

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I am pro-life but I am also very much in favor of sex education and birth control and family planning. In my opinion, it is a contradiction to be opposed to abortions and yet be opposed to birth control and family planning, and that is why I support the Smith-Hyde bill. The Smith-Hyde bill supports

international family planning programs in foreign countries, but not like the President's proposal to promote abortions.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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