

back on the very reform law that we passed a few months ago. We must not do it.

There should not be any broad exemptions for these political conventions. We ought to live up to the law of the land that we passed. We ought to live up to this reform. We all ought to go by very high standards. I think people want us to.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1996 AND 1997—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the conference report.

Mr. HELMS. Now, Mr. President, will the Chair review for me the unanimous consent in terms of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The agreement is 2 hours under the control of the Senator from North Carolina, Senator HELMS, or his designee; 2 hours under the control of Senator KERRY or his designee; 2 hours under the control of Senator NUNN; 3 hours under the control of Senator JOHNSTON; and 1 hour under the control of Senator FEINSTEIN.

Mr. HELMS. That makes 2 hours on our side. That is a total of 10 hours.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ten hours.

Mr. HELMS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. President, the Senate now has before it the conference report accompanying H.R. 1561, which, of course, is the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996 and 1997.

This bill authorizes \$6.5 billion for the operation of the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for 1996 and 1997. That represents a \$500 million cut from fiscal year 1995 spending.

After 1996, the bill authorizes funding for the State Department and requires the President to abolish at least one of the three anachronistic foreign affairs agencies: Either the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the U.S. Agency for International Development, or the U.S. Information Agency.

During the course of this debate, some may attempt to portray this legislation as isolationist. I hear that all the time. But you better not go out and ask the taxpayers of America what they think of it, because they do not agree with these people who cry isolationism.

These people who oppose this bill and have opposed it will not ever, of course, mention that the Secretary of State,

Warren Christopher, himself proposed the abolishment of not one but all three of these agencies. The fact is likely to be ignored, as well, that such prominent isolationists as Henry Kissinger, George Shultz, Larry Eagleburger, General Al Haig, and Jim Baker, all five being former Secretaries of State, support this, testified on behalf of it, and urged that we pare back these anachronistic, bloated foreign affair agencies. Of course, the media did not say much about that. They never do.

This bill, of course, does not cut the muscle out of our foreign affairs apparatus. What it does do is cut the fat—a little bit of it—by making deep and necessary reductions in the current bloated and unwieldy Federal bureaucracy that says it is dedicated to foreign affairs.

This bill cuts \$500 million from the 1995 spending level. I have already said that. I do not think that is isolationism. If it is isolationism, Mr. President, let us make the most of it, because if I could have my full way, we would cut even more deeply across the board and save the taxpayers billions upon billions of dollars, not only in terms of the State Department but all across this bloated Federal bureaucracy.

This bill is simply a recognition that the U.S. Government wants too much money and desperately needs to reduce the \$5 trillion Federal debt that has been piled up and will be dumped on the backs of young people. Simply put, the State Department can and must do more with less, and the greatest advocates of that have been the present Secretary of State, before he was instructed to take a hike, and five former Secretaries of State, who stood up and said, "This needs to be done."

Most important, in agreeing to this conference report, the Senate has an opportunity to send to the President of the United States a bill to disestablish at least one anachronistic Federal agency and, thereby, save the American taxpayers \$1.7 billion. It was my intent, when I embarked on this legislation, to do far better than that, but the distinguished Presiding Officer knows what happened all of last year, and for most of this year—it was filibustered. There were instructions from the White House to delay and obfuscate and not to let this bill pass because it will cost some bureaucrats their jobs. So they filibustered. And only when the Senator from North Carolina said, "All right, if you are going to filibuster this bill, you are not going to get any more ambassadors, and you can tell your President that." Pretty soon, they said, "Let's make a deal." When they made a deal, they got the ambassadors. But if they had not made a deal, at least to have a vote on this legislation, those ambassadors would still be sitting twiddling their thumbs.

Let me remind all involved that Republicans were elected in 1994, in the majority of both the House and Senate,

to cut the size of the Federal Government and to eliminate waste by the Federal Government. And this is the first piece of legislation to be sent to the President of the United States which will result in one agency—one anachronistic Federal agency—being abolished.

I sat at home the night that the President delivered his State of the Union Address. I would rather be with Dot Helms than go to any State of the Union Address. She is a lot better company. I heard the President say over and over again—it was a great show, by the way—"The era of big Government is over." Do you remember him saying that? Some people cheered, including the few conservatives who were sitting down there. Well, the President will soon have the opportunity to prove that he meant that. But, already, the White House is sending word that the President is going to veto this bill, minimal as it may be.

Mr. President, after months of foot-dragging and calculated delays, our friends on the other side grudgingly allowed our reform efforts to be voted on in the Senate and went into a conference committee with the House of Representatives. Mr. President, I have participated, during my nearly 24 years in the Senate, in a lot of conferences. But this conference was one of the most peculiar I have ever seen or heard about, let alone participated in. Prior to the convening of the conference between the House and the Senate, the Democrat Senators made three demands, and I believe the majority made every possible good-faith effort to meet those demands. First was on the question of funding levels. This conference report is consistent with the Commerce, State, Justice appropriations bill on nearly every account. The funding levels contained in this bill are the best that the President of the United States is going to get from a Republican Congress.

