

a captain of industry. As a matter of fact, Mr. Gressette started out as a country lawyer, which is about as far away from corporate America as one can get.

Born in rural St. Matthews, SC., Lawrence Gressette, Jr. was the son of a well-respected attorney who also served as one of the Palmetto State's most influential elected officials, State Senator L. Marion Gressette, Sr. Early on in life, Lawrence learned the importance of being a man of integrity and dedication, and he approached all his tasks with a keen sense of purpose. These characteristics have helped shape Lawrence's life and are a direct correlation to the many successes he has enjoyed. Whether it was during his days at Clemson, where he played football for the Tigers on scholarship and served as student body president; graduating first in his class at the School of Law at the University of South Carolina; building a successful practice as an attorney; or rising to the position of chairman and chief executive officer of the SCANA Corp., it was a commitment to hard work and honesty that paved the way for Lawrence Gressette to become one of the most influential and respected citizens of South Carolina.

While he did not follow his father's footsteps into public service, Lawrence Gressette, Jr. has certainly been a public spirited person, and he has repeatedly lent his time, name, and efforts to many causes, all of which had the goal of making the Palmetto State an even better place to call home. A devoted family man, he served his Nation as an Infantry officer in the U.S. Army, he serves on several boards and committees throughout the State, and he is very active in his community. For his efforts, he has been recognized on several occasions with awards and commendations, and most significantly, he has been awarded two honorary degrees from colleges and universities in South Carolina.

Mr. President, Lawrence Gressette, Jr., is about to step down as the head of the SCANA Corp. We are grateful for all his hard work and leadership in running not only one of our State's most important organizations, but for his commitment to helping make South Carolina one of the Nation's most economically dynamic States. We wish him great health and happiness in the years to come, as well as continued success in whatever endeavors he chooses to undertake.

TRIBUTE TO DR. JAY PHILIP SANFORD

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, perhaps one of the best kept secrets in the American medical community can be found not far from this Chamber, the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences [USUHS], located in Bethesda, MD. For more than the past 20 years, this institution has trained in excess of 2,000 doctors who have gone

on to serve our Nation either in one of the branches of the military, or in the Public Health Service. Without question, this university has greatly benefited the people and military personnel of the United States, and a tremendous debt is owed to the man who is known as the founding dean of this institution, Dr. Jay Philip Sanford. Unfortunately and sadly, Dr. Sanford passed away in October of last year.

To those who willingly risk their lives in order to ensure the security of the United States, there is probably no more comforting thought than to know that should they be wounded, they will receive excellent medical care. Indeed, advances in military medicine have helped to ensure that our service personnel will have access to the very best possible treatment and care no matter where they are located or what the conditions in which they are carrying out their duties. Whether it be the rugged and frigid mountains of Bosnia, or the harsh and hot deserts of Kuwait and Iraq, American military personnel do not want for the most advanced and competent medical care available. Without question, the corps of military medical professionals who have graduated from the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, and the research conducted at that facility, have a great deal to do with that success.

The success of USUHS is directly attributable to the guidance and hard work of Dr. Sanford, who truly molded that university into the respected institution it has become. Established in 1972 at the direction of Congress, USUHS was to become a school that would prepare men and women for medical service careers in the Armed Forces and the U.S. Public Health Service. Not only creating a reliable source for military doctors, the university was to stress the instruction of the highly specialized fields of military medicine, preventive medicine, tropical medicine, and disaster medicine. It was the responsibility of Dr. Sanford to help build the university from the ground up, establishing curriculum, securing the necessary books and equipment required of a first-rate medical school, and ensuring that the first class of doctors would graduate from that school in 1980, as required by law. Dr. Sanford rose to the daunting challenge presented him, and in the finest traditions of the military, succeeded in achieving his mission and opening the doors of USUHS on schedule.

For his many impressive achievements, as a doctor, a researcher, and an educator, Dr. Sanford was awarded no shortage of tributes and recognitions. Regrettably, space does not permit a complete recitation of all the accolades he was granted in his life, but I think my colleagues would be interested to know that his alma mater, the University of Texas Southwestern Medical School established the Jay P. Sanford Lectureship in Infectious Diseases, and the Jay P. Sanford Professorship;

and, USUHS established the Sanford Chair in Tropical Medicine, as well as creating the Jay P. Sanford Distinguished Alumnus Award. Furthermore, in addition to serving as the third president of USUHS, Dr. Sanford was awarded the doctor of military medicine degree [Honoris Causa], the USUHS Distinguished Service Medal, and the Department of Defense Civilian Service Medal.

Despite all these recognitions, one cannot help but think that the distinction of which Dr. Sanford was most proud would be the creation and success of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences. In the years since the first class of doctors graduated from that school, USUHS trained physicians have supported American military operations throughout the world as well as have made many important contributions to the country through the Public Health Service. There is perhaps no greater legacy Dr. Sanford could have left than this institution which is dedicated to helping others. I do not exaggerate when I say that Dr. Sanford was a man who gave his all to our Nation and has left the United States a better place for his service. He will certainly be missed by all those who knew him, and his family has my deepest sympathies.

I yield the floor and 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. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is now closed.

APPROVING THE PRESIDENTIAL FINDING REGARDING THE POPULATION PLANNING PROGRAM

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 1:30 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 36, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 36) approving the Presidential finding that the limitation on obligations imposed by section 518A(a) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1997, is having a negative impact on the proper functioning of the population planning program.

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 hours of debate evenly divided.

Mr. LEAHY. I suggest the absence of a quorum equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the resolution that the President has submitted requesting the early release of population planning funds.

Last fall, in the waning hours of Congress, an agreement was reached by the White House and the leadership to make \$385 million available for family planning at a rate of 8 percent a month beginning in July. That date was agreed to so there would be no overlap of 1996 and 1997 funds.

The effect of the resolution before the Senate would be to virtually double the amount made available for population planning for 4 months this year. If the Senate passes the President's resolution, \$123 million more in funding will be available for organizations that support abortions and lobby to undermine laws which protect the unborn.

There are those who would like to suggest that this is merely a question of shifting dates. We are not arguing over whether money becomes available but when, so the argument goes. In fact, this debate centers on how much will be available, to which groups, and under what circumstances.

I believe those of us who support the pro-life position made significant concessions during the negotiations over the omnibus resolution. Not only did we agree to raise the overall level of funding from \$356 million in 1996 to \$385 million, the disbursement rate was increased from roughly 6 percent to 8 percent a month. Now the President wants to move up the date when disbursement begins.

Very few of us actually oppose making family planning funds available. There is general consensus that a responsible family planning policy has a positive impact on a nation's development. Everyone appreciates the consequences exploding population rates have on every aspect of a nation's well-being, from the availability of education, food and jobs, to the condition of the environment.

So let us all agree that there is no question that U.S. family planning funds are extremely helpful in the developing world. But there is also absolutely no question that when the United States decided to provide resources only to organizations that agreed not—to perform abortions and agreed not to lobby to legalize abortions, we were still the single largest global donor of family planning funds. This understanding is the heart of the so-called Mexico City policy, a policy that

resulted in steady increases in responsible U.S. family planning support, a policy that at the end of the Bush administration meant the United States contributed 45 percent of all family planning funds made available around the world.

There is a deep irony to this debate. On the one hand, the administration argues that the population program is in dire straits and beginning the funding in July will cause the closeout or reduction of at least 17 projects. Virtually all of those programs could be fully funded because they are carried out by organizations which meet the criteria of not supporting abortion or efforts to legalize abortion. In the misguided interest of protecting a few organizations, the administration is withholding support for the many willing to provide family planning services consistent with the Mexico City guidelines. They complain about the negative impact of cuts on funding yet are willing to forego an increase if it is linked to Mexico City. It does not make sense.

I support family planning, but I cannot and will not vote to provide funds to organizations which in the name of family planning take the lives of innocent, unborn children. I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution.

Mr. LEAHY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, there are several people on this side of this issue who will speak, and so I will be brief to retain time for them, and I will yield myself now such time as I need.

All Senators should understand what this vote is. It is really whether to approve the President's finding. The President's finding is that withholding until July 1 the release of the funds that Congress appropriated last September for international family planning would result in more unwanted pregnancies and abortions and harm programs to protect the health of women and children.

This is not whether you are for abortions or against abortions, whether you are for family planning or against it. We know in many parts of the world family planning is abortion because we do not have everything from birth control devices to training, so people rely on abortion. What this would do would really give alternatives to it. In a misguided effort by some foes of abortion last year, the funds were held up until now and, if anything, will result in more abortions, not less.

What I would like to see us do is release the funds for family planning and give people an alternative to abortion as a form of family planning. In fact, 2 weeks ago the House voted by a substantial margin to uphold the President's finding. That meant that Republicans and Democrats voted to uphold the President's finding, and the Senate is going to vote tomorrow.

