

especially from OPEC. So the opportunity to look at some of the other oil-producing countries in the world is something we must pursue. But even more than that, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Research, we must look at renewable and alternative sources of energy including clean coal technology.

We must push for the kind of research necessary to increase efficiency and conservation in this country.

I think also it is time to review President Clinton's increase of 4.3 cents on the gas tax that he implanted in 1993 to be a temporary measure for deficit reduction. The balanced budget is accomplished; let us discontinue that tax increase even if we maintain the Highway Trust Fund.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, the pending business is the question of agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. NUSSLE. 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 348, nays 53, answered "present" 1, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 114]

YEAS—348

Abercrombie	Brown (SC)	Deal
Ackerman	Bryant	DeGette
Akin	Burton	Delahunt
Allen	Buyer	DeLauro
Andrews	Callahan	DeLay
Army	Calvert	DeMint
Baca	Camp	Deutsch
Bachus	Cannon	Diaz-Balart
Baker	Cantor	Dicks
Baldacci	Capito	Dingell
Baldwin	Capps	Doggett
Ballenger	Cardin	Dooley
Barcia	Carson (IN)	Doolittle
Barr	Carson (OK)	Doyle
Barrett	Castle	Dreier
Bartlett	Chabot	Duncan
Barton	Chambliss	Edwards
Bass	Clay	Ehlers
Becerra	Clayton	Ehrlich
Bentsen	Clyburn	Emerson
Berkley	Coble	Engel
Berman	Combest	Eshoo
Berry	Condit	Etheridge
Biggert	Conyers	Evans
Bilirakis	Cooksey	Everett
Bishop	Cox	Farr
Blagojevich	Cramer	Fattah
Blumenauer	Crenshaw	Ferguson
Boehler	Cubin	Flake
Boehner	Culberson	Fletcher
Bonilla	Cummings	Foley
Bono	Cunningham	Ford
Boswell	Davis (CA)	Frank
Boucher	Davis (FL)	Frelinghuysen
Brady (TX)	Davis (IL)	Frost
Brown (FL)	Davis, Jo Ann	Gallegly
Brown (OH)	Davis, Tom	Ganske

Gekas	Lofgren	Rogers (KY)	Udall (CO)	Visclosky	Weiner
Gibbons	Lucas (KY)	Rogers (MI)	Udall (NM)	Waters	Weller
Gilchrist	Lucas (OK)	Rohrabacher			
Gilman	Luther	Ross			
Gonzalez	Maloney (CT)	Rothman			
Goode	Maloney (NY)	Roybal-Allard			
Goodlatte	Manzullo	Royce			
Gordon	Markey	Rush			
Goss	Mascara	Ryan (WI)			
Graham	Matheson	Ryun (KS)			
Granger	Matsui	Sanchez			
Graves	McCarthy (MO)	Sandlin			
Green (TX)	McCarthy (NY)	Sawyer			
Green (WI)	McCollum	Saxton			
Greenwood	McCrery	Schakowsky			
Grucci	McGovern	Schiff			
Hall (TX)	McHugh	Schrock			
Hansen	McInnis	Scott			
Harman	McIntyre	Sensenbrenner			
Hart	McKeon	Serrano			
Hastings (WA)	McKinney	Sessions			
Hayes	McNulty	Shadegg			
Hayworth	Meehan	Shaw			
Herger	Meek (FL)	Shays			
Hill	Meeks (NY)	Sherman			
Hinojosa	Mica	Sherwood			
Hobson	Millender-	Shimkus			
Hoefel	McDonald	Shows			
Hoekstra	Miller (FL)	Simmons			
Holden	Miller, Gary	Simpson			
Holt	Mink	Skeen			
Honda	Mollohan	Skelton			
Hooley	Moran (KS)	Smith (MI)			
Horn	Moran (VA)	Smith (NJ)			
Hostettler	Morella	Smith (TX)			
Houghton	Murtha	Smith (WA)			
Hoyer	Myrick	Snyder			
Hulshof	Napolitano	Solis			
Hyde	Neal	Souder			
Inslee	Nethercutt	Spence			
Isakson	Ney	Spratt			
Israel	Northup	Stearns			
Issa	Norwood	Stenholm			
Istook	Nussle	Stump			
Jackson (IL)	Obey	Sununu			
Jackson-Lee	Oliver	Tanner			
(TX)	Ortiz	Tauscher			
Jenkins	Osborne	Tauzin			
John	Ose	Taylor (NC)			
Johnson (CT)	Otter	Terry			
Johnson (IL)	Owens	Thornberry			
Jones (NC)	Oxley	Thune			
Kanjorski	Pascrell	Thurman			
Kaptur	Pastor	Tiahrt			
Keller	Paul	Tiberi			
Kelly	Payne	Tierney			
Kerns	Pelosi	Toomey			
Kildee	Pence	Towns			
Kilpatrick	Peterson (PA)	Trafficant			
Kind (WI)	Petri	Turner			
King (NY)	Phelps	Upton			
Kingston	Pickering	Velazquez			
Kirk	Pitts	Vitter			
Kleczka	Platts	Walden			
Knollenberg	Pombo	Walsh			
Kolbe	Pomeroy	Wamp			
LaHood	Portman	Watkins			
Lampson	Price (NC)	Watt (NC)			
Langevin	Pryce (OH)	Waxman			
Lantos	Putnam	Weldon (FL)			
Largent	Quinn	Weldon (PA)			
Larson (CT)	Radanovich	Wexler			
Latham	Rahall	Whitfield			
LaTourette	Regula	Wilson			
Leach	Rehberg	Wolf			
Lee	Reyes	Woolsey			
Levin	Reynolds	Wu			
Lewis (CA)	Riley	Wynn			
Lewis (KY)	Rivers	Young (FL)			
Lipinski	Rodriguez				

NAYS—53

Aderholt	Hastings (FL)	Moore
Baird	Hefley	Oberstar
Bonior	Hillery	Pallone
Borski	Hilliard	Peterson (MN)
Brady (PA)	Jones (OH)	Ramstad
Capuano	Kennedy (MN)	Roemer
Costello	Kennedy (RI)	Sabo
Crane	Kucinich	Schaffer
Crowley	LaFalce	Slaughter
DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Stark
English	Lewis (GA)	Strickland
Finler	LoBiondo	Stupak
Gephardt	Lowe	Taylor (MS)
Gillmor	McDermott	Thompson (CA)
Gutierrez	Menendez	Thompson (MS)
Gutknecht	Miller, George	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1  
Tancredo

NOT VOTING—29  
Bereuter  
Blunt  
Boyd  
Burr  
Clement  
Collins  
Coyne  
Dunn  
Fossella  
Hall (OH)

Hinchey  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Jefferson  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Linder  
Moakley  
Nadler  
Rangel

Ros-Lehtinen  
Roukema  
Sanders  
Scarborough  
Sweeney  
Thomas  
Watts (OK)  
Wicker  
Young (AK)

□ 1035

So the Journal was approved. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:  
Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 114, Approval of the Journal, I missed the vote due to detainment departing the White House. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the first vote was rollcall vote 109. It was on H.R. 1696, calling for the World War II memorial to be expeditiously built on the Mall in Washington, D.C. I arrived late for the vote, as I was in a meeting. I was under the impression the first vote was approving the journal; thus I voted no. Had I realized the vote was calling for the World War II memorial being expeditiously built on the Mall, I would have voted yes. I ask the RECORD reflect how I wish to have voted on the World War II memorial on rollcall vote 109, H.R. 1696.

FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 2002 AND 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Pursuant to House Resolution 138 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1646.

□ 1036

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1646) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal years 2002 and 2003, and for other purposes, with Mr. LAHOOD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 107-62.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. HYDE

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment made in order by the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. HYDE:

Page 27, strike line 9 and all that follows through line 2 on page 30.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 138, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and a Member opposed, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

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

I rise in strong support of the Hyde-Barcia-Smith-Oberstar amendment. This amendment will greatly improve the bill by deleting a provision that would require the United States to subsidize abortionists and abortion lobbyists in foreign countries. That provision was adopted by a very close vote in committee; and it would overturn President Bush's benign and sensible policy, the Mexico City policy as it is called, that puts a wall of separation between U.S. family planning programs and the international abortion industry. Taxpayer dollars should not be used to export abortions.

Mr. Chairman, opponents of our amendment have had some harsh and misleading things to say about the Mexico City policy. First, they say, without any evidence, that it is an anti-family planning policy; yet the Mexico City policy does not cut by one penny the \$425 million the United States spends every year promoting family planning overseas. And the Mexico City policy strengthens family planning programs by ensuring that U.S. funds are directed to groups that provide genuine family planning, which is something entirely distinct from abortion.

The opponents of the Mexico City policy like to call it a gag rule. They say it violates the right of free speech, although a Federal appellate court has held it is fully consistent with the first amendment. Everybody has a right to free speech, but nobody has an absolute right to Federal tax dollars. The right to free speech does not include the right to have the taxpayers buy a word processor.

Organizations that work for the United States in foreign countries are our partners and our representatives in these countries. In a very real sense they are our ambassadors. Their advocacy in these countries on issues closely related to the U.S. programs they administer, as well as other activities such as the actual performance of abortions, is inevitably going to be associated with the United States. So must we use tax dollars to facilitate abortions overseas?

Specifically, among the most important stated purposes of U.S. family planning programs overseas is to reduce the number of abortions by providing contraception instead. The U.S. has no obligation to administer these programs through agents who fundamentally disagree with this goal. Would we hire casino lobbyists to run an anti-gambling campaign or a dis-

tillery to run an anti-alcohol campaign? It makes no sense to hire abortionists or abortion lobbyists to run programs that are aimed at reducing abortions.

Opponents of our Mexico City amendment also argue that U.S. family planning grantees should be allowed to perform and promote abortion so long as the abortion-related activities are carried out with their own money rather than U.S. grant money. This is nothing other than a bookkeeping trick. It ignores the fact that money is fungible. When money is given to an organization, it inevitably enriches and empowers all its activities.

U.S. support also enhances the domestic and the international prestige of the organization by giving it an official U.S. seal of approval. And remember, the people we are trying to reach, poor women and men who have a need for family planning, are not very likely to see the organization's books, so they do not know which activities are funded from which spigot. So when the very same organization offers U.S. family planning assistance with one hand and abortion with the other, the message is the United States and its partners are perfectly comfortable with abortion as a method of family planning.

The most outrageous claim made by proponents of the amendment, and this is a brand new one, as far as I can remember they have never claimed this in more than 20 years of debate about this Mexico City policy, is that it will interfere with efforts to address the HIV/AIDS epidemic. This claim is outrageously false. For one thing, the United States currently spends over 1/2 of a billion dollars per year on fighting AIDS, \$482.5 million in direct U.S. expenditures in fiscal year 2001, plus millions more in contributions to organizations such as the World Health Organization and UNDP, part of which funds anti-AIDS programs.

□ 1045

The President's Mexico City Policy has absolutely no application to this half-billion dollars. It only applies to population assistance which is a different set of accounts from HIV/AIDS programs.