Second, despite receiving no input whatsoever—not a syllable—a bipartisan attempt was made to work out an acceptable compromise on population funding. That not being possible, the entire issue was then set aside for later consideration.

Finally, the Democrats demanded that no more aid provisions be included in the final conference agreement. Again, the majority agreed and obliged. Except for the Peace Corps and some antinarcotics funding, there are no foreign aid authorizations in this bill. Important provisions necessary to bring peace in Ireland and to end the embargo of Armenia are included. What do you know? Despite all of these concessions that we made, when the conference began, not one Senate Democratic conferee—except for JOHN KERRY of Massachusetts, with one brief visit by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, Senator PELL—attended any meeting of the conference. Senator PELL just visited briefly one time, and JOHN KERRY was there for a while.

Now, the conference met on five separate occasions over a period of 2 weeks, and never did any other Democratic member of the Foreign Relations Committee even set foot in the room.

Mr. President, the Office of Management and Budget recommends that the President veto this bill when it is presented to him. According to an OMB statement, one reason the President should veto the bill is because "it fails to remedy the severe limitation on U.S. population assistance programs placed in the fiscal year 1996 foreign operations bill."

Do not be deceived by the words "population assistance program." It has nothing to do with assisting the population. It has everything to do with unborn babies that the Federal Government wants to finance to be killed.

Now, I suggest, however, that if the President agrees with OMB, then he should not have signed the foreign operations bill if he did not approve of the abortion-related provision in that because it is strange indeed that the President would veto this bill because it does not fix a problem that he, himself, the President, created when he signed the appropriations bill. So that is the inconsistency that we have run into all along.

Mr. President, the distinguished occupant of the Oval Office apparently wants to have his cake and eat it, too. Further, the Office of Management and Budget recommended to the President that he veto the bill because it terminates the Agency for International Development's housing guarantee program. Now, what OMB kept secret, though, was the fact that this program is the international equivalent to the U.S. savings and loan bailout just a few years ago. The General Accounting Office, when recommending the termination of this program reported: "We estimate that the cost to the U.S. Government of future loan default from the existing portfolio of loans is likely to be an additional \$600 million."

That is on top of the \$400 million already lost, Mr. President. Yet, AID and others in this administration, have been struggling for more than a year to keep this sorry program alive. I suspect that when the American people learn—if the media will dare let them know about it—that Congress has passed and the President has vetoed a bill that would save \$1.7 billion and abolish one of those temporary Federal agencies created in 1950—in the 1950's, at least—I think the American people are going to have a definite reaction. By the way, Ronald Reagan used to say, "There is nothing as close to eternal life as a temporary Federal agency." He was right about that. We are trying to do away with one of them. We are not getting anywhere much. But we will see.

Let me take a moment to recognize the valuable work that has been performed by other of my colleagues on this side of the aisle who served as con-

ferees on this bill—Senator HANK BROWN, Senator COVERDELL, Senator ASHCROFT. Most important, I want to pay my respects to the distinguished Senator from Maine, Ms. SNOWE, who chaired the International Operations Subcommittee and who has worked faithfully side by side with me and others to move this bill forward as best we could in the face of a total blockade by the other side. Senator SNOWE is most knowledgeable about the intricacies of the State Department and the international operations budget.

Well, Mr. President, here we are. We are now at the point, as the saying goes, where "the rubber meets the road." A vote against this conference report is a reaffirmation of the status quo which has contributed so much to the \$5 trillion Federal debt that has been run up by the Congress of the United States. Do not blame any President, Democrat or Republican. The damage was done right here and in the House of Representatives. This is where that \$5 trillion debt was run up because we could have stopped it.

Those of us over the period of the last 23 years and 3 months, as far as I am concerned, who tried to hold down the spending were described by the liberal media as being tight-fisted and ultraconservative. But I think the young people, when they realize what the Congress of the United States has done in dumping this \$5 trillion debt on the American people, are going to have a small revolution of their own. I hope it will start in November among those who are 18 or older.

By the way, Mr. President, back in February 1992, I realized that nobody was paying much attention to the Federal debt which at that time stood at about, as I recall, \$3.5 trillion. I think it was February 22 or 23 that I decided to begin making a daily report to the Senate on the Federal debt as of the close of business the previous day. On Mondays the report, of course, was for the close of business the previous Friday.