Some say that approving the President's finding would result in spending

an additional \$123 million on abortion. Of course, that is false, totally, patently false. This vote will not change the amount spent on family planning by one dime. And, none of this money can be spent on abortion or to promote abortion. Our law prohibits that.

This is an extremely important vote, and there should be no confusion about what it is about. So let me first talk about what this is not, so all Senators, no matter on which side of the abortion issue he or she is, will understand why they can support this resolution. This vote is not about how much we are going to spend on international family planning. We already decided that. We decided that, I believe, last September when we passed the foreign aid bill. That bill contained \$385 million for family planning, and if we pass this resolution that amount is not going to change at all. If the resolution is defeated, the amount still will not change. So nobody should think we are voting to add or take away money.

The vote will also not affect how we spend the \$385 million. It will not affect, for instance, which family planning organizations receive the funds. So, no matter which way we vote today, we do not determine which groups receive the funds. It does not affect that. Nor will this vote decide in any way, no matter which way we vote, if the funds can be used for abortion or to promote abortion.

This vote will decide only one thing. All this vote decides is, what date do we start spending the \$385 million that we appropriated last year in the last Congress? It does not decide whether to spend it or how to spend it or what to spend it on, only whether we start spending the funds on July 1, 9 months after the start of the fiscal year, or March 1, 5 months after the start of the fiscal year.

You may ask, what difference does 4 months make, March 1, July 1, so what? If it did not make any difference, we would not even be here. But the difference is, there are tens of millions of people who will not have access to family planning services during those 4 months. We are talking about modern contraceptives, as well as condoms that protect against AIDS. This vote is about whether we should withhold family planning services to couples who desperately want to limit the size of their families or space the births of their children so their children survive past infancy.

We are not talking about money in a wealthy country like the United States. We are talking about money in the poorest of poor countries. We are talking about money so people might be able to space their children so they do not see, what so many of these countries do, children that die in the first year. In fact, a number of these countries do not even list a birth until the child is several months old, or even years old, because of the high number of infant deaths.

There is no more effective, practical way to reduce the number of abortions

than family planning. I could cite many examples. Here is one. Before 1990, a Russian woman averaged at least three abortions in her lifetime. From 1990 to 1994, with support from USAID, contraceptive use in Russia grew from 19 to about 24 percent. Just that 5-percent increase in the use of contraceptives resulted in a decrease in the number of abortions during that period by 800,000 abortions.

I would ask, how many of those who opposed that family planning money back during those years because somehow it might be used for abortion, how many of them are willing to stand up and say, "Because we spent it, we stopped 800,000 abortions in one country alone"? That should be the beginning and the end of this debate. If you are against abortion—and a number of Senators on this floor have voted for family planning money because, and primarily because, they are opposed to abortion, because they know this provides alternatives to abortion, just as we proved it did in Russia—just that 6 percent increase in contraceptive use cut the number of abortions by 800,000.

I ask unanimous consent a letter from Senator Mark Hatfield to Representative CHRIS SMITH be printed in the RECORD at end of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LEAHY. I mention this because Senator Hatfield was ardently, consistently pro-life for all his years here in the Senate. But I also know he is equally passionate about his support for family planning. He fully understood that when you limit access to family planning, the result is more abortions.

The other side will argue that since a tiny fraction of these funds may go to private organizations that provide abortions in countries like the United States where abortion is legal, the resolution should be defeated. There is no logic in that. What if the tables were turned and I argued that no family planning organization should receive U.S. Government funds unless they do use their own funds for abortion? There would be a big outcry, "It's big Government. How dare you tell these private groups what to do with their money?" That is not a road we want to go down. AID requires every dime to be kept in a separate account. We know how every dime of our money is spent. There has never been any evidence that any of these funds have been used for abortion. If there were, you can be sure we would have heard about it.

So let us start spending the money that we appropriated 5 months ago so it can do some good. The longer we wait, the more we add to the costs of administering the program, the more damage we cause to the health of women and children, the more unwanted pregnancies and abortions will result. It is that simple.

I would also say, this has become more of a political argument than an

argument based on reality. I do not hear any of the advocates of this position, of withholding this money, stand up and say, "Let's not send any of our foreign aid to any country that may use some of their money, their money in that country, to pay for abortions." I challenge those who oppose this resolution, if you want to prove that you are really sincere, if you want to prove you are not doing this because of some other agenda, then pass a law that says that no money, none of our foreign aid money, can go to any country that uses any of its money for abortion. That make no more sense than voting against this resolution.

Mr. President, I retain the remainder of my time.

EXHIBIT 1

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, September 24, 1996.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH,
House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office
Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHRIS: I have reviewed the materials you recently sent to my office in response to my request that you provide proof that U.S. funds are being spent on abortion through AID's voluntary international family planning program. Unfortunately, I do not see anything in these materials to back up your assertion.

AID has a rigorous process to make sure that the current prohibition on the use of U.S. funds is adhered to and that no U.S. funds are spent on abortion services. First, all agreements into which AID enters (grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements) include a legally binding and enforcement clause prohibiting the contractee from using the funds for abortion services. Second, AID staff monitor all agreements as they are implemented in the field to ensure that the agreements terms are being met. And finally, all grants with non-governmental organizations require a "Circular A-133 Audit" every one to two years. This audit looks not only at the financial aspects of the agreement, but reviews compliance with all terms of the agreement including the prohibition on the use of U.S. funds. The audit is done by an outside Big 8 accounting firm, not AID. According to AID, compliance with the funding prohibition has not been a problem.

In the meantime, Chris, you are contributing to an increase of abortions worldwide because of the funding restrictions on which you insisted in last year's funding bill. It is a proven fact that when contraceptive services are not available to women throughout the world, abortion rates increase. We have seen it in the former Soviet Union where women had no access to family planning and relied on abortion as their primary birth control method. Some women had between eight and twelve abortions during their lifetimes. This is unacceptable to me as someone who is strongly opposed to abortion.

It is my hope that we can work together to resolve this issue before AID's international family planning program is destroyed.

Kind regards,

Sincerely,

MARK O. HATFIELD,

U.S. Senator.

Mr. MCCONNELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has 44 minutes and 24 seconds.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for yielding.

Mr. President, I rise today in total support of sound policies which advance and uphold the sanctity of life and family, but in opposition to House Resolution 36. The issue, I believe, in fact, is not one of family planning but is, in fact, one of funding for abortion, organizations which promote and provide for abortions and lobby to change pro-life laws in countries where our foreign aid money goes.

First and foremost, allow me to recognize the importance of the two votes that took place in the House of Representatives on February 13. The Clinton resolution, which we will be voting on tomorrow—which unwisely, I believe, fails to include a ban on American taxpayer funding of organizations which provide and promote abortion—was successful by a vote of 220 to 209. But there was a second vote that occurred that day. The second vote, on H.R. 581, legislation of Congressman CHRIS SMITH, of New Jersey, reinstating the successful Mexico City policy and requiring foreign nongovernmental organizations receiving U.S. funds to agree not to violate the laws, or lobby to change the laws, of other countries with respect to abortion, or to perform abortions in those countries except in cases of rape, incest, or where the mother's life is in danger, that resolution by Congressman SMITH was passed by an even larger majority of 231 to 194. So I remind Senators that the Smith pro-life resolution passed by a far greater margin than did the Clinton resolution.

This vote certainly illustrates the simple fact that one can be for family planning programs while standing for life.

As the Members of this body might recall, I am the only legislator in Congress to have served in the Arkansas House of Representatives when President Clinton was Governor of Arkansas.

In October 1990, in response to written questions submitted by the Associated Press, the President, then Governor of Arkansas, said:

Under the present Arkansas law, abortion is illegal when the unborn child can live outside its mother's womb, I support that . . . I have supported restrictions on public funding and a parental notification requirement for minors.

I believe the President was absolutely correct when he took that position about funding for abortion, and that is the issue before us today. Despite President Clinton's repeated sentiments in wanting to lower the number of abortions performed, his actions,

since he took office 4 years ago, has spoken louder than his words.

In fact, President Clinton has actively fought to lift any and all restrictions on taxpayer-funded abortions, not with congressional approval but by the broad use of the Executive order. Besides refusing to reinstate the Mexico City policy, which had been working very successfully for a decade before he repealed it, he has also attempted to delete the ban on taxpayer funding of abortions and the ban on the use of funds to counsel persons on the practice of abortion. Similarly, his annual budgets have also proposed striking this pro-life language from the foreign operations appropriations bill.

We all know that congressional appropriations for U.S. population assistance have been delayed by the debate over the issue of U.S. funding for abortion and coercive birth control measures practiced by foreign countries.

Mr. President, at the second annual U.N. International Conference on Population in Mexico City in 1984, the Reagan administration announced that it would discontinue U.S. population aid to those nongovernmental organizations that were directly involved in voluntary abortion activities.