The proponents of the Lee amendment argue that population assistance has an incidental effect of reducing exposure to the HIV virus because part of it pays for contraceptive devices which may prevent infection. This argument misses the whole point of the Mexico City policy. The same identical amount of money will be available for contraceptive devices with or without the Mexico City policy. The same number of contraceptives will be available for distribution. The only difference is whether we hire abortionists or non-abortionists to distribute them. There have always been plenty of organizations willing to administer U.S. programs, including hundreds around the world that are very good that are in the business of family planning, not abortion.

The claim that Members have to oppose the President's pro-life policy in order to support efforts to eradicate AIDS is total nonsense.

Mr. Chairman, I remind my colleagues, this amendment would make the bill abortion neutral. The amendment would not enact the Mexico City policy or any other policy on abortion. The only thing our amendment does is strike the pro-abortion language that was inserted in committee.

When this bill was originally introduced, it said nothing at all about abortion. It was a foreign relations authorization bill, pure and simple. Unfortunately, supporters of an international right to abortion decided to use this bill as a vehicle for their attack on the President's authority in this area.

So a vote for our amendment is a vote to restore the bill to its original abortion-neutral position. A "yes" vote will simply uphold the authority of the President to set reasonable terms and conditions on the distribution of U.S. foreign aid as the courts have held he has the power to do.

Get us out of the abortion business. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Hyde-Barcia-Smith-Oberstar amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment because I believe it strongly undermines our support for democracy, free speech, and human rights globally.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE), our lead speaker.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Hyde-Smith amendment which will overturn the pro-family planning language that the Committee on International Relations added by a bipartisan vote of 26-22, and I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking member, for his tremendous leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to begin first by asking Members to put themselves in the shoes of someone who will be affected if we reinstate the dangerous gag rule with the Hyde-Smith amendment. Imagine being a 20-year-old woman living on \$300 per year in Africa, and going to the only health clinic within hundreds of miles of your home to get family planning counseling, and being denied access to the truly life-saving information needed to decide when to have children or how to prevent HIV and AIDS.

Mr. Chairman, the use of condoms and information about sexually transmitted diseases is essential in preventing AIDS. Also, this is central to family planning counseling. We will be compromising the health and the lives of millions of women and children worldwide, and especially those in developing nations, who want and need to plan their families, if this Hyde-Smith amendment passes.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues what they oppose about the current language in the bill. Do they not support access to family planning which is proven to reduce the number of abortions? Do they not support access to HIV and AIDS prevention and education which could be eliminated at clinics under this amendment? Do they not support free speech and medical ethics and allowing health care providers in other nations to give complete information to their patients, as is the case in this country?

Mr. Chairman, I want to remind my colleagues that not one penny of United States funds can go to providing abortions overseas as per the 1973 Helms amendment. The law states, and I have the law right here, the law states, "None of the funds made available to carry out subchapter I of this chapter may be used to pay for the performance of abortions as a method of family planning or to motivate or coerce any person to practice abortions." This has been law since 1973.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on the dangerous Hyde-Smith amendment which will put the lives of millions of women and children at risk.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PRITTS).

Mr. PRITTS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express strong support for the Hyde-Barcia-Smith-Oberstar amendment. When President Bush took office, he reinstated the Mexico City policy. This policy does not reduce by one penny the \$425 million allocated for population control funding. Under President Clinton in fiscal year 2000, we enacted a compromise Mexico City policy, where groups received their funding and they were required to certify that they would not perform abortions, violate the laws of the host country, or lobby to change the country's laws. Groups who refused to abide by these pro-life protections could still receive funds. Well, the sky did not fall. Women were not hurt. Family planning continued. In fact, 448 out of 457 groups agreed to abide by this simple policy. Only 9 international abortion groups refused, a mere 2 percent.

Mr. Chairman, we all want to ensure that our funding benefits the poorest women, helping them with actual family planning decisions. This will happen under the Mexico City policy. We all agree that AIDS is a tragedy. However, some supporters of the Lee amendment have been claiming that Mexico City will harm international AIDS programs. It should be said in no way will the Mexico City policy negatively affect efforts to eradicate this terrible disease. We are spending over a half-billion dollars per year in anti-AIDS efforts around the world. Nor is there any indirect effect on HIV-AIDS through reduction in population assistance which might help prevent AIDS because we will spend the same amount on population assistance. Do not be misled. While we differ on abortion, I

urge that we support the Hyde amendment and stand with President Bush in protecting women overseas and taxpayers' consciences.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD).

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, let me strip this debate down to its essentials and talk about what it is really about.

Mr. Chairman, the great religions of the world differ on when and if and under what circumstances a woman should have or it is moral for a woman to terminate her pregnancy. The Catholic Church thinks one thing. My church, Presbyterians, think something else. Jews think something, Muslims think something, and within those religions there are differences of opinions.

Mr. Chairman, our country was based on religious tolerance and religious freedom. That is why most people came to this country initially. Let us talk about what this debate is about. This debate is about religious intolerance. This debate is about saying, because my religion tells me something about abortion, I as a Member of Congress have a right to impose my religious views on the women of America, regardless of their religion, and now the women of the world; and that I have the power of the purse to say to women overseas, regardless of what their religion tells them, we are going to deny their country and where they might go for their health care family planning funds because of our narrow religious views. That is unAmerican. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this motion.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Hyde-Smith amendment to reinstate Ronald Reagan's Mexico City policy prohibiting American taxpayer dollars to go to groups which violate foreign abortion laws.

Mr. Chairman, clearly, by claiming that organizations performing abortions and receiving funds for lobbying activities are not using Federal funds in support of abortion is to engage in a shell game. Currently 100 countries restrict abortion, and it should not be the policy of the United States to undermine the laws of those countries. Critics of the Mexico City policy argue that the pursuit of such policy results in the denial of first amendment rights to free speech. However, the first amendment does not give anyone a constitutional right to receive Federal money. This bill is not about religious tolerance. It is about the use of U.S. taxpayer dollars. If one thinks taxpayer dollars should go to fund organizations that are going to try to overturn pro-life laws in foreign countries, then they should oppose the amendment.

If my colleagues think this is an inappropriate use of taxpayer funds pro-

vided by our hard-working American families, then vote for the amendment and stand with President Bush.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. As a beacon of democracy and freedom for the entire world, the United States has a responsibility to do what is right and what is fair. The provision which the Hyde amendment seeks to strip from this bill embodies the principles on which our country was founded. The language this amendment seeks to strike says simply that we should not treat others the way we ourselves would not want to be treated; that we should not apply different, more onerous standards to overseas groups, damage which would be unconstitutional if we tried to apply them in our own country simply because we have the authority to do so.

Mr. Chairman, to be honest, I cannot understand why some of my colleagues take issue with this. Proponents of this amendment are armed with the statistics that most overseas groups have accepted the gag rule when it has been imposed in the past. They have continued to receive U.S. funds and have not had to shut off all of their programs. But this misses the point. The statistics do not show the agonizing decisions organizations have to make in order to comply with the policy. They do not show the effects of denying medical advice to poor women. They cannot prove that the gag rule makes abortion more rare. And this returns us to the question of imposing the global gag rules because it is right, because it accomplishes the goal of making abortion more rare, or simply because we can.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS).

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, once again we see the pro-abortion advocates attempting to override the reinstatement of the Mexico City policy by attempting to paint this policy as anti-family. Yet their objections to this policy have nothing to do with families. This current attempt to repeal President Bush's executive order banning U.S. Government aid for U.S. and foreign contraception groups that perform abortions overseas is another disturbing sign of the pro-abortion movement's contempt for the vast majority of Americans who oppose the spending of their tax dollars on abortions.

The President's executive order protects the desires of millions of Americans who ethically and morally oppose Federal funding of abortion. The current misconception being spread that the Mexico City policy hurts family planning efforts overseas is simply not true. By withholding funds from groups that violate the Mexico City policy, the U.S. does not reduce the amount of foreign family assistance. In fact, the

Mexico City policy increases family planning.

From 1984 to 1993, when the Mexico City policy was in effect, U.S. family planning spending increased dramatically. This year, funding for U.S. international family planning is budgeted at \$425 million, and reimplementing of the Mexico City policy will not reduce this.

The only change that will take place under the Mexico City policy is that funding will be provided through representatives who are not in the abortion business.

Mr. Chairman, abortion is not needed for family planning, and we must respect the views of millions of Americans who do not want their tax dollars spent overseas to promote abortion. The Mexico City policy continues family planning funding while respecting the views of millions who cherish life and oppose abortion.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), my distinguished Republican colleague.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly rise today to urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. Recent research shows that voluntary family planning reduces abortion. Two separate studies, one by the RAND Corporation in Bangladesh and one by Princeton demographers in Kazakhstan, show the same conclusion: Abortion rates fall when contraception is prevalent.

Mr. Chairman, across the former Soviet Union, abortion was the principal method of birth control under Communism. Princeton University studied Kazakhstan through the 1990s, looking at the effect of increased access to voluntary family planning. The results are clear. Contraceptive prevalence increased by 50 percent since the beginning of the 1990s, while abortion decreased by the same amount.

"The proposition that the occurrence of abortions can be reduced by increases in the use of contraception has been demonstrated again in the analysis of data from the 1999 Kazakhstan Demographic and Health Survey," said Charlie Westoff, Princeton University's demographer.

□ 1100

This amendment will not reduce abortion but the real way to reduce abortion is to increase voluntary family planning.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN).

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, today as we consider a bill to authorize funding for foreign relations, I find it puzzling that some of my colleagues would wish to include language to repeal President Bush's Mexico City policy. The issue of abortion as a method of family planning is one of the most divisive and controversial that we face as a Nation. Why should we be thrust into that debate in other countries?

President Bush was right to remove the United States from promoting

abortions in developing nations. After all, abortion is legal only in a fraction of these countries. Those who want American taxpayers to fund abortions overseas should consider the destructive impression that it gives others about the United States. As a Nation, the image we promote to the rest of the world should be one of life, health, and hope.

The Mexico City policy allows the U.S. to support overseas family planning programs without tying those dollars to abortion. I urge my colleagues to support President Bush's Mexico City policy.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition. First and foremost this is not about abortion. It is about women dying to the tune of 600,000 a year. That is equal to one or two jumbo jets crashing each day. And it is about saving women's lives. Since 1973, no U.S. Federal funds have been or are used for abortions around the world. During the time that we are debating this amendment, 65 women will die from pregnancy-related complications.

The global gag rule restricts foreign NGOs from using their own funds. In America, this language would be unconstitutional. It is unconscionable that we would impose it on the world's poorest women. The global gag rule is enough to make you gag. The rule puts the U.S. in the position of deciding what speech is acceptable and what speech is unacceptable.

Current Mexico City policy is not abortion neutral. Organizations receiving U.S. funds can use their own money to lobby against abortion but cannot use their own money to lobby to make abortion legal. Vote no on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as a supporter of family planning, I rise in strong opposition to the Hyde-Smith amendment which reinstates the anti-woman antidemocratic Global Gag Rule.

First and foremost, this is not about abortion. It's about women dying, to the tune of 600,000 a year. That is equal to one or two jumbo jets crashing every single day. And, it's about saving women's lives.

Since 1973, no U.S. Federal funds have been or are used around the world for abortions. During the time we are debating the gag rule, 65 women will die from pregnancy related complications because they don't have access to the most basic health care.

