

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 birthweight 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.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, on the basis that I mentioned earlier, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KERRY. 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. KERRY. Mr. President, this conference report that we are now considering on H.R. 1561 is not a traditional nuts-and-bolts authorization bill for the Departments of State, USIA, and ACDA. It is, regrettably, a nonbipartisan and controversial bill in its current form.

This bill seeks to reorganize the foreign affairs agencies of the executive branch by forcing on the President a consolidation of one Agency, USIA, AID, or ACDA, even though the administration has made it very, very clear that is unacceptable to them. So, for that reason alone, this particular bill is subject to veto by the President. He has said that he will, indeed, veto it on that basis. I think it is regrettable we are going to take the time of the Senate to go through the process of sending the President something that he has already said he is going to veto, but that is what we are going to do.

But there are other implications in here. If a President of the United States asserts constitutional authority with respect to particular prerogatives within the formulation of the conduct of American foreign policy, it seems to me we ought to be careful to at least examine, if not respect at face value, those assertions with respect to that constitutional authority. And I think that there are legitimate questions here about whether or not it is appropriate, if the President says that is a prerogative and he does not want to be forced into that position, whether or not we should not respect that and create a different formulation by which we end up with the same result.

We did offer a different formulation by which we would end up with the same result during the course of the conference. That was rejected. Specifically, we offered the same amount of savings that we will achieve under the numbers in this bill—actually, a slightly lower aggregate amount of savings—but we recommended that we only hold out the threat of closure of these agencies if the President refused to return to us a sufficient plan with respect to the reorganization of our foreign policy agencies, and we had the right to determine whether or not we thought that

was a sufficient plan. If we did not, we could reject it and start again.

In addition to that, there are a series of policy issues attached to what should, in normal circumstances, be a nuts-and-bolts reauthorization. Those policy decisions, each and every one of them, present their own set of problems. One such policy issue is the very, very significant alteration of our relationship with China, it might be said, literally shaking the foundations of that relationship at a very precarious time in our dealings with both China and Taiwan. I will have more to say about that subsequently, as will other colleagues.

In addition to that, it undermines the President's July 1995 decision with respect to normalization with Vietnam, and puts language into the authorizing process that, in effect, sets back our accountability process on the POW/MIA's.

Furthermore, it fails to meet the administration's budget requests for fiscal year 1997, particularly for the critical account of peacekeeping. The United States is engaged, as we all know, in most critical peacekeeping efforts in the world, most recently in Bosnia. To suggest the Congress is going to be unwilling to meet what we know are the agreed-upon figures and responsibilities for those peacekeeping efforts is simply irresponsible. Moreover, it sends a very, very dangerous, damaging message to our relationships with our allies.

Yesterday, I had the privilege of having a meeting with our Ambassador to the United Nations, Ambassador Albright, whom I think most would agree has been really doing an outstanding job on our behalf in New York at the United Nations. She relates that, literally in every debate, in every single effort, now, to try to bring our allies along on some particular effort, she meets with not just resistance, but a level of cynicism and scorn with respect to the United States' arrearages and the United States' slowness in paying with respect to peacekeeping.

Even in Bosnia, we are \$200 million shy of a \$200 million commitment. And the on-the-ground effort which the European representative, Carl Bildt, is trying to implement on our behalf and the European's behalf, is significantly restrained by virtue of the perception that we are not serious, we are not there, we are not going to really leverage this and try to guarantee that the on-the-ground civilian component can be as successful as the on-the-ground military component has been to date.

In addition to that, the United States-assessed contributions to the United Nations and its related agencies, as well as ACDA and the International Exchange Programs, are all significantly underfunded for the 1997 year.

I know, as my colleagues know, there is no easier whipping boy in the United States today than foreign policy and the United Nations. If you want to get

applause at a local meeting at home, if you want to get people to kind of vent some of their anger at the waste of Washington, all you have to do is say to them, "By God, I think the money ought to be going here to X, Y, or Z town instead of to these foreign efforts." And most people will automatically cheer and say you are absolutely correct.

When you ask most Americans how much money they think is going into our foreign policy effort, it is really amazing how far off most Americans are. I go to town meeting after town meeting; when the issue comes up, I say, "How much do you think we are paying for foreign assistance, foreign aid? Do you think it is 20 percent of the budget?" And a number of hands go up. "Do you think it is 15 percent of the budget?" Quite a few hands go up. "Do you think it is 10, 9, 8 percent of the budget?" A lot of hands go up, the vast majority. "Is it 5 percent of the budget?" And you get the remainder of the hands with the exception of a few.

Then, when you finally get down and say, "Is it 1 percent or less of the budget," I usually have one or two hands go up. That is what it is. That is what it is. It is 1 percent or less. It is less than 1 percent of the budget of the United States that we commit to all of our interests in terms of peacekeeping, AID, efforts to leverage peace in the Middle East. And most of the money, as we know, is contained within, almost, two items, Egypt and Israel, but significant portions are spread around with respect to some of the development programs and other efforts to curb drugs, narcotics, money laundering, immigration—a whole lot of things that we try to do in that field, including, I might add, one of the most important of all today: our economic enterprises.

We are shortchanging ourselves in places like Hong Kong, Singapore, the Far East, with respect to our Foreign Commercial Service, where we are losing countless job opportunities for Americans, countless manufacturing opportunities in this country, because we do not have the people on the ground sufficient to marry those opportunities with the opportunities in this country. That is extraordinarily shortsighted, because we could pay their salaries many times over in a matter of months, and I think that has been proven many times over.

So, Mr. President, the current level of funding is a very significant issue to the administration, and the administration has appropriately, in my judgment, suggested that those numbers are sufficiently low that that is a reason to veto this bill.

In addition to that, there still is no satisfactory solution to the question of family planning, and it is ultimately a bill that, in my judgment, is deficient.

I think many of my colleagues know that Senator HELMS and I have been grappling in good faith with the central and perhaps most controversial