The Mexico City policy went a step beyond previous legislation that had been passed in the 1970's that specifically banned direct funding of abortions and involuntary sterilizations. The Mexico City policy banned funding to nongovernmental organizations that were indirectly involved in abortion-related activities.

Furthermore, the Reagan administration established a requirement that the U.N. Family Planning Agency provide "concrete assurances that it is not engaged in, or does not provide funding for abortion or coercive family planning assistance programs."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the original Mexico City policy be printed in the RECORD.

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

POLICY STATEMENT: INTERNATIONAL
CONFERENCE ON POPULATION

INTRODUCTION

For many years, the United States has supported, and helped to finance, programs of family planning, particularly in developing countries. This Administration has continued that support but has placed it within a policy context different from that of the past. It is sufficiently evident that the current exponential growth in global population cannot continue indefinitely. There is no question of the ultimate need to achieve a condition of population equilibrium. The differences that do exist concern the choice of strategies and methods for the achievement of that goal. The experience of the last two decades not only makes possible but requires a sharper focus for our population policy. It requires a more refined approach to problems which appear today in quite a different light than they did twenty years ago.

First and most important, population growth is, of itself, a neutral phenomenon. It is not necessarily good or ill. It becomes an asset or a problem only in conjunction with

other factors, such as economic policy, social constraints, need for manpower, and so forth. The relationship between population growth and economic development is not necessarily a negative one. More people do not necessarily mean less growth. Indeed, in the economic history of many nations, population growth has been an essential element in economic progress.

Before the advent of governmental population programs, several factors had combined to create an unprecedented surge in population over most of the world. Although population levels in many industrialized nations had reached or were approaching equilibrium in the period before the Second World War, the baby boom that followed in its wake resulted in a dramatic, but temporary, population "tilt" toward youth. The disproportionate number of infants, children, teenagers, and eventually young adults did strain the social infrastructure of schools, health facilities, law enforcement and so forth. However, it also helped sustain strong economic growth, despite occasionally counterproductive government policies.

Among the developing nations, a coincidental population increase was caused by entirely different factors. A tremendous expansion of health services—from simple inoculations to sophisticated surgery—saved millions of lives every year. Emergency relief, facilitated by modern transport, helped millions to survive flood, famine, and drought. The sharing of technology, the teaching of agriculture and engineering, and improvements in educational standards generally, all helped to reduce mortality rates, especially infant mortality, and to lengthen life spans.

This demonstrated not poor planning or bad policy but human progress in a new era of international assistance, technological advance, and human compassion. The population boom was a challenge; it need not have been a crisis. Seen in its broader context, it required a measured, modulated response. It provoked an overreaction by some, largely because it coincided with two negative factors which, together, hindered families and nations in adapting to their changing circumstances.

The first of these factors was governmental control of economies, a development which effectively constrained economic growth. The post-war experience consistently demonstrated that, as economic decision-making was concentrated in the hands of planners and public officials, the ability of average men and women to work towards a better future was impaired, and sometimes crippled. In many cases, agriculture was devastated by government price fixing that wiped out rewards for labor. Job creation in infant industries was hampered by confiscatory taxes. Personal industry and thrift were penalized, while dependence upon the state was encouraged. Political considerations made it difficult for an economy to adjust to changes in supply and demand or to disruptions in world trade and finance. Under such circumstances, population growth changed from an asset in the development of economic potential to a peril.

One of the consequences of this "economic statism" was that it disrupted the natural mechanism for slowing population growth in problem areas. The world's more affluent nations have reached a population equilibrium without compulsion and, in most cases, even before it was government policy to achieve it. The controlling factor in these cases has been the adjustment, by individual families, of reproductive behavior to economic opportunity and aspiration. Historically, as opportunities and the standard of living rise, the birth rate falls. In many countries, economic freedom has led to economically rational behavior.

That pattern might be well under way in many nations where population growth is today a problem, if counterproductive government policies had not disrupted economic incentives, rewards, and advancement. In this regard, localized crises of population growth are, in part, evidence of too much government control and planning, rather than too little.

The second factor that turned the population boom into a crisis was confined to the western world. It was an outbreak of an anti-intellectualism, which attacked science, technology, and the very concept of material progress. Joined to a commendable and long overdue concern for the environment, it was more a reflection of anxiety about unsettled times and an uncertain future. In its disregard of human experience and scientific sophistication, it was not unlike other waves of cultural anxiety that have swept through western civilization during times of social stress and scientific exploration.

The combination of these two factors—counterproductive economic policies in poor and struggling nations, and a pessimism among the more advanced—led to a demographic overreaction in the 1960's and 1970's. Scientific forecasts were required to compete with unsound, extremist scenarios, and too many governments pursued population control measures without sound economic policies that create the rise in living standards historically associated with decline in fertility rates. This approach has not worked, primarily because it has focused on a symptom and neglected the underlying ailments. For the last three years, this Administration has sought to reverse that approach. We recognize that in, some cases, immediate population pressures may require short-term efforts to ameliorate them. But population control programs alone cannot substitute for the economic reforms that put a society on the road toward growth and, as an after-effect, toward slower population increases as well.

Nor can population control substitute for the rapid and responsible development of natural resources. In commenting on the Global 2000 report, this Administration in 1981 disagreed with its call "for more government supervision and control," stating that: "Historically, that has tended to restrict the availability of resources and to hamper the development of technology, rather than to assist it. Recognizing the seriousness of environmental and economic problems, and their relationship to social and political pressures, especially in the developing nations, the Administration places a priority upon technologically advance and economic expansion, which hold out the hope of prosperity and stability of a rapidly changing world. That hope can be realized, of course, only to the extent that government's response to problems, whether economic or ecological, respects and enhances individual freedom, which makes true progress possible and worthwhile."

Those principles underlie this country's approach to the International Conference on Population to be held in Mexico City in August.

POLICY OBJECTIVES

The world's rapid population growth is a recent phenomenon. Only several decades ago, the population of developing countries was relatively stable, the result of a balance between high fertility and high mortality. There are now 4.5 billion people in the world, and six billion are projected by the year 2000. Such rapid growth places tremendous pressures on governments without concomitant economic growth.

The International Conference on Population offers the U.S. an opportunity to

strengthen the international consensus on the interrelationships between economic development and population which has emerged since the last such conference in Bucharest in 1974. Our primary objective will be to encourage developing countries to adopt sound economic policies and, where appropriate, population policies consistent with respect for human dignity and family values. As President Reagan stated, in his message to the Mexico City Conference:

"We believe population programs can and must be truly voluntary, cognizant of the rights and responsibilities of individuals and families, and respectful of religious and cultural values. When they are, such programs can make an important contribution to economic and social development, to the health of mothers and children, and to the stability of the family and of society."

U.S. support for family planning programs is based on respect for human life, enhancement of human dignity, and strengthening of the family. Attempts to use abortion, involuntary sterilization, or other coercive measures in family planning must be shunned, whether exercised against families within a society or against nations within the family of man. The United Nations Declaration of the Rights of the Child (1959) calls for legal protection for children before birth as well as after birth. In keeping with this obligation, the United States does not consider abortion an acceptable element of family planning programs and will no longer contribute to those of which it is a part. Accordingly, when dealing with nations which support abortion with funds not provided by the United States Government, the United States will contribute to such nations through segregated accounts which cannot be used for abortion. Moreover, the United States will no longer contribute to separate non-governmental organizations which perform or actively promote abortion as a method of family planning in other nations. With regard to the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA), the U.S. will insist that no part of its contribution be used for abortion. The U.S. will also call for concrete assurances that the UNFPA is not engaged in, or does not provide funding for, abortion or coercive family planning programs; if such assurances are not forthcoming, the U.S. will redirect the amount of its contribution to other, non-UNFPA family planning programs.

In addition, when efforts to lower population growth are deemed advisable, U.S. policy considers it imperative that such efforts respect the religious beliefs and culture of each society, and the right of couples to determine the size of their own families. Accordingly, the U.S. will not provide family planning funds to any nation which engages in forcible coercion to achieve population growth objectives.

U.S. Government authorities will immediately begin negotiations to implement the above policies with the appropriate governments and organizations.

It is time to put additional emphasis upon those root problems which frequently exacerbate population pressures, but which have too often been given scant attention. By focusing upon real remedies for underdeveloped economies, the International Conference on Population can reduce demographic issues to their proper place. It is an important place, but not the controlling one. It requires our continuing attention within the broader context of economic growth and of the economic freedom that is its prerequisite.

POPULATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND ECONOMIC POLICIES

Conservative projections indicate that, in the sixty years from 1950 to 2010, many Third

World countries will experience four, five or even sixfold increases in the size of their populations. Even under the assumption of gradual declines in birth rates, the unusually high proportion of youth in the Third World means that the annual population growth in many of these countries will continue to increase for the next several decades.

Sound economic policies and a market economy are of fundamental importance to the process of economic development. Rising standards of living contributed in a major way to the demographic transition from high to low rates of population growth which occurred in the U.S. and other industrialized countries over the last century.