One day I went into the Cloakroom where Senators were awaiting a roll-call vote that had been scheduled by unanimous consent. I got to thinking about how big \$1 trillion is. I went in, and I said, "Fellows, how many million are there in a trillion?" I had all sorts of guesses. These are the folks, myself included, who have been here when this debt has been run up. Only one of them, as I recall, had the vaguest notion of how many million there are in a trillion. Finally one of them got out a piece of paper and scribbled it down. He said, "There are a million million in a trillion." What do you know about that? Now we owe 5 million million dollars—"we" being the coming generation, in the main.

I think that is a criminal act on the part of the Congress of the United States—to run up that debt for these young people to pay.

In any case, a vote in favor of this pending conference report will be a

vote to cut Federal spending by \$1.7 billion for the American taxpayers while shutting down at least one anachronistic, wasteful, bloated, antiquated agency.

I reserve the remainder of my time and yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, since last year we have been working hard to reform the foreign policy bureaucracy—to save the taxpayers nearly \$2 billion and to get our foreign policy machinery working smoothly. This bill takes a big leap forward in that direction.

And, this bill does even more. It supports numerous U.S. foreign policy goals—from Europe to Asia—at a time when our interests are being challenged around the globe.

In addition to State Department reorganization, this bill has many other important provisions including:

The Humanitarian Aid Corridors Act, which prohibits U.S. aid to other governments does not block U.S. assistance to needy populations;

Full funding of the administration's request for assistance to Israel;

Funding for the International Fund for Ireland and provisions to encourage recipients to use business practices consistent with the so-called MacBride Principles;

A mandate for the establishment of Radio Free Asia and the beginning of broadcasts into China and other Communist countries in Asia;

Prior notice of Security Council votes on U.N. peacekeeping activities and a limitation of the U.S. assessment percentage for U.N. peacekeeping to 25 percent;

Authorization for the Bosnia and Herzegovina and self-defense fund to provide \$100 million to arm and train Bosnian Federation Forces.

The list goes on and on. The Point is that no matter how hard the administration tries to muddy the waters with its long list of objections—no matter how much rhetoric administration officials spew forth—it is clear that the Clinton administration is more interested in protecting the foreign policy bureaucracy and promoting the status quo, than protecting and promoting American interests.

We've heard the administration's objections, but let's look at the facts. This bill is silent on abortion. With respect to Vietnam, the Congress is only requiring that the President certify that his own stated criteria have been met before relations with Vietnam are upgraded. This legislation supports U.S. foreign policy interests and only limits bureaucratic redundancy and inefficiency. This bill allows our limited foreign aid dollars to go further.

Mr. President, to threaten to veto this bill is irresponsible. To actually veto this bill is inexcusable.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time in the quorum call be deducted proportionately from both sides controlling the time.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for up to 5 minutes as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HELMS. To be charged to each side. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair. I thank my distinguished colleague from North Carolina.

#### TEEN PREGNANCY PREVENTION WEEK

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to comment about the establishment of Teen Pregnancy Prevention Week in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania from March 18 to March 24, and about a meeting of a number of people at Central High School in Philadelphia on Friday, March 15, at 3 p.m. where a group of educators, ministers, students, and I spoke briefly about this subject.

There is enormous controversy on the subject of pro-choice, pro-life, but there is a consensus that there ought to be the maximum effort made toward prevention of teen pregnancy and that, to the extent possible, information should be distributed and there ought to be positive peer pressure on teens on the subject of abstinence.

The birth rate among teenagers remains at a surprisingly and alarmingly high level compared to those of nearly all other developed countries. In Pennsylvania, the pregnancy rate is 58.3 per 1,000 females aged 15 to 25.

A proclamation was adopted which I ask unanimous consent to be printed at the conclusion of these remarks on Teen Pregnancy Prevention Week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, this is in line with efforts which are now being made by the Appropriations Subcommittee which I chair, Labor, Health, Human Services and Education, to allocate more funding for Title XX on abstinence. This is a funding issue which I have been active in at the specific request of our colleague, Senator Jeremiah Denton, who was a major spokesman for this issue prior to his departure from the Senate back in 1987.

Mr. President, it is my intention to introduce legislation to increase funding and authorization on the abstinence issue and, also, legislation to promote adoption with tax breaks. My staff and I are currently in the process of securing cosponsors for that legislation, which I anticipate introducing sometime in the latter portion of April.

Mr. President, at this point, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the proclamation be printed in the RECORD together with the list of the

speakers who spoke at the Teen Pregnancy Prevention Week press conference back on March 15, 1996, together with a copy of the "Dear Colleague" letter which I am circulating with the request that any of my colleagues who wish to support this legislation let me know so they may be added as cosponsors.

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

PHILADELPHIA FAMILY POLICY COUNCIL,  
Philadelphia, PA, March 14, 1996.

