

14. Users protected by USAID [11] \times (1-percent using long term methods [12] + percent using long term methods [12] \times New ster acceptors as % of users [13]).

15. Assumed to be 35 percent.

16. Users needing current protection [16] \times percent of budget cut [17].

17. This is an estimate of the percent people who lose their family planning services due to USAID budget cuts that would adopt traditional methods as an alternative. Since the people losing their services are committed users, many would adopt traditional methods. However, traditional methods require the active participation of both partners, so many would probably not adopt these methods. One approach to estimating this figure has been developed by The Alan Guttmacher Institute. This approach uses DHS data to determine traditional method use as a proportion of all women either using a traditional method or having an unmet need for family planning. The average of 36 developing countries for which data are available shows that 20 percent of these women use traditional methods (Alan Guttmacher Institute, 1995. *Hopes and Realities: Closing the Gap Between Women's Reproductive Aspirations and their Reproductive Experiences*, AGI, New York, Appendix Table 7). This is likely to be an under-estimate since there are many reasons other than lack of access for women to have an unmet need (lack of knowledge, religious objections to family planning, spouse opposes family planning, fear of side effects). Therefore, to be conservative, we have doubled this figure to 40 percent.

18. Users left unprotected [18] \times percent adopting traditional methods [19].

19. Failure rates for withdrawal and periodic abstinence in developed countries are reported to be around 20% (*Contraceptive Technology*, 16th Revised Edition, Robert A. Hatcher, et al., New York: Irvington Publishers, Inc. 1994, p. 652). For developing countries there is very little information. One study used DHS data to calculate that 16% of users of withdrawal had a birth in the first years of use (Lorenzo Moreno and No-reen Goldman, 1991. "Contraceptive Failure Rates in Developing Countries: Evidence from Demographic and Health Surveys." *International Family Planning Perspectives*, 17(2), June 1991, pp. 44-49.) The number of pregnancies (rather than births) due to traditional method failure would be even higher (Elise F. Jones, "Contraceptive Failure and Abortion." *International Family Planning Perspectives*, 17(4), December 1991, p. 150) Also, this study was based on respondent recall. There is a tendency, especially with traditional method users, to forget or not report use immediately before a pregnancy. Therefore, we assume that the annual pregnancy rate among traditional method users is about 40%. For users of modern methods the pregnancy rate is about 10%. (It is estimated to be about 14% in the U.S. among users of reversible methods. [Elise F. Jones and J.D. Forrest, 1992. "Contraceptive failure rates based on the 1988 NSFG." *Family Planning Perspectives*, 24:12-19.] but this number is high because there is little use of the IUD. For USAID-supported users, the IUD accounts for about half of all couple-years of protection provided by reversible methods.) Therefore, the additional pregnancy rate due to users switching from modern methods to traditional methods is 30% (40%-10%).

20. New traditional method users [20] \times failure rate [21].

21. The annual pregnancy rate for those couples using no method is 85% (*Contraceptive Technology*, 16th Revised Edition, Robert A. Hatcher, et al., New York: Irvington Publishers, Inc. 1994, p. 652). Subtracting the 10% pregnancy rate for couples using modern

methods (note 19) leaves an additional pregnancy rate of 75%.

22. (Users unprotected [18]—new traditional method users [20] \times pregnancy rate [23].

23. Unwanted pregnancies from traditional method failure [22] + unwanted pregnancies from users left unprotected [24].

24. Estimated to be 40%. Estimates are based on the following information:

The number of unintended pregnancies is the sum of abortions, unintended births and unintended pregnancies that end as spontaneous abortions (estimated as 10% of abortions + 20% of unintended births).

The main source of data on abortions is World Health Organization, 1994. *Abortion: A tabulation of available data on the frequency of unsafe abortion*, Geneva: WHO. These figures are also supported by S.K. Henshaw, 1990. "Induced abortion: A world review", *Family Planning Perspectives*, 22, 76-89 and The Alan Guttmacher Institute, 1994. *Clandestine Abortion: A Latin American Reality*, New York: AGI.

The number of unintended births is obtained by applying regional average proportions of all births that are unintended, to UN estimates of the total number of births in each region. Estimates of the total number of births that are unintended are obtained from DHS surveys done in the late 1980s/early 1990s. The weighted average for countries that have surveys, in a given region, is assumed to apply to the region as a whole. These proportions are based in women's reports of the wantedness status of each birth in the five years prior to the survey. Regional distributions of all pregnancies by planning status were published in chart form in *Hopes and Realities: Closing the Gap Between Women's Reproductive Aspirations and their Reproductive Experiences*, p. 25). These data were used to recalculate the distribution of unintended pregnancies by pregnancy outcome (that is, excluding wanted births and that proportion of wanted pregnancies that end as spontaneous abortions).