The current situation of many developing countries, however, differs in certain ways from conditions in 19th century Europe and the U.S. The rates and dimensions of population growth are much higher now, the pressures on land, water, and resources are greater, the safety-valve of migration is more restricted, and, perhaps most important, time is not on their side because of the momentum of demographic change.

Rapid population growth compounds already serious problems faced by both public and private sectors in accommodating changing social and economic demands. It diverts resources from needed investment, and increases the costs and difficulties of economic development. Slowing population growth is not a panacea for the problems of social and economic development. It is not offered as a substitute for sound and comprehensive development policies. Without other development efforts and sound economic policies which encourage a vital private sector, it cannot solve problems of hunger, unemployment, crowding or social disorder.

Population assistance is an ingredient of a comprehensive program that focuses on the root causes of development failures. The U.S. program as a whole, including population assistance, lays the basis for well grounded, step-by-step initiatives to improve the well-being of people in developing countries and to make their own efforts, particularly through expanded private sector initiatives, a key building block of development programs.

Fortunately, a broad international consensus has emerged since the 1974 Bucharest World Population Conference that economic development and population policies are mutually reinforcing.

By helping developing countries slow their population growth through support for effective voluntary family planning programs, in conjunction with sound economic policies, U.S. population assistance contributes to stronger saving and investment rates, speeds the development of effective markets and related employment opportunities, reduces the potential resource requirements of programs to improve the health and education of the people, and hastens the achievement of each country's graduation from the need for external assistance.

The United States will continue its longstanding commitment to development assistance, of which population programs are a part. We recognize the importance of providing our assistance within the cultural, economic and political context of the countries we are assisting, and in keeping with our own values.

HEALTH AND HUMANITARIAN CONCERNS

Perhaps the most poignant consequence of rapid population growth is its effect on the health of mothers and children. Especially in poor countries, the health and nutrition status of women and children is linked to family size. Maternal and infant mortality rises with the number of births and with births

too closely spaced. In countries as different as Turkey, Peru, and Nepal, a child born less than two years after its sibling is twice as likely to die before it reaches the age of five, than if there were an interval of at least four years between the births. Complications of pregnancy are more frequent among women who are very young or near the end of their reproductive years. In societies with widespread malnutrition and inadequate health conditions, these problems are reinforced; numerous and closely spaced births lead to even greater malnutrition of mothers and infants.

It is an unfortunate reality that in many countries, abortion is used as a means of terminating unwanted pregnancies. This is unnecessary and repugnant; voluntary family assistance programs can provide a humane alternative to abortion for couples who wish to regulate the size of their family, and evidence from some developing countries indicates a decline in abortion as such services become available.

The basic objective of all U.S. assistance, including population programs, is the betterment of the human condition—improving the quality of life of mothers and children, of families, and of communities for generations to come. For we recognize that people are the ultimate resource—but this means happy and healthy children, growing up with education, finding productive work as young adults, and able to develop their full mental and physical potential.

U.S. aid is designed to promote economic progress in developing countries through encouraging sound economic policies and freeing of individual initiative. Thus, the U.S. supports a broad range of activities in various sectors, including agriculture, private enterprise, science and technology, health, population, and education. Population assistance amounts to about ten percent of total development assistance.

TECHNOLOGY AS A KEY TO DEVELOPMENT

The transfer, adaptation, and improvement of modern know-how is central to U.S. development assistance. People with greater know-how are people better able to improve their lives. Population assistance ensures that a wide range of modern demographic technology is made available to developing countries and that technological improvements critical for successful development receive support.

The efficient collection, processing, and analysis of data derived from census, survey, and vital statistics programs contributes to better planning in both the public and private sectors.

THE U.S. AT MEXICO CITY

In conjunction with the above statements of policy, the following principles should be drawn upon to guide the U.S. delegation at the International Conference on Population:

No. 1. Respect for human life is basic, and any attempt to use abortion, involuntary sterilization, or other coercive measures in family planning must be rejected.

No. 2. Population policies and programs should be fully integrated into, and reinforce, appropriate, market-oriented development policies; their objective should be clearly seen as an improvement in the human condition, and not merely an exercise in limiting births.

No. 3. Access to family education and services needs to be broadened, especially in the context of maternal/child health programs, in order to enable couples to exercise responsible parenthood. Consistent with values and customs, the U.S. favors offering couples a variety of medically approved methods.

No. 4. Though population factors merit serious consideration in development strategy, they are not a substitute for sound economic

policies which liberate individual initiative through the market mechanism.

No. 5. There should be higher international priority for biomedical research into safer and better methods of fertility regulation, especially natural family planning, and for operations research into more effective service delivery and program management.

No. 6. Issues of migration should be handled in ways consistent with both human rights and national sovereignty.

No. 7. The U.S., in cooperation with other concerned countries, should resist intrusion of polemical or non-germane issues into Conference deliberations.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, 2 days after his 1993 swearing-in ceremony, President Clinton submitted an Executive order repealing the Mexico City policy. This repeal now allows American taxpayer funds to be given to the United Nations planning agency in support of coercive abortions and involuntary sterilization, commonly practiced in places like China, a position which is completely contrary to the desires of the American people.

I sincerely consider these practices of involuntary sterilization and coercive abortion to be well outside the boundaries of what can be legitimately called family planning.

Most organizations agreed to the terms of the Mexico City policy, even giving up their pro-abortion activities in some cases, in order to receive U.S. funds. It did not decrease by even 1 penny the amount of funding for international population control assistance programs. Rather, it ensured that family planning dollars were sent to organizations which neither promoted nor performed abortion as a method of family planning.

Furthermore, since 1973, when Congress passed the Helms amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act, Federal law has prohibited direct payment of most abortion procedures with U.S. foreign aid funds. The Helms language was also included in the annual foreign operations appropriations bill last year.

For most of the years it has been in effect, the Helms amendment has not been challenged either in the Foreign Assistance Act or in the foreign operations appropriations bill. However, since President Clinton has been in office, he has continually sought to repeal the Helms amendment ban on foreign abortion funding, thereby subverting the will of the vast majority of Americans.

The American people overwhelmingly oppose the use of taxpayer funds to perform or promote abortion. And at one time, I might add, so did President Clinton. On September 26, 1986, then Governor Clinton wrote the following letter to the Arkansas Right to Life:

I am opposed to abortion and to Government funding of abortions. We should not spend State funds on abortions because so many people believe abortion is wrong.

And the logic of the President, then Governor Clinton, was exactly right. I ask unanimous consent that the letter to the Arkansas Right to Life dated

September 26, 1986 be printed in the RECORD.

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

ARKANSAS RIGHT TO LIFE,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Little Rock, AR, September 26, 1986.

Earlene Windsor,
Arkansas Right to Life,
Little Rock, AR.

DEAR MRS. WINDSOR: Thank you for giving me the opportunity to respond to the Arkansas Right to Life Questionnaire. However, most of the questions address federal issues outside the authority of a governor or the state.

Because many of the questions do concern the issue of abortion, I would like for your members to be informed of my position on the state's responsibility in that area. I am opposed to abortion and to government funding of abortions. We should not spend state funds on abortions because so many people believe abortion is wrong. I do support the concept of the proposed Arkansas Constitutional Amendment 65 and agree with its stated purpose. As I have said, I am concerned that some questions about the amendment's impact appear to remain unanswered.

Again, thank you for allowing me to share my position on this important issue.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, because of the concerns of the Clinton administration's population assistance policy, this Congress added language that requires any amount that the United Nations population fund spends on family planning programs in China be deducted from its total United States appropriation.

Communist China has one of the worst human rights records in the world, promoting forced abortions and sterilizations to limit births. It is a country which has little regard for human life and, in particular, the lives of little baby girls. Press reports are filled with accounts of beautiful female children who are abandoned by their families because under China's one-child-per-family rule, male children are considered more desirable. This policy is and should be offensive to all civilized people.

If the administration's resolution is passed by the Senate tomorrow, the American taxpayer will become an unwilling participant in China's outrageous practices because some of the \$25 million designated for United Nations population fund will go to China.

Without the Mexico City policy, the United States will be giving money to such countries and organizations which blatantly promote and support pro-abortion policies and procedures. This should be unacceptable to all of us.

While I believe the United States can provide meaningful assistance to countries attempting to control their population growth, I adamantly oppose American taxpayer funding for abortion both home and abroad.

While I will continue to support continued U.S. population assistance programs, I also believe that the United States should encourage the development of market economies which im-

prove the standard of living for growing populations.

This resolution came about because of the Clinton administration's refusal to accept pro-life language preventing AID grantees from using foreign aid dollars to promote abortion.

Mr. President, please remember at the end of the last Congress, White House negotiator and former Chief of Staff, Leon Panetta, adamantly rejected a proposal which would have allowed AID to spend as much as \$713 million for international family planning by the end of the fiscal year. This takes into account \$303 million carried over from fiscal year 1996.

