

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 gentleman 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 gentleman 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