

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