The proposal provided \$385 million for population control programs, in addition to \$25 million for the U.N. Family Planning Agency. If an organization did not agree to the terms of the Mexico City policy, it would only receive up to 50 percent of the population funds it received in fiscal year 1995. All the fiscal year 1997 funds would be available in fiscal year 1997.

The administration rejected this proposal because of the nominal pro-life conditions on the fiscal year 1997 funds. Even without the other evidence of the Clinton administration's abortion activities, this stand by the administration is a clear admission that family planning funds are used to establish, sustain, and build up abortion providers and pro-abortion lobbying in developing countries, and the ability of AID grantees to perform and promote abortion in developing countries is the real priority of the administration.

It is obvious that this battle will be renewed each year on the foreign operations appropriations bill until the pro-life position prevails, as it has ultimately prevailed on the Hyde amendment, the ban on Federal employees health benefits coverage of abortions, the prohibition on abortions in military hospitals, and all other pro-life amendments which became law over the President's opposition.

I cannot stand here today and believe the Clinton administration's claim that it wants to reduce the number of abortions when United States dollars are given to organizations which actually perform abortions and which lobby to legalize abortions in countries like Latin America, Africa, and other regions of the world which recognize the humanity and the value of the lives of unborn children.

The Clinton administration continues to emphasize that no U.S. funding goes directly to abortion practices. However U.S. funding is allocated to organizations like International Planned Parenthood Federation, which receives \$70 million from the United States. The IPPF makes no secret of their pro-abortion commitment, which is apparent in their "Vision 2000 Strategic Plan."

With millions of U.S. dollars each year providing funding for the IPPF's lobbying campaigns, overhead, and utilities, how can we then say that

American taxpayer dollars are not being used to fund abortions? I believe they certainly obviously are.

Mr. President, we must end this practice of the IPPF and similar groups exploiting the hard-earned dollars of every taxpaying citizen across this great Nation.

The will of the American people is being subverted by this policy. Americans do not want Federal tax dollars being used for abortions. This applies to our foreign aid policies as well as our domestic agenda.

Mr. President, I will leave you today with a quote from Mother Teresa of Calcutta. Mother Teresa made this comment on February 3, 1994, at the National Prayer Breakfast. Many of us were in attendance that day. I was there and so was the President. I believe that this statement speaks volumes. She said:

But I feel that the greatest destroyer of peace today is abortion, because it is a war against the child, a direct killing of the innocent child.

The issues in this debate are not just family planning, whether millions of pro-life American taxpayers will be required to help foot the bill for a practice they find morally reprehensible; but also ceding control of taxpayer dollars to foreign governments over which we have no control. I believe that is unacceptable. I think it is wrong to ask pro-life American taxpayers to foot the bill for that which they find morally offensive and morally wrong. I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin is on the floor. How much time does he wish?

Mr. FEINGOLD. Eight minutes.

Mr. LEAHY. I yield 8 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Thank you, Mr. President.

I rise today in support of House Joint Res. 36 to uphold a Presidential finding regarding the provision of international family planning assistance.

I thank the senior Senator from Vermont for his leadership on this issue.

Let me just briefly clarify a point with regard to the remarks of the junior Senator from Arkansas, who indicated his belief that this resolution would impact the UNFPA program. My understanding is that the resolution is not related to that program at all, that the resolution in question today has to do with USAID funds. If there is any error in that regard, I would be happy to be corrected, but my understanding is that what we are dealing with here is USAID money. So the arguments concerning funding for UNFPA do not relate to the topic we are discussing today.

Mr. President, by voting to uphold this resolution, the Senate will express

agreement with the President that further delays in the disbursement of funds in the population account will cause undue hardship for the organizations that carry out U.S. international population programs. In fact, President Clinton has said that "a delay will cause serious, irreversible and unavoidable harm" to these programs.

U.S. assistance to voluntary family planning supports a broad array of products and services for maternal and child health—including family planning education, clinical services, and birth control. These programs have proved enormously effective—not only in improving the health of hundreds of thousands of women and children, but also in reducing the pressures that rapid population growth places on food and water, on housing and education, and on forests and trees in developing countries.

Perhaps most importantly, studies indicate that international family planning programs can have a tremendous impact on limiting the number of unintended pregnancies throughout the world, which—ultimately—greatly decreases the perceived need or demand for abortions.

Now let me reiterate this point, because it is extremely important. This vote actually will have the effect of limiting the number of abortions conducted worldwide.

This vote also is a referendum on how the Senate views family planning. Does the Senate support the provision of family planning services to women and men in the developing world, or does it not?

I know that several Senators will speak today about the awful consequences that will result if we fail to uphold the Presidential certification. Each one of us will highlight some area of the world, or the provision of some service, that will suffer from a further delay in the disbursement of these funds.

As the ranking Democrat on the Africa Subcommittee, I would like to focus on Africa, where the United States international family planning program has made a tremendous impact.

In fiscal year 1996, United States population assistance funds were distributed in 21 countries in sub-Saharan Africa, with a combined population of 426 million people. These countries are overwhelmingly poor, yet have among the highest fertility rates in the world.

The United States population assistance program is one of the most important things that the United States Agency for International Development does in Africa.

As elsewhere, USAID supports a comprehensive program of voluntary family planning and closely related health efforts in several sub-Saharan African countries. It has trained hundreds of nurses and midwives in Uganda. In Mozambique, a country whose entire infrastructure was destroyed by 17 years of civil war, USAID helps deliver family planning and maternal-child health

services in four provinces with a combined population of more than 6 million people. And it contributes to the distribution of modern contraceptive products in Zimbabwe, where 42 percent of women are now demanding such products.

Now what will happen if the resolution that we will vote on tomorrow fails?

First, many of the nongovernmental organizations that currently administer these programs will be forced to close key activities. To give a compelling example, CARE, an NGO that has 50 years of experience helping poor families, already is considering shutting down its family planning program in Uganda because of the funding restrictions imposed by the United States Congress. After investing some \$2 million of USAID funds in this program over 4 years, CARE has trained more than 1,000 community-based health workers, launched family planning services in 71 clinics, and increased the percentage of couples using contraception in the program target area from 1 percent to 10 percent.

If this resolution fails tomorrow, CARE's network of trained volunteers will no longer be able to serve their communities to educate women and men about family planning and other health care.

Second, even those programs that do not close their doors will be negatively affected if we delay our support. The distribution of key family planning and health products will be seriously disrupted.

In Lusaka, the capital of Zambia and a city with one of the highest rates of HIV infection, condom distribution would have to be reduced significantly, greatly increasing the chances of a rapid spread of the HIV virus.

In Kenya, USAID-funded programs that have spent years teaching women about health and family planning, and have helped create a demand for contraceptive services, may no longer be able to offer birth control pills or other products to the men and women who now depend on them.

A third consequence of a negative vote tomorrow is that information campaigns on family planning and maternal and child health will also be cut back dramatically. These campaigns have been successful at reaching millions of couples worldwide, helping to educate them about birth spacing, natural family planning and other family planning methods.

Finally, as one Member of the Senate who is careful about how and where we spend U.S. taxpayer money, I am concerned that a negative vote today will waste thousands—if not millions—of dollars in unnecessary administrative costs that will be incurred if the disbursement of funds for the international family planning program is delayed any further.

AVSC International, the second largest-funded agency that works in partnership with USAID on international

family planning, estimates that because of previous congressional restrictions and metering, it already has spent \$2 million in staff time and associated administrative costs in order to manage the impact of delayed funding. What this means, according to an AVSC report, is that "for every dollar intended to provide access to these services last year, a smaller quantity of services was actually provided."

I find this type of expense, which wastes valuable taxpayer dollars, absolutely unconscionable.

If the Senate fails to uphold the Presidential finding, more and more organizations will be faced with similar, equally ridiculous costs.

In other words, Mr. President, a further delay in the disbursement of these funds would be inefficient.

It would be disruptive.

And it would be costly.

Opponents of House Joint Resolution 36 will have you believe that U.S. tax dollars are used to pay for abortion, even though they are well aware that such a practice has been illegal for more than two decades.

Mr. President, this vote, as we always have to point out on this issue but it bears constant repetition, this vote is not about abortion. It is about whether the United States will continue to support efforts to educate both men and women about modern methods of birth control, about the importance for health and financial well-being of spacing one's children, and about obtaining adequate pre- and post-natal care.

Mr. President, it frankly boggles the mind that these logical, commonsense activities, which promote sensible family planning in order to prevent or delay pregnancies until they are wanted, can be thought of as promoting abortion. These funds help prevent pregnancies, not end them. Without these funds, abortion rates will undoubtedly increase.