The Global Gag Rule restricts foreign NGO's from using their own funds. In America, this language is unconstitutional. It's unconscionable that we would impose it on the world's poorest women. The gag rule is enough to make you gag. It cripples foreign NGO's ability to practice democracy in their own countries.

We can't afford to stifle the international debate on family planning by tying the hands of NGO's with an antiwoman gag rule.

The gag rule forces NGO's to choose between their democratic rights to organize and

determine what is best in their own countries and desperately needed resources of U.S. family planning dollars.

We know that family planning reduces the need for abortions. We know that it saves lives. The gag rule reduces the effectiveness of family planning organizations and should be eliminated.

I urge my colleagues to support the Lee language and oppose the Hyde-Smith amendment.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and I commend their efforts in this important matter.

Mr. Chairman, much has been said this day about the effects of the Mexico City policy. Our opponents claim that this is a gag on the first amendment and that it is an attack on family planning.

Mr. Chairman, these claims are false and are simply an effort to change focus away from the real issue here which is federally funded abortions and abortion lobbying around the world.

Regardless of one's personal stance on the sanctity of life, this body should be able to agree that the millions of pro-life taxpayers that have a moral objection to the practice of abortion should not be forced to pay for abortions or abortion advocacy internationally. America has always and should ever stand for life and liberty across the globe.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to choose life today and to vote for the Hyde-Barcia-Smith amendment and end forced taxpayer funding of abortion and abortion advocacy internationally.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Hyde-Smith amendment. What we are talking about today is not abortion. No U.S. tax dollars are used for abortions. Zero. Zilch. That has been the fact since 1973 and it is the same today. The Lee amendment does not change that one single bit.

Mr. Chairman, we have all read stories in the newspaper and seen on television reports on the ravages of HIV/AIDS throughout the world. It is easy to forget those stories and the plight of millions of people around the world who are so far removed from today's debate. Last year I visited one of those far-off places, Malawi, in sub-Saharan Africa. I saw how in one location in a small village family planning is provided in the same place as immunizations for kids and HIV and TB testing for adults.

With up to 35 percent of the population in some countries in sub-Saharan Africa infected with HIV/AIDS and

with India and the South Asia region on the horizon as the next HIV time bomb, the U.S. must be more actively involved in funding programs.

A one-size-fits-all solution is not what we need. What we need to do is work with the local NGOs and health care organizations to provide the highest quality of service, education, and care that we can possibly provide.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I think the fundamental issue with the Mexico City policy is whether or not we will use our American tax dollars to promote the abortion industry overseas.

We are known for our exports, beautiful cars, commercial jets, music, and movies. The Lee amendment will add abortion to our list of exports and does so at taxpayer expense. I believe this is the wrong message to send the world. Instead, let us promote life, the arts, new technology, not the industry of death. And above all, not with taxpayer dollars.

I encourage my fellow Members of Congress to support the Hyde amendment and raise the standard of exports from America.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am honored to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the Democratic leader.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge my colleagues to vote against the Hyde amendment and for international family planning assistance that we know makes a difference in the lives of women and children across the globe.

Our international family planning assistance should not be encumbered. It should be enhanced. Overpopulation leads to the suffering of women and children, poverty and environmental degradation. Family planning is critical for the survival of the planet and the people on it, and it plays a critical part in preventing the spread of diseases like HIV/AIDS, which I believe is the moral issue of our time.

In one of his first official actions, President Bush decided to restore the so-called Mexico City policy and reinstate controversial restrictions on U.S. family planning assistance. The President said he wanted to make sure U.S. taxpayer dollars were not being spent on abortions abroad. Respectfully, I believe this is a misunderstanding of our law. Since 1973, U.S. policy has prohibited taxpayer funds from being used in any way, shape, or form to provide abortions. But under the Mexico City policy, nongovernmental organizations, with their own funds, cannot inform women about their options, nor can they advocate their own government's laws regarding reproduction. I believe these Presidential restrictions are harmful and will reduce the availability of family planning services to

some of the world's poorest and most needy women.

There is talk about compassion. In my view, this is not compassionate. In fact, these restrictions placed on overseas family planning organizations would be illegal in our own country. We are imposing restrictions on free speech, putting on a gag order that would not be allowed in the United States of America. We are asking nongovernmental organizations in other places, in other countries, to live under a restriction that we would not impose here in the United States.

So the issue is simple. Do we empower women and families across the globe with the ability to plan for the number of children they will have, as is the case here in America? Or do we pull the rug out from under these important efforts? For me, the choice is clear. We must continue to work to empower women with the ability to make their choice necessary to plan the size of their own family.

I was in Cambodia recently and we visited a family planning clinic. There were no abortions going on. There was no effort at abortion. They were simply giving women needed advice and education and help with what they desperately wanted, which was family planning. I could not see that without coming to the floor here today to try to change this policy. I think it is the right thing to do morally. I think it is the right thing to do for our leadership role in the world. I ask Members to examine their conscience and to examine the facts. If they will do that, I believe a majority here today will vote to overrule the President's ill-advised order on international family planning.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the distinguished chairman of the full committee for yielding me this time and for his courage in offering this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the sole purpose of the seemingly benign title of this language that we are seeking to strike, the Global Democracy Promotion Act of 2001, is to provide Federal funds to organizations that perform and/or promote abortions overseas as part of this legislation, as part of our population account.

The Lee language has nothing whatsoever to do with building democracy and the rule of law. It has nothing whatsoever to do with the protection of human rights, all causes to which I have devoted and many others have devoted their entire lives to. The Lee language is not about protecting people. Indeed, the absolute contrary is true.

I am sure many others like myself find it highly offensive when a legislative proposal that seeks to abolish the most fundamental, the most elemental of all human rights on the face of the Earth, the right to life, is euphemistically cloaked as a democ-

racy builder, which it is not. The Lee language is designed to repeal the pro-life, pro-child Mexico City policy which as Members know was recently reinstated by President Bush to ensure that we do not fund the killing of unborn babies, either directly or indirectly.

Mr. Chairman, it is high time we came to the recognition that abortion is violence against children. Abortion methods are cruel. Abortion procedures, referred to in the language as medical services, rip and dismember the innocent child or they chemically poison the baby with some toxic substance. Today, Mr. Chairman, the pro-life laws and policies of about 100 countries around the world are under continuous siege. Regrettably, the forces, the engine behind the pro-abortion push are nongovernmental organizations, pro-abortion groups that we fund and we are the primary provider of subsidies to those groups.

The Bush executive order, like the original Reagan-Bush executive order, permits funding only to those organizations that provide family planning. Abortion is not family planning, and by funding only family planning, innocent children are not put at risk. As one of my previous colleagues pointed out so well, an overwhelming number of organizations, including some Planned Parenthood affiliates, accepted the Mexico City policy. For several years, there was a wall of separation between abortion and family planning. And the Bush policy ensures that as well. Who we subsidize, not just what, but who we give millions upon millions of dollars to has profound consequences.

The simple fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that as far back as 1984, we recognized that the longstanding law that said no funds could be used directly to pay for abortion was very infirm, it was incomplete and it was not working.

□ 1115

Money is fungible. The millions of dollars we gave to a family planning group to perform abortions immediately freed up millions more that were used for the performance and promotion of abortion.

It should matter to us, not just what an organization does with our specific subsidy, but what else they do. It is a package deal. Many groups, regrettably, use family planning as a Trojan horse to conceal their real agenda, which is abortion on demand.

Mr. Chairman, I know that Members of Congress are getting blitzed by Planned Parenthood and other abortionists who oppose the Hyde-Barcia-Oberstar-Smith amendment. I appeal to you to resist. I ask you to stand with the victims, both mother and child, and against the victimizers. When we subsidize and lavish Federal funds on abortion organizations, we empower the child abusers; and Planned Parenthood, make no mistake

about it, both here and overseas, is "Child Abuse, Incorporated."

Here in the United States, for example, and I would say parenthetically, this is not a domestic amendment, but the example gives you an insight as to what is happening overseas. Planned Parenthood has been given \$2 billion and performed 2.6 million abortions since 1977. That is 2.6 million girls and boys who will never know the joys and challenges of living or the thrill of learning or marrying or playing soccer or raising their own families some day. That is 2.6 million individual dreams and talents and creativity the world will never see.

The loss of children's lives directly attributable to Planned Parenthood is staggering; 2.6 million dead babies and counting. And if that is not enough, Planned Parenthood both lobbies and litigates against virtually every child protection initiative, including parental notification, women's right to know laws, abortion funding bans, partial-birth abortion, and, again, most recently, the Unborn Victims of Violence Act.

Sadly, they do exactly the same thing overseas; and these non-governmental organizations will be affected by this legislation we pass today. Members should be aware that the International Planned Parenthood Federation, which is based in London, is leaving no stone unturned in its misguided, obsessive campaign to legalize abortion on demand. If they succeed, millions of babies will die from the violence of abortion. I urge Members, please, let us not add to the body count.

Mr. Chairman, Planned Parenthood's Vision 2000 strategic plan makes it very clear that they want family planning organizations to bring pressures on governments to campaign for abortion on demand. They do not cloak it; they do not disguise it. They wanted to undermine Central and South American countries that protect their babies, as well as Ireland and many other countries.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a strong vote in favor of the Hyde amendment, in favor of family planning and against abortion promotion.

Mr. Chairman, Title I Subtitle C of the pending Foreign relations Act, inserted by amendment over the Prime Sponsor's objection during committee markup, is breathtakingly misleading.

Subtitle C hides its sole purpose—providing federal funds to organizations that perform and/or promote abortion overseas, under the seemingly benign title of "Global Democracy Promotion Act of 2001."

Don't be fooled, I say to my colleagues.

Subtitle C has nothing whatsoever to do with building democracy and the rule of law. It has nothing whatsoever to do with protection of human rights—all causes to which I have devoted my entire life.

The Lee language is not about protecting people. The absolute contrary is true.

As Chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, former Chairman of the International Operations and Human

Rights Subcommittee, and today as Vice Chairman of the International Relations Committee—I not only have traveled on numerous human rights trips and chaired over 160 hearings on human rights and democracy building in the People's Republic of China, Russia, Vietnam, France, Sudan, Rwanda, Indonesia, Cuba, Peru, Turkey, the Middle East, Northern Ireland, and the Ukraine (to name a few)—I am also the prime sponsor of:

Public Law 106-386—the "Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000,"

Public Law 105-320—the "Torture Victims Relief Act of 1998,"

Public Law 106-87—the "Torture Victims Relief Authorization Act of 1999,"

Public Law 104-319—the "Human Rights, Refugee, and Other Foreign Relations Provisions Act of 1996," as well as

Public Law 106-113, Division B—the "Admiral James W. Nance and Meg Donovan Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 2000 and 2001," which is filled, like the other bills I have listed, with human rights and democracy provisions.

In addition to authoring human rights legislation, I have offered scores of amendments to boost the Child Survival Fund, Refugee Protection, and Freedom Broadcasting, like Radio Free Asia.

I and, I'm sure, many others find it highly offensive when a legislative proposal that seeks to abolish the most fundamental human right on the face of the earth—the right to life—is euphemistically cloaked as a democracy builder.

It is not.

Amazingly, no specific mention is made of abortion in either the findings or operative clause of the amendment. Why the unwillingness to be candid and transparent?