Country or region specific numbers were used for the individual countries. For Peru estimates are from: The Alan Guttmacher Institute, 1994. *Clandestine Abortion: A Latin American Reality*, New York: The Alan Guttmacher Institute. Other country estimates are based on regional data (The Alan Guttmacher Institute, unpublished tabulations).

25. Unwanted pregnancies [25] percent resorting to abortion [26].

26. Estimated as 47% for all developing countries. (Alan Guttmacher Institute, unpublished tabulation.) For Peru estimates are from: The Alan Guttmacher Institute, 1994. *Clandestine Abortion: A Latin American Reality*, New York: The Alan Guttmacher Institute. Other country estimates are based on regional data (The Alan Guttmacher Institute, unpublished tabulations).

27. Unwanted pregnancies [25] percent resulting in live births [28].

28. The Progress of Nations: 1995, UNICEF, pp. 52-53.

29. Additional live births [25] maternal mortality rate [26] / 100,000.

WAKE UP: TRADE MATTERS

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I would like to draw my colleagues' attention to a short interview that appeared this morning in USA Today. In it, textile businessman Roger Milliken outlines the inaccuracies in the present-day argument that only free trade can improve our Nation's economy. With a plethora of hard facts, Mr. Milliken debunks this myth by focus-

ing on the real problem: America does not have real trade troubles with nations that accept and sell products from America. America's trade problems are with countries like Japan and China that won't let American products into their markets.

Across the Nation, columnist and now Presidential candidate Pat Buchanan has opened up the wound of disinvestment in America. Unlike the Washington pundits and experts, people across America know that trade matters. Hard-working people have a tremendous disaffection with our trade policies and that unsettledness is bound to grow.

Mr. President, Roger Milliken hit the nail on the head of trade in this interview. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From USA Today, Mar. 5, 1996]

TEXTILE MAGNATE CRITIQUES RECENT TRADE DEALS

Roger Milliken, the South Carolina textile magnate, is a leading advocate of protectionist trade policies and a major contributor to GOP presidential candidate Patrick Buchanan and other conservative politicians and causes. In a rare interview, Milliken tells USA Today's Beth Belton why he thinks recent trade deals have been a mistake.

Q: You're against free trade, right?

A: Stop right there. We do believe in free trade. We have plants offshore. We have one in Japan and 11 in Europe. But the products we make are all sold in those countries. We don't take advantage of low labor costs to bring products back and destroy U.S. jobs.

Q: But you are against the North American Free Trade Agreement. Do you have plants in Canada or Mexico?

A: No. And we wouldn't consider either country because I've studied history, and I've found that no country has ever remained a major economic factor in the world that has lost its own manufacturing. . . . We have a manufactured goods trade deficit of \$174 billion, and if you use Clinton administration figures that every \$1 billion of exports supports 20,000 jobs, it's not far-fetched to say that if we didn't have a deficit, we would have 3.4 million more manufacturing jobs in the U.S. than we have.

Q: The USA has been losing manufacturing jobs for decades, and many economists say technology, not trade is the reason. You disagree?

A: Technology companies in this country pay lower wages than textile companies. The biggest piece—\$52 billion—of our \$174 billion goods trade deficit is in autos and auto parts. The second is textiles and apparel—\$37 billion. We're talking about year-round, full-time jobs. Most of the U.S. jobs created now are in the tourist trade or part-time fast-food jobs. These jobs don't pay benefits. They don't hold the family together. The turnover rate in the fast-food business is 250%. There's nothing steady or stabilizing to the economy about that.

Q: But don't statistics from your home state, South Carolina, show trade is helping create manufacturing jobs?

A: I take total exception to that. Four weeks ago in Spartanburg County, where I live, five textile plants closed down permanently. That's 800 jobs. Sure, the state gained 6,000 jobs last year because foreign companies invested in South Carolina.

That's absolutely terrific. But if we put in more protectionist laws, more of those jobs would be coming here. Foreign companies would have to locate here to get U.S. business.

Q: Has NAFTA increased export demand for cloth and other products?

A: It's not true, and it's worse than that because what everybody isn't told is that the textile industry today is operating six days a week instead of seven, or five days instead of six. Most of them have cut off the third shift or are closing one day a month because imports are hurting demands here.