This vote is about helping empower individuals to make the most basic and personal decisions a person can make. It is about helping empower individuals to make choices about how many children to bring into this world and when to have them. It is about helping empower individuals to safely prevent pregnancy, and when they choose to give birth, to deliver and care for their children to maximize health. This is an issue of fundamental freedom. Our support of these programs represents a longstanding commitment from which our Nation, founded on the principles of liberty and democracy, must not back away.

Mr. President, I urge all of my colleagues who care about women and their children, who care about health and the eradication of disease, who care about access to food and water, who care about the environment and the effect of global warming, who care about Africa or Latin America or Asia, who care about responsible spending, or who care about preventing the de-

mand for abortion, I urge all of my colleagues to uphold the Presidential determination and to vote in favor of this resolution.

Mr. President, I thank not only the Senator from Vermont but my colleagues who gave me the courtesy of letting me speak at this point. I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCONNELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. We are going to go from side to side, Mr. President.

Mr. LEAHY. If you would like.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we have sort of an informal agreement here to rotate sides. Senator HELMS is here and would like to speak on my side of this issue. I would like to yield him 8 minutes.

Mr. HELMS. That will be fine, or less.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I thank the Chair and I thank the distinguished managers of the bill.

Mr. President, I am grateful to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas Mr. [HUTCHINSON], for offering S. 337, which is the bill to restrict U.S. assistance to foreign organizations that perform or actively promote abortion. I am an original cosponsor of that bill. I believe it is safe to assume it will receive careful consideration in the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. President, if S. 337 were law, Congress would not be tied in the existing knot regarding international population control funding that now exists.

With regard to the pending business, I was astonished to learn that there were 21 mentions of the so-called Helms amendment during the February 13 House debate on House Joint Resolution 36. The references to the Helms amendment were prompted by the purpose of my resolution, which prohibits using foreign aid funds for performing abortions as a method of family planning.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the text of section 104(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act, known as the Helms amendment, be printed in the RECORD.

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

SEC. 104—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961
(P.L. 87-195)

(f) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR ABORTIONS AND INVOLUNTARY STERILIZATIONS.—(1) None of the funds made available to carry out this part may be used to pay for the performance of abortions as a method of family planning or to motivate or coerce any person to practice abortions.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, since the Helms amendment, so-called, is referenced in the administration's talking points, it may be that Senators will be referring to it from time to time in this debate, and therefore I feel obliged as the author of the Foreign Assistance

Act to offer a few comments about what section 104(f) does and what it does not do.

The Helms amendment has been permanent law since 1973, the year after I came to the Senate. It is a narrow restriction on how funds provided by the American taxpayers can be used. It is not a restriction on the actions of private groups—for example, International Planned Parenthood Federation—that receive funding provided by the taxpayers of this country.

A group may use Federal funds for administrative expenses, distributions of condoms, or to pay for, if you can believe it, family planning radio soap operas and gender analysis tool kits, whatever they are. Simultaneously, funds available to these same groups from other sources can and often do pay for abortion or pro-abortion lobbying efforts. It goes without saying when the U.S. Government pays for administrative and other expenses of these groups, funds from other sources are freed up for activities that otherwise would be a violation of U.S. law.

Which is precisely why the Reagan administration came up with the Mexico City policy—so that funds provided by the American taxpayers would not be misused to underwrite, directly or indirectly, the pro-abortion dogma of the International Planned Parenthood Federation and other similar pro-abortion foreign organizations. President Clinton, who agrees with the pro-abortion doctrine, reversed President Reagan's Mexico City policy and other pro-life protections on the second day that Mr. Clinton was in office back in 1993.

So the administration has, therefore, once again masterfully obfuscated the real issue, which is, does the 105th Congress today agree with underwriting, directly or indirectly, organizations that make a callous business out of performing abortions and browbeating those poor Third World governments into reviewing and reversing their long-held beliefs and pro-life laws.

I cannot condone what these organizations set out to do and I refuse to be a part of a scheme leading to the deliberate destruction of the lives of the most innocent and most helpless human beings imaginable, and those are unborn babies.

I will vote against the pending resolution, because, as my father so often told me many years ago, he said "Son, you become a part of what you condone," and I cannot condone this.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). Who yields time?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I know the distinguished senior Senator from Maine wishes to speak, and I yield to her such time as she may require.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, and Members of the Senate, I rise in strong support of this resolution to expedite the release of already appropriated funds for international family planning. This resolution essentially reaffirms the President's certification that

the delaying of these funds which were appropriated last year will cause serious and irreparable harm to family planning programs around the world.

The life and health of women and children should transcend politics and party lines. The United States has traditionally been a leader in family planning assistance around the world for more than 30 years. It has enjoyed strong bipartisan support for such leadership. It has had unrivaled influence worldwide in setting standards for these programs.

These family planning assistance programs fund voluntary family planning services, contraceptive research, maternal health programs and child health programs. An estimated 50 million families in over 60 developing countries, with a combined population of 2.7 billion people across the world, use family planning as a direct result of U.S. population assistance programs.

There is no question that our support and our assistance over the last 30 years in developing countries has been enormously successful. The average family size in countries that receive our assistance has decreased from six children to three children. The Agency for International Development has increased the use of contraceptives in developing countries from 10 percent of married couples in the 1970's to 50 to 60 percent today.

Yet, there is still a great need for additional family planning assistance. In developing countries, maternal mortality is the single leading killer of women in their reproductive years, with 600,000 women dying annually from pregnancy-related complications. Family planning could reduce the deaths by one-fifth. It is estimated one out of five infant deaths could be averted if all children were spaced at an interval of at least 2 years.

Unfortunately, the passage of the omnibus appropriations bill last year came at a heavy price for U.S. family planning assistance programs. As we all know, fiscal year 1997 funds cannot be spent until July 1, and at only 70 percent of the 1995 level, and on a monthly basis of 8 percent over the next 12½ months.

As a result, family planning assistance by our Government will be reduced from \$547 million in 1995 to only \$385 million during 1997. This translates into a 30 to 35 percent cut of \$162 million. If we delay the funding for these programs until July 1, we are talking about delay in funding of another \$123 million.

We agreed to these cuts and restrictions only because we wanted to avoid a Government shutdown given that there was a difference between the House and the Senate on this issue. The Senate rightfully took the position that we should fund these programs without the Mexico City language. But in order to protect these programs, we inserted language requiring a vote on the President's certification that is before us today.

I can assure Members that the failure to release these funds now will have a devastating impact on women, children, and families all over the globe, and particularly in developing countries. Countless programs have already been suspended or halted, as mentioned by the Senator from Wisconsin, and if the funds are released in July rather than now, dozens of programs may be forced to permanently close their doors, including programs in Peru, Bolivia, Mexico, the Philippines, and elsewhere. These programs are critical in preventing unplanned pregnancies, reducing infant mortality, reducing rates of HIV infection, and promoting maternal and child health.

So there is no question, as the President has indicated, there will be irreparable harm to these programs. More than that, the Alan Guttmacher Institute and other research institutions predict as a result of just the funding cuts alone, not even the delay in funding, but just in the funding cuts alone, 7 million couples in developing countries who would have used modern contraceptives will be left without access to family planning. Four million more women will experience unintended pregnancies.

Now, according to the World Health Organization, 40 percent of unintended pregnancies result in abortions. So we can expect 1.6 million more abortions and countless miscarriages; 1.9 million more unplanned births, often to families, as we know, living in terrible poverty conditions and who cannot afford another child; 8,000 more women dying in pregnancy and childbirth, and 134,000 infant deaths. These figures relate to the funding cuts alone. They do not even take into account the effect of the metering out, on a monthly basis for 12½ months, of this funding, or, most importantly, the significant delay in funding.

Make no mistake about it, a vote against this resolution is a vote for more abortions, more women dying, more children dying. That is what I think is inconceivable in this debate—that those individuals who are against abortion are also against family planning. That is the bottom line in this debate. I have been debating this issue since 1985. Time and time again there hasn't been one single shred of evidence to suggest that U.S. population assistance funding is going for abortions or abortion-related activities in other countries.

Senator LEAHY was absolutely correct when he discussed the implications of the fungibility argument if applied to our assistance to foreign governments. We give assistance to foreign governments who allow abortions in their countries, according to their laws. We don't impose the requirement that if they use their money for abortion-related activities, we will not provide them foreign assistance. But this is a standard we are using for private organizations who have been instrumental in reducing the incidence of

abortion worldwide. That should be of interest to all of us, given the enormous implications of population growth in the future.

So I suggest that some are trying to bury their heads in the sand, taking an ostrich-like approach to this entire issue, to suggest that somehow if we don't provide family planning assistance, we will have fewer abortions in the world. The statistics do not bear that out.