#### TEEN PREGNANCY PREVENTION WEEK PRESS CONFERENCE SPEAKERS LIST

1. William Devlin, Director, Philadelphia Family Policy Council.
2. Reverend Ray Barnard, pastor, Impacting Your World Christian Center.
3. Dr. Della Blair, Founder and Director, Blair Christian Academy.
4. Dr. Keith Herzog, pediatrician, affiliated with Holy Redeemer Hospital and Medical Center and St. Christopher's Hospital for Children.
5. Reverend Herb Lusk, pastor, Greater Exodus Baptist Church.
6. Tim Julien, Senior at Central High School.
7. Monica Sneed, Junior at Girls' High.
8. Rachel Toliver, Junior at Central High School.
9. Dan Kim, student at Central High School.
10. Senator Arlen Specter; Signing of Proclamation.

U.S. SENATE,  
SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,  
Washington, DC, March 25, 1996.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I am writing to urge you to cosponsor two bills I intend to introduce shortly: the Adolescent Family Life and Abstinence Education Act of 1996 and the Adoption Promotion Act of 1996.

While there are obviously great differences of opinion on the pro-life/pro-choice issue, there is a consensus that all efforts should be made to prevent unwanted teen pregnancies through abstinence. The first bill does just that.

Where tax breaks for adoption would encourage carrying to term, we should act on that as well. The second bill does just that.

The following describes the essence of the two bills:

Adolescent Family Life and Abstinence Education Act of 1996.—Reauthorizes the Adolescent Family Life (Title XX) program, which funds demonstration projects focusing on abstinence, adolescent sexuality, adoption alternatives, pregnancy and parenting. This program had bipartisan support when originally enacted in 1981 and when it was reauthorized in 1984. Authority for Title XX expired in 1985 and since then, the program has been operating under funding provided in the annual Labor, HHS, and Education Appropriations bill. For FY 1996, the Labor, HHS, and Education Appropriations Subcommittee, which I chair, has provided \$7.7 million for the Adolescent Family Life program. Congress should reauthorize Title XX to demonstrate our commitment to abstinence education and the physical and emotional health of adolescents.

The Adoption Promotion Act of 1996.—Provides tax incentives to encourage adoption, a policy which serves as a compassionate response to children whose own parents are unable or unwilling to care for them. This is particularly important in an era when so many teenagers are having babies and are unable to care for them. This proposal is

based substantially on the provisions contained in the balanced budget legislation which Congress passed in 1995 but was vetoed by the President.

I hope you will cosponsor one or both of these bills. If you are interested, please contact me or have your staff contact Dan Renberg at 224-4254.

Sincerely,

ARLEN SPECTER.

P.S. A more detailed statement of the bills is enclosed. My office and I would be glad to provide additional information upon request.

#### EXHIBIT 1

Whereas, In the United States, birth rates among teenagers remain at alarmingly high levels compared to those of nearly all other developed countries and in Pennsylvania, the pregnancy rate is 58.3 per 1,000 females ages 15-19; and

Whereas, the negative effects of early parenthood on the lifelong health, educational status, and financial condition of adolescents are well documented and babies born to teenage mothers are more prone to low birth-weight and to have medical and developmental problems, teenage pregnancy is a public health issue of serious concern. Still, it is just one symptom of the greater problem of teenage sexual activity which carries many additional risk; and

Whereas, sexually transmitted diseases (STD's) some of which can be easily cured but others of which can cause permanent damage, infertility, death or harm to an unborn child, continue to affect 3 million teenagers per year, a solution that offers complete protection from these diseases is needed; and,

Whereas, The emotional consequences of early sexual activity can include anxiety, regret, decreased self-esteem, confusion about intimacy and shattered dreams; and

Whereas, "Safe sex" is at best a relative concept since even consistent, correct use of condoms can not guarantee freedom from STD's or pregnancy and offers no protection from the emotional consequences of intimacy without commitment; and

Whereas, studies indicate a decrease in sexual activity among teenagers in recent years, a recent study indicated that 9 out of 10 youths want help in saying "no" to sexual pressure, and, abstinence programs designed for pre-teens and teenagers record a clear reduction both in teen pregnancy rates and teen sexual activity at large; and

Whereas, the people of the state of Pennsylvania are interested in the health and well being of youth, I recognize that young people must be taught the risks of pre-marital sexual activity, the benefits of abstinence prior to marriage, and how to build healthy relationships on a solid foundation. This indicates my belief in the strength and character of the young people of this fine state.

Now, therefore, I Arlen Specter, United States Senator From Pennsylvania, do hereby proclaim the week of March 18 to 24, 1996 to be Teen Pregnancy Prevention Week. I urge all citizens to take part in activities and observances designed to increase understanding of abstinence as the positive solution to the problems of teenage pregnancy and its related issues. This message is not one of mere prevention, but a message of hope. At the local, state, and national levels, I uphold and support the message of abstinence prior to marriage as the healthy alternative for all Pennsylvanians.

In witness thereof, I have hereunto set my hand.