Abortion is referred to as "a particular issue" or "medical service."

But I guess one would have to be blind to not understand the precise nature of this section. It is designed to repeal the pro-life, pro-child Mexico City Policy—recently reinstated by President Bush to ensure that we do not fund the killing of unborn babies, either directly or indirectly.

Mr. Chairman, abortion is violence against children.

Abortion methods are cruel. Abortion procedures—referred to this section as "medical services"—rip and dismember the innocent child, or chemically poison the baby with some toxic substance.

This—and only this—is the "particular issue" referred to in the section we seek to strike.

Today, Mr. Chairman, the pro-life laws and policies of approximately one hundred countries that restrict abortion are under continuous siege and the forces behind the pro-abortion push are non governmental organizations funded by the US Government.

The Bush executive order—like the original Reagan-Bush executive order—permits the funding of only those organizations that provide family planning—and abortion isn't family planning. Innocent children, therefore, are not put at risk.

Who we subsidize—not just what—but who, we give millions of dollars to has profound consequences.

The simple fact of the matter is that as far back as 1984, the longstanding law stipulating that no U.S. funds can directly be used for

abortion was found to be infirm and incomplete. Money is fungible. The millions of dollars we give to a group immediately frees up other non-U.S. funds that can be used—and have been used—for performing and aggressively promoting abortion. It should matter greatly to each of us not just what an organization does with our specific subsidy, but the rest of its agenda as well. It is a package deal. Many groups use family planning as the Trojan horse to conceal their real agenda—abortion on demand.

I know Members of Congress have been getting blitzed by Planned Parenthood and other abortionists to oppose the Hyde-Barcia-Smith-Oberstar Amendment.

I appeal to you to resist.

I ask you to stand with the victims—both mother and child—and against the victimizers.

When we subsidize and lavish federal funds on abortion organizations, we empower the child abusers.

And Planned Parenthood, make no mistake about it, both here and overseas is Child Abuse Incorporated!

Here in the United States for example, and of course it's not affected by this amendment, Planned Parenthood has been paid \$1.997 billion in taxpayer dollars and has performed 2,608,362 abortions since 1977.

That's 2.6 million girls and boys who will never know the joys and challenges of living, or the thrill of learning, or marrying, or playing soccer, or raising their own family someday.

That's 2.6 million individual dreams, talents and creativity the world will never see.

The loss of children's lives directly attributed to Planned Parenthood is staggering—2.6 million dead babies and counting.

And if that wasn't enough, Planned Parenthood both lobbies and litigates against virtually every child protection initiative including parental notification, women's right to know laws, abortion funding bans, partial birth abortion bans and the Unborn Victim of Violence Act. Sadly—they do the same overseas, and those non governmental organizations would be affected by what we do today.

Members should be aware that the International Planned Parenthood Federation is leaving no stone unturned in its misguided, obsessive campaign to legalize abortion on demand around the world. If they succeed, millions of babies will die from the violence of abortion on demand. Please, let's not add to the body count.

Planned Parenthood's Vision 2000 strategic plan says that family planning organizations should "bring pressure on governments and campaign for policy and legislative change to remove restrictions against abortion." Can anything be more clear? "Pressure" governments to nullify their pro-life policies. "Campaign" for abortion on demand. And Subtitle C of this bill would compel us to provide millions of dollars to these abortionists.

A headline in the Philippine Daily Inquirer a few years ago succinctly underscores our concern, "Flavier Hits U.S. Pressure on Abortion." The article quotes Senator Juan Flavier:

We had just celebrated our 50th anniversary of independence from America, but we can still see insidious methods of imperialism trying to subvert our self-determination by using [population control] funds as subtle leverage . . . I strongly opposed abortion. It is prohibited by our laws and the Philippine Constitution. Hence, we should be prepared to lose foreign funding rather than

be pressured into causing the death of unborn children.

The abortion promotion by Planned Parenthood is so extreme in the Philippines, for example, that the President of IPPF's affiliate—the Family Planning Organization of the Philippines (FPOP)—resigned over what he called International Planned Parenthood Federation's "hidden agenda" and misuse of his family planning affiliate to legalize abortion.

The use of family planning to cloak its real agenda—the use of family planning as a cover for permissive abortion laws—is now commonplace, and must be stopped. The Bush executive order will help.

Let me remind Members that the pro-life safeguards included in the Bush executive order are nothing new; they were in effect for almost a decade. And they worked!

The pro-life safeguards—the Mexico City Policy—were in effect during the Reagan and Bush years as a principled way to fund family planning without promoting abortion.

We should have no part in empowering the abortion industry to succeed in performing or promoting violence against children.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 1 minute to my friend and neighbor, the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time and congratulate him and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for their leadership on the committee in putting forth this global democracy act. I also want to commend the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) for writing those words in an independent bill.

Mr. Chairman, I want to address some of the concerns raised by our colleagues. This language that is in this bill is good because it goes a long way to address the concerns, in fact, the entire way to address the concerns Members have about international family planning.

This is the first time Members will have to vote on this particular language. This is not tied to anything they have ever voted for before. It is simply saying we treat non-governmental organizations in other countries the way we treat our own people over there.

The gentleman used the argument of fungibility. The President of the United States, when issuing this executive order, used the argument of fungibility. Yet no one says anything when the faith-based initiatives say that organizations can use their own money for religion, while using our money for social services.

Let us be consistent. Let us let these organizations use their own money, just as we do in the U.S., for reproductive freedom, for pregnancy counseling, issues like that, using our money for international family planning.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I am advised that there are more Members that want to speak on this, and, at the same time, I am reluctant to open the floodgates, so I ask unanimous consent for an additional 5 minutes on each side.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I would like to ask my friend, would he be willing to agree to an additional 10 minutes on each side?

Mr. HYDE. Yes.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to an additional 10 minutes of debate on this amendment on each side?

There was no objection.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hyde amendment. I would encourage all of my colleagues who support the right-to-life and who also are opposed to Federal funding for abortion to support the Hyde amendment, to support the Hyde language.

As most people know, I practiced medicine for many years before I came to the U.S. Congress. Though I never performed abortions, I did have the opportunity to witness abortions being performed in my medical training. While I know some people who defend the right to abortion do so more or less seeing it as the better of two evils, protecting the right of the woman for reproductive autonomy versus the right to life, there is no question if you ever actually go into the operating suite and actually see an abortion being performed, really in any of the techniques that are used, that it is extreme violence against an unborn baby. It is brutal, it is most certainly very painful.

The anatomical data, the embryology, what we know about the fetus in the womb based upon our understanding of what we see using ultrasound, ultrasonic techniques, I just spoke to a radiologist recently in my district who described to me how you can clearly see when you do amniocentesis and some of these other procedures in the womb, you can see these babies reacting.

This is clearly, I think for me personally, a no-brainer. Keeping in mind that there are millions of Americans who are pro-life, should we be using taxpayer dollars to go to these international family planning organizations who perform abortions? Now, they will tell us, and we are going to hear it on the floor today, oh, they use the American money, the Federal money, for fax machines and IUDs and other contraceptive purposes, and use this other money. As we all know, money is fungible, you can move it around.

I think this is a very, very good amendment. It is a very, very well thought out amendment; and I would highly encourage all of my colleagues, this is very, very consistent with our long-established policy in not funding abortions. We should not be funding abortions overseas.

Furthermore, these organizations use their money to lobby foreign countries to repeal their pro-life laws. Should American taxpayer dollars be used for something like that? I say no.

Support the Hyde language. Support the President of the United States.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, by lifting the global gag rule, this bill does not send U.S. funds overseas to pay for abortions. The 1973 Helms amendment prohibits Federal funding of abortions as a method of family planning.

This amendment remedies a hypocritical double standard imposed by the global gag rule which would be unconstitutional if it were applied to family planning organizations in the United States.

Although it is constitutionally permissible for the U.S. government to restrict how a U.S.-based organization spends Federal funds, the Constitution does not permit the government to impinge upon an organization's rights to free speech and association by restricting how it spends funds received from other non-Federal sources.

Under the global gag rule, foreign organizations that receive U.S. family planning funds cannot use their own non-U.S. funds to provide medical counseling, which includes information about abortion or abortions or to lobby their own governments on the subject. These restrictions, if applied to U.S. organizations, would quickly be struck down as violating the right to free speech and association.

The United States should respect the rights of citizens of other countries to freedom of speech. It is arrogance for us to attempt to limit the rights of free speech abroad in a way we would never do at home. I urge the defeat of this amendment.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to my friend the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Hyde-Smith amendment. As a member of the Russia Duma Study Group, I have seen firsthand how important these funds are to women around the world. I have met with family planning providers from around the world; and they consider this aid to be the most important assistance that they receive from the United States, especially the providers in the former Soviet Union and African nations.

This is not about promoting abortion. It is about helping women and their families. When I was coming up in the 1960s, there used to be a program with Sergeant Joe Friday, and he would say, "Just the facts." The facts are we do not spend a dime of U.S. taxpayer money for abortions and have not since 1973.

This is not about protecting the taxpayers' dollars. This is about the fact that each year more than 600,000

women die of pregnancy-related deaths that are preventable. This is about the fact that more than 150 million married women in developing countries want assistance.

Vote against this ill-fated amendment.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN).

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, for more than 30 years, the United States has led an international effort to reduce the toll of maternal deaths, unwanted pregnancies, and abortion in developing countries by providing money and technical assistance for family planning programs. The Hyde-Smith amendment would severely limit our efforts to reduce abortions worldwide because it would reinstate the global gag rule, a policy that prohibits foreign, non-governmental organizations that receive U.S. Federal funds from promoting and providing comprehensive family planning services.

By reducing funding to reproductive health care providers in underserved areas, this amendment will decrease women's ability to access pregnancy-related care, family planning and services for HIV/AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases. Our efforts to reduce the number of abortions worldwide through greater access to family planning services will be hindered.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against the Hyde-Smith amendment.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, the findings of the amendment of the gentlewoman from California read as following: "It is the fundamental principle of American medical ethics and practice that health care providers should at all times deal honestly and openly with patients. Any attempt to subvert the private and sensitive physician-patient relationship should be intolerable in the United States and is an unjustified intrusion into the practices of health care providers when attempted in other countries."

No one will argue with that, and yet the Hyde amendment strikes this from this bill.

What happens here then is that women in poor countries die. Six hundred thousand women a year die. Abortion is not stopped. Women are simply not able to plan their families, and women die.

Do we want the people to understand that the United States only cares about the doctor-patient relationship and about giving decent health care only in our own borders?

Stop letting women in other countries die because we refuse to give

them the information that they need. It is not about abortion.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the former distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

□ 1130

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

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the distinguished chairman of our Committee on International Relations, my dear friend.

The Mexico City global gag rule is unnecessary and it is unproductive. We should not impose any conditions on funding for family planning programs that restrict credible organizations from helping us achieve our family planning goals, because those organizations, with their own funds, engage in activities that we may disagree with, such as lobbying for the lifting of restrictions on abortions overseas. Please bear in mind, I say to my colleagues, that under the current U.S. law, no U.S. funds are allowed to support abortion or abortion-related activities abroad.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress, not the President, should be deciding issues of this nature. It is inappropriate for the President, for whom I have the highest regard, to be issuing executive orders to provide for policies such as the so-called global gag rule, the Mexico City policy. And any Member, or any administration, wishing to provide for that policy should bear the burden of moving that legislation through the Congress.