I hope that the Senate will overwhelmingly support this resolution, because I think that there is no question that it is in America's interest and it is in the world's interest. The United States has traditionally taken a leadership role for more than 30 years on international family planning. In fact, the first Presidential message was issued by a Republican President, President Nixon, back in 1969, saying that population growth was a world problem. America has always shown an inclination for humanitarianism through population assistance funding. We should be predisposed to doing the same thing in this body here today. To do less will impose serious hardship on women and children in developing countries. We know the strain it is going to impose. We know there will be millions fewer couples who have access to family planning assistance because we are undercutting our support. If we undercut our support, I can assure you that other countries will follow suit and it will affect an already fragile international family planning system program worldwide.

When you think about the future, we should be concerned because it will provide an enormous strain on economic and social stability all around the world. In the next decade, the number of women of reproductive age will increase from 185 million to 900 million women. That is 10 times the size of Mexico. So I know there will be grave consequences of this incremental decrease in U.S. support for international family planning year after year. How can we incrementally undercut our family planning assistance to those organizations who have been the most effective, the most instrumental in preventing unplanned pregnancies and improving maternal and child health?

I can assure you of one other point: Not one dime has been spent—and it bears repeating here today, and let there be no misunderstanding—there has not been one U.S. dollar that supports abortion or abortion-related activities in other countries. We have had that prohibition in law since 1973. The fact of the matter is, those funds are maintained separately, and there is monitoring and independent reviews on an annual basis. That is why I believe that former Senator Mark Hatfield, who was a pro-life Senator for many years in the U.S. Senate, wrote a letter to a colleague in the House of Representatives, saying that there is no evidence to suggest that our funding has ever gone for abortion or abortion-

related activities in other countries through our family planning assistance programs. In fact, he goes on to say that we are contributing to the increase in abortions worldwide by our failure to provide this assistance.

So I hope, Mr. President, for these and many other reasons I have highlighted, that my colleagues will support this resolution. It is in our interest and in the world's interest. As the Senate votes tomorrow on this resolution, I hope that these facts will not be forgotten.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to commend the senior Senator from Maine for her statement. It demonstrates, as we have said before, that this is not a partisan issue. This is an issue of good sense. Whether people believe that abortion should be legal or whether people believe there should not be abortion, it makes no difference. We should be trying to join together in this to avoid all abortion. If you have family planning, that, to me, is a far greater alternative than using abortion as family planning.

As we also showed in this, in Russia, where just increasing our foreign aid over a relatively short period of time and increasing the availability of contraceptives by about 5 percent, that cut out 800,000 abortions. I mean, the fact of the matter is, if we hold the money back for family planning, abortions go up. If we release the money for family planning, abortions go down. Holding back the money, just because it may make some feel like they are being a purist on the abortion issue, flies in the face of reality. It is rhetoric over reality. The reality is, spend money for family planning and you reduce abortions.

I see the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts. I yield to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I know there are others who want to speak on the resolution. But at the outset of this discussion, I want to pay tribute to Senator LEAHY and Senator SNOWE for their bipartisan leadership on this issue. I think that working together bodes well not only for this issue but for other matters that will come before the Senate. I congratulate them for their leadership on this important resolution, which affects millions of families around the world—people whose names we will never know, as they will not know ours. Nonetheless, with the release of these resources, which we expect as a result of this vote, lives will be enhanced.

I just want to again underline what Senator LEAHY and Senator SNOWE mentioned about what this bill is and is not. This is not legislation to promote abortion. They have laid out very clearly that this is about providing resources that will be used to support family planning and avoid unwanted pregnancies and subsequent abortions. That case has been made by Senator

LEAHY, Senator SNOWE, and our former colleague Senator Mark Hatfield, who is a strong opponent of abortion. Senator Hatfield rejected the argument that family planning is a back-door means of supporting abortion services. He reviewed the alleged evidence that family planning funds were being used to provide abortions and, in a letter to Representative CHRIS SMITH, said, "I do not see anything in these materials to back up your assertion that U.S. funds are being spent on abortion."

This is not only the understanding of those of us here today but also the clear understanding of the President. I think those that support this action have been justified in challenging those that are opposed to it to produce information or evidence to the contrary.

As President Clinton has said very clearly, "The United States provides family planning support where it is wanted and needed. We are prohibited from law from ever funding abortion—and we abide faithfully by that law. Indeed, the work we have funded in developing countries has been supportive of families, helping them to flourish."

One of the extraordinary examples of this work is the lifesaving efforts of CARE. In many different parts of the world I have had the opportunity to see the extraordinary work of many non-governmental organizations, and I have enormous respect for the dedication of the men and women who are so selfless in volunteering for these organizations.

All we have to do is read the newspapers of the past weeks and months to recognize the enormous threat to their lives. Red Cross and other NGO workers in Chechnya, Uganda, Rwanda, and other parts of the world have actually lost their lives because of their work.

CARE, long respected for its efforts to meet the basic health needs of poor families around the world, has used U.S. funds to enhance the lives of large numbers of women and children.

In Uganda, over the last 4 years, CARE has trained over 1,000 community-based health workers, launched family planning services in 71 clinics, and increased the number of couples using contraception from 1 percent to 10 percent. But, that project in Uganda—as well as projects in Bangladesh, Niger, and Togo—will be shut down if these United States funds are not forthcoming.

That is the story all across the Third World. Without U.S. aid, millions of people would not have access to gynecological examinations, postnatal care, and family planning services. The funds appropriated by Congress decrease the instances of female genital mutilation and prevent the spread of sexually transmitted diseases, such as HIV and AIDS.

So, for all of these reasons, Mr. President, this is an extremely important vote. It is really about children, and it is about struggling families in foreign and distant parts of the world that are trying to take care of their families

and ensure a future with a greater sense of hope and health. It is really about life—not about other factors. That is the underlying purpose of this bill. That is what the record has demonstrated.

That is why I think this vote is so important, and why I commend the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Maine for their leadership.

Mr. JEFFORDS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. The distinguished Senator from Vermont is on the floor. How much time does he need?

I yield 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that William Jackson of my staff be granted privilege of the floor for the duration of the consideration of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rise today in support of House Joint Resolution 36, which would approve the President's finding that the congressionally imposed delay in disbursement of international population funding is having a negative impact on the effectiveness of our population planning programs overseas.

I have been a strong supporter of international family planning assistance and see this measure now before us as an important test of our Government's commitment to these important, lifesaving programs.

Claims that this resolution somehow promotes abortion are completely unfounded. This resolution is about the health of women and children in the desperately poor corners of the world, and, if anything, it is about preventing abortion.

At issue here is whether to begin releasing funds March 1, or delay the disbursement for another 4 months, until July 1. The 1997 fiscal year began October 1, but under the terms of the fiscal year 1997 Omnibus Appropriations Act, funding for this particular program was delayed for 9 months. Regardless of the outcome of this vote, a total of \$385 million will be spent on bilateral family planning programs. In other words, we are not debating if these funds will be spent, but when they will begin to be released—July 1 or March 1.

I would like to point out that an additional 4-month delay in funding would result in an actual reduction of \$123 million in funds available for programming during fiscal year 1997. The President's finding states that at least 17 bilateral and worldwide programs will have urgent funding needs in the March-June period which cannot be met by remaining fiscal year 1996 funds. If fiscal year 1997 funds are withheld until July 1, these programs would need to suspend, defer, or terminate family planning services and other critical supporting activities.

The continued disruption and possible termination of family planning services would have a devastating impact on the health of women, children, and their families in many parts of the world. Medical research shows that women who are able to space their children in at least 2-year intervals have children that are less likely to die at a very early age. Children born less than 2 years apart are more likely to have a low birth weight, making them more vulnerable to disease and illness. Moreover, births too close together affect older children in the family as well. Infection, malnutrition, and dehydration result from premature discontinuation of breast-feeding. The inadequate nutrition, sanitation, and crowded living conditions often found in poor countries, increase the likelihood that already vulnerable children will succumb to illness. For the health of their families, women in these circumstances turn to family planning services, when they can get them.

UNICEF estimates that each year 600,000 women die of pregnancy-related causes, and 75,000 of these deaths are the result of self-induced, unsafe abortion. UNICEF also estimates that these women leave behind at least 1 million motherless children. In short, to continue to obstruct and delay family planning assistance is to contribute to the deaths of women and young children. Why would we delay the release of funds until July 1 when we could prevent more needless, tragic deaths by releasing funds March 1?

Mr. President, no Senator in this body wants to promote policies that increase the incidence of abortion overseas. But by continuing to delay funding to clinics in the poorest countries in the world, that's exactly what we are doing—shutting off women from the only possibility they have of obtaining family planning services and contraception and forcing them to consider abortion as a last, desperate option.

Very simply, to vote against this resolution is to vote against the health of women and children, and to force more women to have abortions. I do not believe this is the true intention of the Senate and I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 36.

This is a vote solely to determine whether funds already appropriated for fiscal year 1997 will be released 5 months late or 9 months late.

Currently at least one woman dies every minute from causes related to pregnancy and childbirth. In developing countries, maternal mortality is the leading cause of death for women in reproductive age. The World Bank estimates a 20-percent reduction in maternal death would result from improved access to family planning.