Q: What's the solution?

A: I'd like to see us withdraw from the World Trade Organization. The U.S. has one vote. Cuba can cancel our vote. Or St. Kitts, an island in the (Caribbean). . . . We also want higher tariffs. Our opponents say that would prompt retaliation. I don't know how anybody retaliates against their best customer. I would love to retaliate against some of my best customers who treat us badly.

Q: Why are you speaking out now?

A: We're a private company and we like to stay private, but we're fighting for our industry. We have 14,000 employees in the U.S., and one of my jobs is to fight for preservation of those jobs.

Q: Didn't some in the textile industry support passage of NAFTA?

A: It was a split vote in the industry. There were some who believed the industry might benefit. They believed no textile plants would go to Mexico. But already we see plants setting up there, where all-in costs are \$2 an hour compared to \$12 an hour in the U.S.

Q: Have you had to downsize?

A: No, but I have to tell you we're running on curtailed schedules and the industry has had to close 12 plants in an economy that's growing all over. We ought to be a growing industry. We ought to be creating jobs.

Q: What about plans to expand?

A: We plan to continue expanding. Last year, we bought a company in Japan that makes fabric for auto interiors. When you deal with international auto companies, one of their requirements is that you be located in parts of the world where they can exchange products.

Q: You don't often give interviews. Why?

A: The media emphasize the growth in exports and the jobs created by exports. There are figures collected by the government that are put together very skillfully. But there is no way to look at government figures to find out how many jobs have been lost to imports. I hear a lot of talk about the growth of exports but hardly anyone talks about the growth of imports, which in percentage terms are slightly less. But in absolute numbers, the U.S. imports three times as much as it exports.

THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, 4 years ago I commenced these daily reports to the Senate to make a matter of record the exact Federal debt as of the close of business the previous day.

In that report of February 27, 1992, the Federal debt stood at \$3,825,891,293,066.80, as of close of business the previous day. The point is, the Federal debt has escalated by \$1,190,704,977,476.86 since February 26, 1992.

As of the close of business yesterday, Monday, March 4, 1996, the Federal debt stood at exactly \$5,016,596,270,543.66. On a per capita

basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$19,041.42 as his or her share of the Federal debt.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORT CONCERNING THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO CUBA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING RECESS—PM 125

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 4, 1995, the Secretary of the Senate, on March 1, 1996, during the recess of the Senate, received the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of The United States:

Pursuant to section 1 of title II of Public Law 65-24, ch. 30, 50 U.S.C. 191 and sections 201 and 301 of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*, United States Code, I hereby report that I have exercised my statutory authority to declare a national emergency in response to the Government of Cuba's destruction of two unarmed U.S.-registered civilian aircraft in international airspace north of Cuba.

In the proclamation (copy attached), I have authorized and directed the Secretary of Transportation to make and issue such rules and regulations that the Secretary may find appropriate to prevent authorized U.S. vessels from entering Cuban territorial waters.

I have authorized these rules and regulations as a result of the Government of Cuba's demonstrated willingness to use reckless force, including deadly force, in the ostensible enforcement of its sovereignty. I have determined that the unauthorized departure of vessels intending to enter Cuban territorial waters could jeopardize the safety of certain U.S. citizens and other persons residing in the United States and threaten a disturbance of international relations. I have, accordingly, declared a national emergency in response to these threats.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 1, 1996.

REPORT CONCERNING THE INTER-AGENCY ARCTIC RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 126

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 108(b) of Public Law 98-373 (15 U.S.C. 4701(b)), I transmit herewith the Sixth Biennial Report of the Interagency Arctic Research Policy Committee (February 1, 1994, to January 31, 1996).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 5, 1996.

REPORT CONCERNING REVISED DEFERRAL OF BUDGETARY RESOURCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 127

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975 as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on the Budget, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, and the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report one revised deferral, totaling \$91 million, and two proposed rescissions of budgetary resources, totaling \$15 million.

The deferral affects the Department of State U.S. emergency refugee and migration assistance fund. The rescission proposals affect the Department of Agriculture and the General Services Administration.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 5, 1996.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 4, 1995, the Secretary of the Senate, on March 4, 1996, during the adjournment of the Senate, announcing that the House insists upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1004) to authorize appropriations for the U.S. Guard, and for other purposes, and asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and appoints the following Members as the managers of the conference on the part of the House:

From the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for consideration of the Senate and the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. COBLE, Mrs.