If our colleagues support the bill as reported from our committee, we will be promoting a sound policy and will be defending the prerogatives of the legislative branch.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to join in opposing this amendment.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Hyde amendment. I do not think it is the strongest amendment that we could have, because ultimately, this debate will not end until we stop the Federal funding or taxpayer funding of population control overseas. But nevertheless, a vote for this amendment is a strong statement in opposition to tax-supported abortion.

I would like to address the subject of the gag rule. As many of my colleagues know, if there is any violation whatsoever of any civil liberties or the Con-

stitution, no matter how well intended a piece of legislation is, I will vote against it. On occasion even though I'm strong pro-life, I have occasionally voted against pro-life legislation for that reason.

But let me tell my colleagues, this gag rule argument is a red herring if I have ever seen one. This has nothing to do with the first amendment. This would be like arguing that if we had a prohibition in this bill against passing out guns to civilians in some foreign nation, we would say, we cannot have a prohibition on that because of the second amendment, defending the right to own guns. It would be nonsense. So this has nothing to do with the first amendment; but it does have something to do with the rights of U.S. citizens, Mr. Chairman, in forcibly taking funds through taxes from people who believe strongly against abortion their rights are violated.

Someone mentioned earlier that this was a violation of the religious beliefs of people overseas. What about the religious beliefs of the people in this country who are at the point of a gun forced to pay for these abortions? That is where the real violation is. It is not an infraction on the first amendment.

As a matter of fact, I think this is a bad choice and bad tactics for those who support abortion, because this is like rubbing our nose into it when the people who feel so strongly against abortion are forced to pay for abortion, to pay for the propaganda and to pay for the lobbying to promote abortion. Ultimately, the solution will only come when we defund overseas population control.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, the family planning programs our country supports provide critical reproductive health care for millions of women around the globe. Family planning assistance prevents unwanted pregnancies and yes, helps to prevent abortions. These family planning programs are the only health care these women and their families have.

The President's executive order dictates to these groups that they must forfeit their right to determine what they do with their own private funds: you must not talk about certain things, you must not perform certain health care services, you must report to us what you do with your own money.

If we were to impose these mandates on domestic groups, they would be struck down as unconstitutional. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), my colleague, acknowledged that in 1997 on this floor. He also said at that time that he would like to impose this gag rule on these domestic organizations.

The United States Government does not fund abortions here or abroad. We have not done that for decades. We



have now begun to restrict what groups can do with their own money. Who suffers when we penalize the funding for these groups? Women and children, some of the most impoverished women and children in the world.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject the Hyde amendment, save women's lives, and promote democratic values.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

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

It has been said, but I will say it again: the issue we are debating today is not abortion, it is family planning. Equally important, everyone who will be voting on this amendment today needs to know that the ban on international family planning assistance is more restrictive than any this House has voted on before. If this amendment passes, the global gag rule will go back into effect. This policy disqualifies overseas groups from U.S. planning assistance if they use their own funds simply to counsel pregnant women on all their pregnancy options, including birth control.

The distinguished gentleman from Illinois said, well, birth control will still be there. These workers just will not be able to tell the women about it. Well, that is really helpful, if the birth control is sitting there in the drawer and no one can tell them about it.

The truth is, we all do share one goal today. The goal we share is reducing abortion overseas. There is one way to reduce abortion overseas, and that is family planning. Vote "no" on the Hyde amendment, and let us keep family planning available to women around the globe.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), my dear Republican friend.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I join so many of my colleagues in opposing this Hyde amendment, which would impose a gag rule on critical international family planning funds.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know what we are hearing, because the taxpayers' dollars have never been used or have not been used for paying for abortions, and people are talking about abortions. This is not about promoting abortions at all. The taxpayer money has never been used to perform or promote it. It has been mentioned that the law that explicitly forbids such activities began as an amendment by Senator HELMS to the Foreign Operations bill in 1973, which is renewed annually. Therefore, there should be no anti-abortion concerns within international family planning.

International family planning helps women, it helps families, it helps our national security. Access to international family planning services is one of the most effective means of re-

ducing abortions, because it provides safe and effective contraceptive options allowing women to plan and space their children; and it promotes the health of both mother and child.

Mr. Chairman, we need this access, so I hope people will vote against this Hyde amendment.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, just to respond very briefly. First of all, this is all about foreign aid grant money and whether or not we will have modest conditions that protect children.

Mr. Chairman, it was mentioned a moment ago that we have never voted on this issue before. That is patently untrue. I offered the amendment supporting the Reagan-Bush Mexico City policy year in and year out going back to 1985. This body has voted repeatedly, close to 15 years of voting on this very policy, identical to what we have under consideration today. So hopefully, that argument, that false statement will not be made again.

Let me remind my colleagues, the Hyde, Barcia, Smith, Obestar Amendment does not reduce family planning by one penny; we condition it; we put in safeguards. Who we give our tax dollars to does matter. Pro-abortion organizations perform and promote abortions. Let us give our tax dollars to those that will divest themselves of abortion, and simply stick to family planning.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL).

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Hyde-Smith amendment. The distinguished chairman started this debate by saying there is a difference between the issues of abortion and family planning, and he is correct. The underlying issue in the Hyde-Smith amendment is not the question of stopping abortion, although they would like us to believe that. The underlying issue is how do we best deliver family planning services to women around the world. We do that by abolishing the gag rule, by voting against this amendment.

This amendment would prevent women around the world from getting fundamental family planning information, the most basic information that would go directly to the issue of them controlling their reproductive freedom and not needing to turn to abortions. It is contrary to what my Republican colleagues say they stand for to cut off funding for international family planning, and we would cut it off to the poorest women in the world, not women in our districts, but women around the world that need this information.

Vote "no" on the amendment.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), my good Republican friend.

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

In 1960 there were 3 billion people that lived on this Earth. Today, there are 6 billion people who live on this Earth; and in 40 years, without worldwide family planning services, it will rise to nearly 9 billion. Without worldwide family planning, abortions will be more prevalent.

We need to defeat the Hyde-Smith amendment. There is no funding in this bill for abortions. U.S. law already prohibits family planning funds from being used for abortions, and nothing in this bill permits organizations to break the laws of their host countries or those of the United States.

We need to defeat the Hyde amendment.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS). Although she has been with us only a few months, she has already made a significant contribution to the work of this House.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to oppose the global gag rule. It has been stated before, but it bears repeating: the global gag rule imposes restrictions on foreign organizations that would be illegal and unacceptable in our own country.

In this country, we value our freedom of speech, and we value the sanctity of our doctor-patient relationships. The global gag rule prevents foreign, non-governmental organizations from participating in public policy debates regarding the right to choose. Can any of us imagine if Congress passed a law that silenced the Christian Coalition or Planned Parenthood? The American public would not stand for such a blatant violation of the freedom of speech. Like American groups, foreign organizations should have the right to advocate for their cause.

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, however, the most egregious impact of the global gag rule is that it violates the sanctity of the doctor-patient relationship. We should not be making decisions about personal, private health care decisions. It is absolutely critical that women are able to discuss their health care concerns with their doctors. So in turn, doctors need to be able to answer all of their questions and discuss every available health care option. If Congress votes to limit what doctors can say to their patients, we will jeopardize the health of women around the world.

The time has come to stand up for democracy and patients' rights. I urge all of my colleagues to vote to repeal the global gag rule today.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER).

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Chairman, this debate is a matter of subsidy versus choice. The amendment makes our foreign policy consistent with our domestic practices. While many Americans regard themselves as advocates of abortion choice, they clearly oppose subsidies for abortions, whether directly

or indirectly, through a fungible subsidy, which is the focus of this amendment.

Our proposal funds family planning, but distinguishes family planning from lethal abortion. America's standard is clearly stated in our Declaration and in our Constitution, a standard which promotes life and regards the right to it as unalienable.

The most pernicious aspect of the efforts by our opponents to promote overseas abortions is that these promotions are targeted to the world's poor, those whose children are already the most vulnerable on the planet. The amendment promotes free will, while avoiding ill will. It draws a clear line at human life and places our country on the side of sanity, decency, and human dignity.

□ 1145

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to my friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, the global gag rule is anti-family and it is pro-abortion.

President Bush said the policy was necessary "to make abortion more rare." There is absolutely no evidence that it did that the last time it was in effect. Rather, there is statistical evidence that family planning reduces the number of abortions all over the world.

This gag rule would deny money to places like Turkey, where the Ministry of Health initiated a pilot program linking family planning services and abortion. The results have been dramatic. After a program to promote the use of birth control, the number of abortions performed at that hospital dropped 42 percent from 1992 to 1998.

This policy would be unconstitutional if applied in our own country. How could we even imagine voting in favor of a policy that hinders and gags democracy around the globe?

The global gag rule undermines women's health by denying aid money to organizations that provide crucial family planning services. I urge a no vote.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues, I plead with my colleagues, to oppose this amendment that would put the Mexico City policy back into this bill, that would put the language that gags foreign private organizations from using their own funds, and I want to repeat this, using their own funds to educate women and families about reproductive choices and options, including birth control options.

International family planning operations provide women in foreign countries with access to maternal care, clinic health services, education and counseling, programs that reduce the need for abortion in the first place. At the very least, we should allow organizations that participate in family plan-

ning programs to use their own private funds to provide information and services for women and their families.

Mr. Chairman, if we truly care about women and children, we will support international family planning. Without it, women in developing nations will be forced to make unconscionable choices.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, quickly, let me observe that the President and his faith-based organizations' proposal said that funds can be segregated. Yes, they may be fungible, but they can make a difference. That is what this issue is about.

Family planning programs supported by the United States save lives around the world. The World Health Organization estimates that close to 600,000 women die each year of pregnancy-related causes that are often preventable. Nearly one in four of these deaths could be prevented if high-quality family planning services were available.

Proponents of the global gag rule would lead us to believe that taxpayer dollars are being spent to actively promote or fund abortions. This is false and has been prohibited by United States law since 1973. Imposing restrictions on the freedom of speech of foreign NGOs not only undermines the key goal of our foreign policy, promoting democracy worldwide, but it would be unconstitutional in the United States.

I urge my colleagues to preserve the existing language in the bill and vote against the global gag rule.

Mr. Chairman, family planning programs supported by the United States save lives around the world.

The World Health Organization estimates that close to 600,000 women die each year of pregnancy-related causes that are often preventable—99 percent of which are women that live in developing countries.

Nearly one in four of these deaths could be prevented if high-quality family planning services were available.

Proponents of the global "GAG" rule would lead you to believe that taxpayer dollars are being spent to actively promote or fund abortions. This is false. The truth is that not one penny of U.S. assistance pays for abortion services. Federal law has explicitly prohibited funding for abortion services since 1973. Furthermore, the global "GAG" rule would be unconstitutional in the United States.

Imposing restrictions on the freedom of speech of foreign NGOs not only undermines the key goal of our foreign policy—promoting democracy worldwide—but it would be unconstitutional in the U.S.

I urge my colleagues to preserve the existing language in the bill and vote against the global "GAG" rule.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER).

