maternal and child deaths, and abortions.

Those who oppose this family planning program assert that U.S. funds are being used for abortions. Nothing could be further from the truth. Current Federal law prohibits the use of U.S. funds for abortions or abortion counseling. The Agency for International Development, which administers these funds, has strict procedures to assure no U.S. funds are used for abortion. These procedures include legally binding contract provisions forbidding such activity, staff monitoring, and regular audits by nationally recognized accounting firms.

Even a highly respected pro-life advocate, former Senator Mark Hatfield, has found no evidence to suggest U.S. family planning funds are used to fund abortions in other countries. In a September 24, 1996, letter to Representative CHRIS SMITH, who is offering H.R. 581, Senator Hatfield said:

> I have reviewed the materials you recently sent to my office in response to my request that you provide proof that U.S. funds are being spent on abortion through AID's voluntary international family planning program. Unfortunately, I do not see anything in these materials to back up your assertion.

I have received no evidence to contradict Senator Hatfield's belief.

Those who say providing funds to family planning agencies increases abortions need to review the evidence to the contrary. Here are some examples:

Russia: From 1990 to 1994, contraceptive use increased by 5 percent, and the total number of abortions fell by 800,000.

Hungary: A dramatic increase in contraceptive use from the late 1960's to 1986 resulted in a drop in abortion rates from 80 per 1,000 women to about 30 per 1,000 women.

Chile: From 1960 to 1990, an increase in contraceptive use resulted in a drop in abortion rates from 77 per 1,000 women to 45 per 1,000.

By supporting the expedited release of these family planning funds, we in fact will decrease the incidence of abortions internationally. In a letter to congressional leadership, Reverend Leo O'Donovan, president of Georgetown University, said,

> Your vote to release these funds on March 1, 1997 rather than delaying until July 1, 1997 will make a tremendous difference to countless families. Our program and international efforts in natural family planning are dependent on these federal resources.

The Smith bill, H.R. 581, would unnecessarily restate the existing abortion prohibition and would restrict the expenditure of family planning organizations' own funds. We have the right and the responsibility to place conditions on U.S. taxpayer moneys, but not on all the resources of these groups.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of House Joint Resolution 36 and to oppose the Smith bill at this time. We will have numerous opportunities in this 105th Congress to cast votes on real abortion issues. Although H.R. 581 is cast as one, it fails the test.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to support the Presidential finding that family planning appropriations should be released on March 1 because any further delay would seriously impact this very important program.

Congress should support family planning programs because they are a crucial tool in international efforts to curb global overpopulation. At current growth rates, we will add more humans in the next 50 years than in all previous 500,000 years of human history. In the next decade alone, world population will increase by 1 billion people. This growth means more than longer lines at Safeway or at the local drug store. Unrestrained population growth devastates environmental resources, exacerbates immigration pressures, and raises the specter of worldwide malnutrition and the spread of infectious diseases.

I also support family planning funds because I support healthy families. Numerous studies have documented that mortality rates for women and children are highest when births are too close together, when women have many children, and when women give birth at very young and old ages. These family planning funds will enable mothers and fathers around the world to raise the healthiest children they can.

In addition, U.S. family planning aid often goes to families that have no other recourse. It is estimated that 77 percent of the couples using contraceptives in developing countries, excluding China, depend on publicly financed family planning programs.

We only need to look to Mexico for indices of the success of family planning. Due in part to foreign family planning assistance, the average Mexican woman now has 2.7 children, a dramatic reduction from the average of 6.7 children in 1970. Family planning is about thinking ahead. It's about giving families, especially poor families, the chance to make choices for their future. Let's not make the choice for them.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of House Joint Resolution 36, which provides for the release of U.S. contributions to international family planning programs.

For over 30 years America has been a supporter of international family planning. These programs have improved the health of millions of women and children, eased the environmental impact of rapid population growth, and prevented millions of unwanted pregnancies.

But in the past 2 years, Congress has withheld, cut or placed arbitrary restrictions on these programs.

Approximately 4 million women, who do not have access to modern contraception, medical advice or prenatal care, will have an unwanted or dangerous pregnancy, resulting in nearly 2 million more abortions or miscarriages. Funding restrictions only add to these numbers.

Unless we vote today to release the funds already appropriated, we will create even greater obstacles to common sense family planning. If this resolution is defeated there will be an increase in maternal death, there will be an increase in abortions, and there will be an increase in malnutrition.

The support of the United States for international family planning has helped families space out the birth of their children and has increased the odds that there will be enough food and other essentials to be shared among all family members. We've enabled women to bear children when they are physically strong and can breast-feed normally—increasing child survival by as much as 20 percent.

These funds have not sponsored or supported abortion. For 20 years, the U.S. Agency for International Development has prevented any money distributed by the Federal Government from being used to perform abortions or motivate anyone to have one. This is current law, and nothing in this resolution will change it.

Mr. Speaker, for three decades Republications and Democrats, pro-life and pro-choice,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 209, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 22]

YEAS—220

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

NAYS—209

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

NOT VOTING—4

Carson
Clay
Obey
Young (AK)

□ 1303

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 21

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

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