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

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Hyde-Barcia-Smith-Oberstar amendment, which

preserves President Bush's legal authority to implement the pro-life Mexico City policy which prohibits U.S. population assistance funds from being made available to foreign organizations that perform or actively promote abortions in foreign countries.

I would have thought that I would not have needed to remind anyone in this body today about the revelation last year that the International Planned Parenthood Federation quietly repaid \$700,000 in U.S. grants just days before a congressional audit to determine if the funds were used for abortions or the promotion of abortion in India and Uganda.

If International Planned Parenthood Federation believes they were used illegally according to Federal law, my colleagues should probably contact them to find out the truth. While International Planned Parenthood might have repaid the U.S. Treasury, they could not pay us back in the human lives they stole.

Today, let us reaffirm our fundamental belief that all of the world's unborn have precious lives that should be protected. Our own Declaration of Independence recognizes that governments are instituted to protect the inalienable right to life. Why should we want to export a contrary doctrine?

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 1 minute to my friend and neighbor, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Just 2 days after the Bush administration came into office, he issued an executive memorandum reinstating the notorious global gag rule on international family planning programs, so we knew that this was going to come to the floor, but we must know the facts on this.

The fact is, access to family planning services is one of the most effective ways of reducing abortion. Limiting access to family planning results in higher rates of high-risk pregnancies, unsafe abortions, and maternal deaths. Let us know the facts: 600,000 women die each year of causes related to pregnancies or childbirth. Ninety-nine percent of those women live in developing countries.

We must vote no on this Hyde-Smith-Oberstar amendment so we can strengthen HIV-AIDS prevention, so we can encourage the Golden Rule, respect medical ethics, and respect and reinforce current U.S. laws. I urge Members to vote against this thinly veiled legislation that is anti-family planning. Vote no.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, in the late seventies when I was assistant administrator of AID in charge of population programs, I was in charge of the effort to enforce the Helms amendment, whether the agency liked it or not. We did that. We set up a rigorous procedure to make sure that no U.S. monies were used for abortion-related activities.

Now, the argument is that money is fungible, and even if an organization uses a small amount of its own monies, or an affiliate uses its monies, we should make sure that that organization receives no American funding. That carries the fungibility argument to an extreme, period. It is not a rule of reason.

I just suggest to those who are carrying this fungibility argument to an extreme, they should not be surprised if it is used against them or others when they try to apply a different principle in terms of domestic programs.

This is a bad amendment. It is an extreme amendment. I urge its rejection.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for giving me the time for a very important discussion.

I respectfully rise to oppose the Hyde-Smith amendment. I guess it is because I have spent a lot of time in developing nations visiting with women across the world. Many of them want peace, and they fight for human rights. They want dignity for their families, their children. They want to be able to raise their children. They want to be able to give them a good quality of life. They want to live, I say to the gentleman from California. The reason they want to live is because they want to be able to foster the opportunities for their children.

But if this amendment passed, 600,000 of those women can die because of pregnancy-related problems, because there has been no family planning. I think it is very important to realize that this Bush Mexico City global gag rule policy that was implemented is more extreme than any other policy we have ever had, because the policy disqualifies overseas groups from U.S. family planning assistance if they use their own funds simply to counsel women on their pregnancy options.

Family planning is vital. We should vote this amendment down so women and children around the world might live.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Members are reminded to address their comments to the Chair, and not to other parties.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I hope this body can come together on this very sensible plan that we have discussed today to protect birth control, yes, birth control, in the international aid program.

We know that the Republican party is opposed to choice, but what is at stake here is not the fight about abortion, it is whether poor women in the Third World are going to be able to have access to birth control so that they can plan their families.

Surely this House is not so radical that it will oppose birth control and the family planning program.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a couple of points in rebuttal to those comments made by my friends on the other side of this issue.

A couple of their speakers have said that somehow the fungibility argument is analogous, to what we were doing with the faith-based initiative proposed by President Bush.

I would suggest that in the faith-based initiative, there is a benign outcome, a benign consequence. If, as a matter of fact, because we give money to a religious organization, which in turn frees up money, for example, for them to proselytize their religion, I think most of us would agree that is not a bad thing. That is why we give tax breaks to religious organizations, regardless of denomination or belief, because we do believe that religious beliefs are a positive good for society.

That is not the case when we are talking about money and fungibility with regard to family planning and abortion. If the organization, a pro-abortion organization, is performing and killing and decimating, destroying, chemically poisoning and dismembering unborn children, because U.S. funding allows them to use their own money for abortion, that is not a benign consequence, that is a horrific consequence.

If our U.S. funding for family planning is used to free up other money for abortion, we have a responsibility to step in and protect the child and only fund those groups that just do family planning.

I believe as reasonable men and women we can make choices and say, we do not want that consequence. So here in the Mexico City policy, the fungibility argument has real teeth, it has real grip. It ensures that we do not subsidize groups that engage in abortion, the killing of unborn children.

Let me also point out to my colleagues again that when the Mexico City policy was in effect, 350 non-governmental organizations accepted the pro-life Mexico City provisions, including 57 affiliates of the International Planned Parenthood Federation based in London. That is 57 mostly in-country affiliates who said, we will divest ourselves of killing. Abortion is killing. Family planning is not.

I would hope and I would respectfully submit, this is a modest policy. We do not reduce family planning by a dime. Last year we appropriated \$425 million for family planning, and \$425 million will go forward for family planning, with the pro-life safeguards.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to request a vote no on this amendment. Let me share with Members that my religious values I hold dear. I am not in church right now, but I respect the right of every woman to choose medical procedures that she and her doctor have decided.

But that is not what this is about. This is about family planning. Family planning will eliminate the need for abortions. As a professional nurse, abortions are not done lightly. It is a tough decision and a medical one, for the most part. I can assure the Members that not a single dollar in this bill is going to fund an abortion.

□ 1200

But, Mr. Chairman, we recognize the need for family planning, not only will it save lives, it will also prevent a lot of disease. When people have access to information on how to control their emotions and their lives, we will see a better result.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE).

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) for yielding the time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hyde-Barcia-Smith-Oberstar amendment to preserve the President's legal authority to implement the pro-life Mexico City policy.

Mr. Chairman, the pro-abortion lobby likes to call the Mexico City policy a gag rule. This is a cunning and deceptive argument and could not be further from the truth. Abortion, even when it is cloaked in the terms of those who favor it as choice or reproductive freedom, is still giving one human being the power to terminate the life of another.

Fortunately, many of the countries that are considered the Second and Third World still respect and cherish life. These countries though vulnerable and in need of aid should not be forced, coerced, or unduly influenced to accept a practice that is abhorrent to them and a complete contradiction of their most basic beliefs.

That is exactly what the Mexico City policy is all about, Mr. Chairman. It is a reasonable attempt to ensure that the pro-abortion lobby in the West does not undermine the traditions and the laws of other countries.

The Mexico City policy prohibits organizations that perform abortions or lobby foreign governments to legalize abortions from receiving U.S. tax dollars. It is a just but modest measure for those Americans and, Mr. Chairman, there are a clear majority of Americans who do not want their foreign aid dollars used to fund abortions.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and to implement the Mexico City policy, a policy which protects and values and respects life not only in this country but around the world.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON), my Republican friend.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to be an American. I am proud to be a citizen in the freest Nation in the world. We have the confidence in America that if everyone is allowed to speak up, to share their experience, to share their knowledge, we as a Nation will find the best and truest path into the future.

I am proud that I am part of a country that trusts what is an extraordinarily difficult process, because it is difficult sometimes to trust the chaos that comes with public debate about difficult issues. And so I am humiliated as I stand here as an American to watch Members of this House impose on other countries a limit on their citizens' rights to speak up, to advocate what they think their government ought to do in governing themselves.

Mr. Chairman, the underlying bill denies the use of American dollars for abortion; that is that. The underlying bill denies the right to counsel women to go get an abortion; that is that. I do not agree with it; but that is that.

That is not the issue that so profoundly concerns me about the amendment, which I strongly oppose. If America's policy is to be no American funds for abortion, no American funds to counsel for abortion, so be it. But we do know that empowering women with the knowledge to space their children, to have healthy pregnancies, not only saves lives but produces healthy mothers and healthy babies. I am glad that there is money in the bill for family planning.

This amendment is about whether we take the next step and we say to that country that the people who have experience in providing information and education to women may not raise their voice as citizens of their own country, to inform the debate in their own country about what public policy and public law ought to be. And worse than that, this bill says if you have an opinion that we approve of, you may speak publicly. If you have an opinion we disapprove of, you may not speak publicly.

Are we going to send in the FBI? American troops? Are we going to be the censors of speech of people in other countries? It is one thing for America to say you cannot use our money for

abortions; it is another thing to say and for us to export as a matter of American policy, we deny you the right to speak your opinion in your own country. We should be ashamed.

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, let me just say to my colleagues, if we subsidized an organization that used their money and our money for hunger relief, but hunger relief was only part of their mix of programs a mix that also include the promotion of racial prejudice, we would withhold U.S. funds. Take for instance, apartheid, just go back 15, 20 years in South Africa. We would fund only NGOs who did not agree with Apartheid because we found it egregious and something we could not agree with. So we would suggest to those NGO's that had Apartheid as part of their package, just part of their program, that we will find another NGO to fund. One that divested itself from Apartheid.

Mr. Chairman, that is exactly what has happened with the Mexico City policy. We have said we will provide enormous amounts of money for family planning, but we want some pro-life safeguards to ensure that we are not promoting abortion. Many of us and many in America and many in the world believe abortion to be the taking of human life and exploitation of women as well, we don't want to fund that. Instead, we want to make sure that that money goes for family planning, their own money as well as our own.

Again, if we apply this policy to other issues where we have grave disagreements, like racial prejudice, we would pick and choose among NGOs, and only fund those who divested themselves, completely, from the egregious activity.

Finally, this policy has been found to be constitutional. It has already been litigated, and has been reaffirmed through the scrutiny of the U.S. courts. The Mexico City policy is fully constitutional.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I say I have great respect for my colleagues who feel so strongly about the Hyde amendment, but I would like to repeat once again exactly why I am asking my colleagues to vote no on the Hyde amendment. Number one, the Hyde amendment reduces abortion funding from zero to zero. There is no abortion funding in any family planning legislation which we are proposing.

The Hyde amendment will not reduce the number of abortions, it can only make them less safe. The Hyde amendment, in fact, may well increase the number of abortions, because we are

denying poor women around the world the opportunity to get counseling and spacing their children to get family planning.

The Hyde amendment violates medical ethics. It interferes in the doctor-patient relationship. The Hyde amendment punishes free speech and democracy. The Hyde amendment will strip language that respects United States law and laws in foreign countries.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues, please read this carefully. Vote no on the Hyde amendment. Vote for free speech and democracy and the rights of the United States citizen. Let us not, let us not impose on others what we would not impose on our own.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) is recognized for 6 minutes.

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I speak in defense of millions of people who are offended by having their tax dollars coercively spent to facilitate abortions, and that is the state of the bill now with the Lee amendment.

My amendment strikes the Lee amendment and makes this bill abortion neutral. I have heard people argue, debate abortion, and say that government ought to keep its hands out of this decision. They ought not to be involved in abortion. That is what we are trying to do.

The Lee amendment provides that money, millions of dollars can go to organizations that facilitate abortions, that propagandize for abortions, that lobby to change the laws of countries that are antiabortion and that perform abortions. And it is wrong.

Our country, this Congress, the President, are all entitled to specify the terms and conditions under which our tax dollars are being granted to nongovernment organizations to spend. We can tell them what to spend it for because it is our money, and that has been held constitutional by the courts. If my colleagues want the citations, I have them here.

Now, abortion is not family planning. Family planning is helping you get pregnant or keeping you from getting pregnant. It is not killing an unborn child after you become pregnant. That is abortion. You can call it reproductive rights if you want, but it is abortion. It is killing a life once it has begun.

Mr. Chairman, a lot of people do not want their money facilitating that practice overseas. No family planning dollars are going to be lost. Four hundred and twenty-five million dollars of your tax money and mine will go for family planning, and every penny of it will be spent. It will be spent providing family planning, not abortion. And that is as it should be.

We invite a veto from the President. The President has reestablished the

Mexico City policy, which is we do not subsidize organizations that propagandize, that lobby, that perform abortions.

If this Lee amendment stays in the bill and if the Hyde amendment is defeated, we are inviting a veto of a very good bill. That is a shame.

Secondly, this amendment, the Lee amendment, does not belong in this bill. This bill is an authorization for the State Department, not a foreign aid bill. It properly belongs as an amendment on a foreign aid appropriation, not in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, money is fungible. If we provide millions of dollars to international planned parenthood, sure, they are spending their own money on abortions, but we free up their money. We make it available to them by providing our money for other purposes. So the notion that we are telling an organization how to spend its own money is nonsense.

The gag rule, nobody is being gagged. If you want to talk about abortions, talk away, but not on our dime, not on tax dollars provided by this Congress. That is the difference.

I heard my friend, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), talk about how important family planning is. I do not doubt that. He talked about all kinds of millions of people who cannot sustain a decent standard of living, that is fine.

We provide family planning, and whether Planned Parenthood spends the money or other organizations, the money will be spent for family planning. Whatever good can come of that will come of that whether the Hyde amendment is there or not.

Mr. Chairman, I plead with my colleagues, support the Hyde amendment. Help this bill get passed to where the President will sign it and do not, do not saddle people's consciences and souls with the fact that my colleagues are coercing tax dollars to facilitate organizations that preach and promote abortion. It is just wrong.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1215

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

Mr. Chairman, let me first thank all of my colleagues on both sides of this issue for conducting an enlightening and civilized debate. Let me also specifically commend the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) who led our side in the debate in the committee where we won the issue 26 to 22. It was a significant bipartisan vote.

I would also like to pay tribute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD), the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON), the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) for raising the awareness on this so-called Mexico City policy.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a partisan issue. This is not a pro-choice versus pro-life issue. This is about advocating globally what we so cherish for our own citizens here at home, the right to speak freely and the right to choose wisely.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that reasonable people can and do have different views on the matter of a woman's right to choose; and I respect the views of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and on both sides of this issue.

But our debate today is not about abortion. Not one dime of U.S. Government tax dollars are used for abortions overseas. Since 1973, it has been illegal to use U.S. taxpayer funds for abortions. This debate is not about funding abortions. It is about the right to free speech and the principle of an open and privileged doctor-patient relationship.

We have heard from the other side repeatedly the notion of fungibility. Fungibility is a real concept. It means that, if funds are made available to purpose A, then funds become freed for purpose B. This is as true of President Bush's faith-based initiative as it is true of this issue.

I think it is important that we not be hypocrites in dealing with this legislation. It is not enough to talk about human rights and democracy and free speech, it is important that we practice what we preach.

I urge my colleagues strongly to vote against this amendment to save the lives of countless poor women across the globe in the most destitute countries on the face of this globe. I urge my colleagues to defeat the amendment.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I have dedicated my efforts in Congress to the promotion of more livable communities, communities that are safe, healthy and economically secure, here and abroad. Our contribution to international family planning efforts is an example of our partnership on an international level to promote more livable communities.

Poverty-stricken nations face significant obstacles to providing for the health, safety, and economic security of their families. The "Global Gag rule" put into effect by the Bush Administration earlier this year placed an additional burden on these struggling countries. I commend Congresswoman LEE for her successful effort in Committee to overturn the Mexico City restrictions and restore funding to family planning clinics across the world.

U.S. aid for international family planning is used to provide health education, family planning, contraception, and women's health services to women across the globe. Since 1983, by law these funds cannot be used to perform abortions; instead they provide resources critical to combating mother and infant mortality and diseases like HIV/AIDS which cripple development efforts in third world nations. Without these funds, non-governmental agencies in 52 developing nations will be forced to lose or severely reduce their efforts to reduce unwanted pregnancies and sexually transmitted diseases.

The people who don't believe women should control their own reproduction have successfully placed many restrictions on

American women in the last 25 years. We should not further this agenda overseas with additional restrictions that would be illegal if enacted here. The height of hypocrisy is that the President proposes providing federal dollars for his Faith Based Initiative, allowing churches to compartmentalize their federally funded activities, but refuses to extend the same latitude to hard pressed organizations in desperately poor countries.

I urge my colleagues to support the action of the committee to restore U.S. international family planning dollars by opposing the Hyde/Barcia/Smith/Oberstar Amendment.

Mr. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to this amendment.

This amendment flies in the face of the very principles upon which our Nation was founded. Free speech is a right that we all hold dear. Yet by imposing the Global Gag Rule, we are refusing that right to healthcare providers throughout the world.

We all came to Congress because we believe in full and open Democratic participation. But this Amendment uses U.S. AID funding as blackmail to silence millions—simply because their ideas differ from those of our current administration.

If this policy were imposed on us, we would be outraged. If it was proposed for community groups in our districts, we would not stand for it. But because it is being inflicted upon poor, third world countries, it's OK. What gives this body the right to dictate to people how they should think and what they should be allowed to say?

This policy is hypocritical, it's discriminatory, and it has no place in a free and open society. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today as the Democratic Chair of the Pro-Life Caucus and as one of the original sponsors of the Hyde/Barcia/Smith/Oberstar amendment to urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this important pro-family planning, pro-life, and pro-woman legislation.

Mr. Chairman, four months ago, President Bush re-instituted a long-standing policy of the United States: that no American tax-payer dollars should go to support those international organizations which promote or provide abortions for women in foreign countries. This is the cornerstone of the so-called Mexico City family planning policy.

But, Mr. Chairman, even as we celebrate our return to an international family planning policy that promotes the sanctity of life, we are called to the floor of this House to defend this important idea. We are currently debating a bill which funds much of our foreign policy. Unfortunately, buried amongst countless worthy American efforts to make the world a better place, there is a provision in this bill which repeals the Mexico City policy. Our amendment is intended to delete this pro-abortion provision.

I urge my colleagues who oppose this amendment, and who oppose eliminating the American subsidy of abortions overseas, to consider that this amendment in no way damages the American commitment to vital international family planning efforts throughout the world.

But don't just take my word for it, Mr. Chairman, we've done this before—in 1984—and the record of history speaks more loudly and more eloquently than I. Despite predictions by

the supporters of the international abortion industry that no international family planning organization would accept American funds under the terms of the Mexico City policy, more than 350 foreign family planning agencies agreed to use American funds with these restrictions. Also during this period, we funded family planning efforts throughout the world at higher levels than ever before.

Mr. Chairman, at the beginning of my time, I stated that this amendment is pro-family planning, pro-life, and pro-woman. It is pro-family planning because it will strengthen genuine family planning programs by enacting a wall of separation between real family planning and the performance and promotion of abortion—all while maintaining the high level of economic assistance the United States contributes to international family planning efforts.

It is pro-life because it prohibits the funding of abortions overseas and therefore protects the sanctity of life throughout the world. And it is pro-woman because it offers pregnant mothers in the poorest places on earth more options for her family than a paid-for trip to an abortion clinic, subsidized by the American taxpayer.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, this is a critical issue with which this body must grapple: with all of the problems in the Third World—the grinding poverty, the enduring famines, the absence of life-saving medicine or adequate health care—is access to subsidized abortion all we have to offer the suffering, and poverty-ridden women of the developing world? Is abortion the only type of family planning assistance worthy of American support and promotion?

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, I simply do not believe this is true. We can support family planning without promoting abortion, and still give the vital family planning assistance many countries need to sustain their populations.

Support this amendment and tell the world that after almost ten years of encouraging abortion overseas, the United States is back in the business of defending the rights of the unborn and promoting the sanctity of life throughout the world.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the provision added to the Foreign Relations Authorization Act (H.R. 1646) that would reverse the Bush administration's policy known as the global gag rule, and in opposition to the Hyde-Barcia-Smith-Oberstar amendment that would enforce the global gag rule. The rule prohibits international family planning organizations that receive U.S. funds from counseling on or conducting abortions with their own funds—not U.S. government dollars.

Many international family planning organizations in developing nations offer comprehensive reproductive health services including contraceptive counseling, sexually transmitted disease prevention, rape counseling, and abortions. Women often enter the patchwork healthcare systems of developing nations through such international family planning organizations. By qualifying the use of U.S. funds according to the gag rule, we are rendering these comprehensive programs ineligible for valuable resources and limiting their effectiveness in providing health services overall. Furthermore, the gag rule could have the perverse effect of increasing the number of abortions, because those organizations that are ineligible for funds may no longer be able to provide a broad range of family services such as contraceptive counseling.

In African countries where HIV/AIDS has reached epidemic proportions, every chance to counsel on disease prevention must be taken. Life expectancies are plummeting and drug prices are soaring, leaving a grim picture for the future of African children. Thus far, 17 million Africans, including 3.7 million children, have died of AIDS and over 12 million African children have been orphaned. Once a person is at a clinic, the door is open to provide information such as STD prevention. Integrating reproductive health services maximizes the effectiveness of these programs. We cannot stand by and watch this tragedy unfold without exploring every avenue possible to slow the growth of this disease that is devastating the spirits and economies of the developing world.

On another note, how can we justify imposing restrictions on the rights of people in other countries that are constitutionally protected in the United States? In this country, the Constitution does not permit the government to restrict how organizations spend their own, non-federal funds. In this country, our right to free speech allows us to assemble peacefully and petition our government. In this country, we expect full disclosure of all our medical options when we seek treatment from a physician. Yet, the global gag rule prohibits all of these legal activities in other countries in exchange for U.S. funds. We would not stand for such restrictions in the United States, and we cannot allow international family planning organizations to be prevented from discussing and performing services that are legal in their countries.

Let's be clear, even if the Hyde-Barcia-Smith-Oberstar amendment fails here today, the United States Agency for International Development (U.S.A.I.D.) cannot promote abortion, nor can it fund abortions except in the cases of rape, incest, or if the life of a woman is in danger.

I urge my fellow colleagues to oppose the Hyde-Barcia-Smith-Oberstar amendment. Reproductive health services are not solely the responsibility of developing nations. We are all affected by the growing population and the spread of HIV/AIDS. Furthermore, we should not impose restrictions on the citizens of other countries that citizens in the United States would not tolerate.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Hyde/Barcia/Smith/Oberstar Amendment which would effectively reinstate president Bush's order implementing the Mexico City Policy. The Mexico City Policy reflects the views of million of U.S. citizens and is a common sense approach for a civilized nation to take to ensure support for genuine family planning programs, not the promotion of abortion.

Passage of the Hyde/Barcia/Smith/Oberstar Amendment would result in a return to a policy that prohibits U.S. population assistance funding—which comes straight from the pockets of U.S. taxpayers—from going to foreign organizations that perform or actively promote abortion as a method of family planning.

As a world leader, we have an obligation to protect the sanctity of life and liberty, especially for those who are helpless to protect themselves. I, like many in our great country, cannot condone abortion as a means of birth control, population control, material comfort or mere convenience; and I certainly cannot understand the U.S. taking the lead on encouraging this practice or funding lobbying efforts

to influence other countries to change their anti-abortion laws.

Accordingly, today, I ask my colleagues to join me in voting for this important amendment. We must return to a policy that respects the ethical and moral views of our citizens and provides support for groups who are willing and able to reflect these values in their family planning programs.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the Hyde-Smith Amendment would reinstate the Mexico City anti-international family planning policy known as the global "gag" rule.

This policy requires that foreign non-government organizations (NGOs)

1. Withhold information from pregnant women about the option of legal abortion and where to obtain safe abortion services.

2. Refuse to provide legal abortion services,

3. Sacrifice the right to engage in any public debate or public information effort on the availability of legal abortions.

4. And, most importantly, it prevents the NGOs from educating women and families on family planning options that would help prevent abortions in the first place.

The subject of abortion has always been controversial.

Very often highly charged emotions and special interest organizations enter the debate and muddle the true issue at hand.

The key issue of debate today should be on whether educating women and families about family planning services will reduce the number of abortions each year.

The passage of the Hyde-Smith amendment would prevent educating women and families on the issue of abortion.

That is why I urge my colleagues to vote against Hyde-Smith amendment so that we can educate women and families about family planning services and ways to reduce the number of abortions each year in foreign countries.

I would also like to clarify that U.S. taxpayer funds are not being used for foreign (NGO's) abortions or for the advocacy of abortion.

The Hyde-Smith amendment confuses people by stating that no federal U.S. funds will be used to fund abortions or family planning services.

These activities have already been prohibited by longstanding U.S. statutes, and recipients of U.S. international family planning assistance are in compliance with those laws.

NGO's use their own funds to provide family planning and legal abortion services.

Finally, I would like to address their HIV/AIDS epidemic in South Africa.

The Hyde-Smith amendment interferes with the effectiveness of HIV/AIDS prevention efforts.

36 million people worldwide are living with and dying from AIDS. A majority of these people are in developing countries.

This is especially true in South Africa, where 55% of new infections occur among women and where the disease is spreading most rapidly among the young.

Family planning providers are a key effort in preventing the transmission of HIV/AIDS, other sexually-transmitted diseases, and unintended pregnancy.

However, it is these same programs that are being targeted by the gag rule in the Hyde-Smith amendment since abortion is legal in South Africa and clinics there do provide women with information about abortion in the context of pregnancy options counseling.

To reduce the number of abortions and to prevent the transmission of HIV/AIDS we must educate women and families on family planning.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Hyde-Smith amendment that would strike Rep. LEE's language containing the text of H.R. 755, the Global Democracy Protection Act.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong opposition to the Hyde amendment, and in support of the important family planning language in the bill.

I want to commend my colleague from California, BARBARA LEE, for her courageous work in the Committee that overturned the "global gag rule."

The gag rule is a medical and moral disaster.

It simply defines common sense to prevent women in the developing world from having access to full and accurate information about their health care options.

It is inexcusable for the United States to force community-based organizations to choose between desperately needed aid and their basic democratic rights.

It is outrageous to reinstate a policy that will reverse global progress in the fights against unwanted pregnancies and the spread of AIDS.

Let's stand up for women, children and families around the world. Let's stand up for fundamental democratic freedoms.

Defeat the Hyde amendment.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by Chairman HYDE and Representatives BARCIA, SMITH of New Jersey and OBERSTAR. This amendment would reimpose the Mexico City Policy, also known as the global gag rule, which prohibits U.S. population funds from being made available to foreign non-profit organizations engaged in family planning programs abroad that perform or actively promote abortions.

I will be brief, Mr. Chairman.

Since 1973, no U.S. funds can be used for abortions. Period. End of discussion.

This amendment imposes restrictions on non-governmental organizations (NGOs) abroad that would be unconstitutional here in the United States. It stifles freedom of speech and the rights of individuals to present their views to their own government. It prohibits locally raised funds from being used for locally-defined purposes. In a word, it is anti-democratic.

Finally, this amendment is counter-productive, even in achieving its own stated goals. Cutting off funding for family planning programs results in more abortions taking place around the world, not fewer. Cutting off family planning funds results in greater poverty, not less. Cutting off family planning funds results in increased rates of disease, not decreased rates.

This amendment is very bad policy. I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 210, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 115]

AYES—218

Aderholt Hall (TX) Peterson (PA)  
 Akin Hansen Petri  
 Arney Hart Phelps  
 Bachus Hastert Pickering  
 Baker Hastings (WA) Pitts  
 Ballenger Hayes Platts  
 Barcia Hayworth Pombo  
 Barr Hefley Portman  
 Bartlett Herger Putnam  
 Barton Hilleary Quinn  
 Bereuter Hobson Radanovich  
 Berry Hoekstra Rahall  
 Bilirakis Holden Regula  
 Blunt Hostettler Rehberg  
 Boehner Hulshof Reynolds  
 Bonilla Hunter Riley  
 Bono Hutchinson Roemer  
 Borski Hyde Rogers (KY)  
 Brady (TX) Issa Rogers (MI)  
 Brown (SC) Istook Rohrabacher  
 Bryant Jenkins Royce  
 Burr Johnson (WI) Ryan (WI)  
 Burton Johnson (IL) Ryun (KS)  
 Buyer Johnson, Sam Saxton  
 Callahan Jones (NC) Scarborough  
 Calvert Kanjorski Schaffer  
 Camp Keller Schrock  
 Cannon Kennedy (MN) Sensenbrenner  
 Cantor Kerns Sessions  
 Chabot Kildee Shadegg  
 Chambliss King (NY) Shaw  
 Coble Kingston Sherwood  
 Collins Knollenberg Shimkus  
 Combest Kucinich Shows  
 Cooksey LaFalce Simpson  
 Costello LaHood Skeen  
 Cox Langevin Skelton  
 Crane Largent Smith (MI)  
 Crenshaw Latham Smith (NJ)  
 Cubin LaTourette Smith (TX)  
 Culberson Lewis (CA) Souder  
 Cunningham Lewis (KY) Spence  
 Davis, Jo Ann Linder Stearns  
 Deal Lipinski Stenholm  
 DeLay LoBiondo Stump  
 DeMint Lucas (KY) Stupak  
 Diaz-Balart Lucas (OK) Sununu  
 Doolittle Manzullo Tancredo  
 Doyle Mascara Tauzin  
 Dreier McCrery Taylor (MS)  
 Duncan McHugh Taylor (NC)  
 Ehlers McInnis Terry  
 Emerson McIntyre Thornberry  
 English McKeon Thune  
 Everrett Mica Tiahrt  
 Ferguson Miller, Gary Tiberi  
 Flake Mollohan Toomey  
 Fletcher Moran (KS) Traficant  
 Fossella Murtha Vitter  
 Gallegly Myrick Walsh  
 Ganske Nethercutt Wamp  
 Gekas Ney Watkins  
 Gibbons Northup Watts (OK)  
 Gillmor Norwood Weldon (FL)  
 Goode Nussle Weldon (PA)  
 Goodlatte Oberstar Weller  
 Goss Ortiz Whitfield  
 Graham Osborne Wicker  
 Graves Otter Wilson  
 Green (WI) Oxley Wolf  
 Grucci Paul Young (AK)  
 Gutknecht Pence Young (FL)  
 Hall (OH) Peterson (MN)

NOES—210

Abercrombie Blagojevich Castle  
 Ackerman Blumenauer Clay  
 Allen Boehlert Clayton  
 Andrews Bonior Clement  
 Baca Boswell Clyburn  
 Baird Boucher Condit  
 Baldacci Boyd Conyers  
 Baldwin Brady (PA) Coyne  
 Barrett Brown (FL) Cramer  
 Bass Brown (OH) Crowley  
 Becerra Capito Cummings  
 Bentsen Capps Davis (CA)  
 Berkeley Capuano Davis (FL)  
 Berman Cardin Davis (IL)  
 Biggert Carson (IN) Davis, Tom  
 Bishop Carson (OK) DeFazio

DeGette Kennedy (RI) Pryce (OH)  
 Delahunt Kilpatrick Ramstad  
 DeLauro Kind (WI) Rangel  
 Deutsch Kirk Reyes  
 Dicks Kleczka Rivers  
 Dingell Kolbe Rodriguez  
 Doggett Lampson Ross  
 Dooley Lantos Rothman  
 Dunn Larsen (WA) Roukema  
 Edwards Larson (CT) Roybal-Allard  
 Engel Leach Rush  
 Eshoo Lee Sabo  
 Etheridge Levin Sanchez  
 Evans Lewis (GA) Sanders  
 Farr Lofgren Sandlin  
 Fattah Lowey Sawyer  
 Filner Luther Schakowsky  
 Foley Maloney (CT) Schiff  
 Ford Maloney (NY) Scott  
 Frank Markey Serrano  
 Frelinghuysen Matheson Shays  
 Frost Matsui Sherman  
 Gephardt McCarthy (MO) Simmons  
 Gilchrest McCarthy (NY) Slaughter  
 Gilman McCollum Smith (WA)  
 Gonzalez McDermott Snyder  
 Gordon McGovern Solis  
 Granger McKinney Spratt  
 Green (TX) McNulty Stark  
 Greenwood Meehan Strickland  
 Gutierrez Meek (FL) Sweeney  
 Harman Meeks (NY) Tanner  
 Hastings (FL) Menendez Tauscher  
 Hill Millender Thomas  
 Hilliard McDonald Thompson (CA)  
 Hinchey Miller (FL) Thompson (MS)  
 Hinojosa Miller, George Thurman  
 Hoeffel Mink Tierney  
 Holt Moore Towns  
 Honda Moran (VA) Turner  
 Horn Morella Udall (CO)  
 Houghton Nadler Udall (NM)  
 Hoyer Napolitano Upton  
 Inslee Neal Velazquez  
 Isakson Obey Visclosky  
 Israel Olver Walden  
 Jackson (IL) Ose Waters  
 Jackson-Lee Owens Watt (NC)  
 (TX) Pallone Waxman  
 Jefferson Pascrell Weiner  
 Johnson (CT) Pastor Wexler  
 Johnson, E. B. Payne Woolsey  
 Jones (OH) Pelosi Wu  
 Kaptur Pomeroy Wynn  
 Kelly Price (NC)

NOT VOTING—4

Moakley  
 Ros-Lehtinen

□ 1240

Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. HILLIARD, and Mr. ACKERMAN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. EHRlich. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 115, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, Earlier today I did not register my vote for roll No. 115, Mr. HYDE's amendment to H.R. 1646. If present, I would have voted "no" on this amendment.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS) having assumed the chair, Mr. LAHOOD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1646) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal years 2002 and 2003, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.