In parts of sub-Saharan Africa, there are more than 1,500 maternal deaths for every 100,000 live births; in the United States, this ratio is 12 deaths per

100,000 live births. By being able to plan their pregnancies, mothers are able to ensure they bear their children at their healthiest times and that pregnancies do not occur too close together. This reduces the risks to the lives of both the mother and her children.

Babies born less than 2 years after their next oldest sibling are twice as likely to die in the first year as those born after an interval of at least 2 years. Analysis of data from 25 developing countries shows that, on average, infant mortality would be reduced by one-quarter if all births were spaced at least 2 years apart.

Family planning education also helps prevent the spread of sexually transmitted diseases, including AIDS.

At least 76,000 women die every year from the consequences of unsafe abortions. Thousands more suffer serious complications that can result in chronic pain and infertility. A U.S. study found that for every \$1 increase in public funds for family planning, there is a decrease of 1 abortion per 1,000 women.

According to the Rockefeller Foundation, in just 1 year, cuts and severe restrictions of Federal funding for family planning programs will result in an additional 4 million unplanned pregnancies and 1.6 million of those will end in abortion; 8,000 of those women will die in pregnancy and childbirth. These are conservative estimates.

Pathfinder International is one organization whose 30-year partnership with USAID has delivered high-quality family planning, reproductive health services, and information to some of the poorest countries in the world. The delays in Federal funding have jeopardized a significant portion of Pathfinder's programs.

One woman who has benefited from Pathfinder's programs is a 27-year-old Bangladeshi woman named Ferdousi Begum. She was married when she was 14 years old. Ferdousi and her husband, Mahmud, are poor and their lives are hard. Mahmud works 12 to 14 hours a day and Ferdousi works as a part-time domestic in addition to tending the home and being a mother. But they are happy—family planning has given them hope for a better future.

Ferdousi and Mahmud received counseling to postpone having children until she was 18 and her body was more developed. After having two daughters spaced several years apart, they decided not to have any more children.

Mahmud speaks proudly of his daughters. He speaks of having dreams of his older daughter, Salma, becoming a doctor after winning a prize in a science competition.

However, after years of using family planning in order to provide a better life for her family, Ferdousi is at risk of becoming pregnant again. Without the necessary funding, many local affiliates are unable to restock their contraceptive supplies. An additional 4 month delay will have severe repercussions on Ferdousi, her family, and mil-

lions of other families like theirs in Bangladesh and around the world.

In 1960 in Chile, less than 3 percent of married women were practicing family planning and the abortion rate was 77 abortions per 1,000 married women of reproductive age. By 1990, use of family planning had increased to 56 percent of married women, and the abortion rate had dropped to 45 per 1,000.

Data from Bogota, Columbia showed a one-third increase in contraceptive use between 1976 and 1986, accompanied by a 45-percent decrease in the abortion rate during the same period.

In Mexico City use of contraception increased by about 24 percent between 1987 and 1992, while the abortion rate fell 39 percent.

In Almaty, Kazakstan, the United States population program has provided funding to train doctors and nurses and to increase contraceptive supplies for 28 clinics. Between 1993 and 1994, the number of people provided contraceptives by the clinics increased by 59 percent, while the number of abortions fell by 41 percent.

In Russia, contraceptive use has increased from 19 percent to 24 after an affiliate of the International Planned Parenthood Federation opened in 1991. During that period, the abortion rate dropped from 109 per 1,000 in 1990 to 76 in 1994. The total number of abortions fell from 3.6 million in 1990 to 2.8 million in 1994. For years, the average Russian woman had 7 to 8 abortions.

In Hungary, a dramatic drop in abortion rates from a peak of 80 per 1,000 women in the late 1960's to just over 30 per 1,000 women in 1986 is due in part to an increase in contraceptive use.

The numbers are incredible, but what is truly important and who we can't forget are the women and their families represented in these numbers.

One such woman is 30-year-old Maria Elena Absalon Ramirez in Mexico. Her husband earns just \$80 per month to support Maria and their 4 children. They cannot afford contraceptives and rely on USAID. These are Maria's words: "What I fear most is becoming pregnant again. One more child would completely change our life; it would be our ruin."

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support the resolution and release the international family planning funds.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon such time as he may desire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Thank you, Mr. President. I would also like to thank Senator LEAHY.

Mr. President, I rise today to speak on an issue that is both very controversial and personal; therefore, I do not have a prepared speech, but wish to speak from the heart.

Much has been said here today about Senator Mark Hatfield's leadership on the issue of international family planning. In fact, I occupy the seat that

Mark Hatfield sat in for more than 30 years. Like Mark Hatfield, I am pro-life. As a State Senator, I advanced pro-life legislation in the Oregon State senate, and have never been afraid to stand up for the principles of the sanctity of life.

As a candidate in two races for the U.S. Senate in one calendar year, no other issue was brought up more frequently than the issue of abortion. As I have stated throughout my career as a legislator, I intend to continue my support of pro-life issues and to work constructively with Members on both sides of the aisle on legislation to reduce the incidence of abortion on a national and international level.

For these reasons, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to join in my support of Senate Joint Resolution 14. While the debate on this resolution has centered on the issues relating to abortion, the underlying question is whether the \$385 million that has already been appropriated for international family planning will be released on March 1, 1997 or whether it will be released on July 1, 1997. Regardless of the outcome of this vote, the money will be released.

According to research conducted by the Guttmacher Institute, the World Health Organization, and other independent researchers, the release of these funds on March 1, 1997, will significantly reduce the incidence of abortion in developing countries that receive assistance through USAID. Therefore, as a pro-life Member of this body, I encourage my colleagues to vote yea.

I understand and share the concerns of those who have suggested that this money is being spent for abortion services. This concerns me greatly, particularly as the law of the United States prohibits the use of Federal funds for abortion services. To address these concerns, I reviewed the USAID audits and am assured that this funding is in fact being used for family planning services, not abortion. For this reason, I also encourage a yea vote.

In addition to sharing my support for this resolution, I would also like to take a moment to express my frustration on this issue. While I certainly respect those who may not support my pro-life position, I am so often disappointed that there is little effort to educate about the options to abortion and ways to make abortion less frequent. The focus is often on the legal and the safe but never the rare. Similar frustration stems from those who advocate for life. It is unfortunate that the effort to advocate and encourage family planning does not equal the effort to discourage abortion. Today, we have the opportunity to address this inequity and to encourage and protect family planning both nationally and internationally. This is a vote to support life, and tomorrow I will vote as my predecessor Mark Hatfield, in favor of this resolution.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

For the benefit of the bill managers, the time of the distinguished Senator from Vermont remaining is 14 minutes and the time of the Senator from Kentucky is about 35 minutes.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, when the House of Representatives passed the resolution, House Joint Resolution 36, which allowed for the releasing of funds, \$30 million per month for 4 months, 4 months earlier than under current law—after they passed that resolution they also passed another resolution. It is called the Smith-Oberstar-Hyde Resolution, H.R. 581. H.R. 581 actually releases more money for international family planning, but it does have restrictions to make sure that none of that money would be used for abortion purposes.

Since the House has already passed H.R. 581 and these are related issues, I would like now, at this point, to ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on final passage on H.R. 581 at a time not later than Friday of this week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEAHY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I tell the distinguished majority whip that I will object and explain why. I understand that there are people who wish to be consulted, I believe on both sides of the aisle, on this. Therefore, I do object and suggest perhaps we could run a hotline on both sides. We may be able to work out a time agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Vermont. I ask his assistance. Hopefully we can get to a vote in the Senate on this other resolution. It is a different idea. Let me just compare the two so all our colleagues can see exactly what we are talking about.

This is the current law. It says, basically, we are going to spend \$420 million on international family planning funds. Under the administration's resolution, that will increase by \$120 million. For 4 months there will be \$30 million more per month.

This is a convoluted way to do this. I was not involved in coming up with the consent agreement that arranged this. My sympathies go to my colleague from Vermont and the Senator from Kentucky, because they wrestled with

this for a long time. I know Mr. Pannetta was involved in this. We had a real impasse.

Maybe I will give a little background in between, so our colleagues might remember, but there is a difference in philosophy on what we should do with international family planning money. The House felt very strongly we should continue the Mexico City restrictions, the Mexico City restrictions being restrictions that these moneys could not be used by an organization, international family planning organization, if they had involvement with abortion. Not only could they not use the U.S. taxpayer funds, but they could not use their own funds for abortion services, and they also could not promote changes in a country's laws dealing with abortions. Those are the two main restrictions known as the Mexico City policy, which was the policy in the United States from 1984 through, I believe, 1993. It was changed by the Clinton administration. So, it was the law of the land for 10 years.

I might mention also that, under that policy, a significant number of organizations followed that policy. From 1984 to 1993 we had 350 foreign organizations that complied with the Mexico City policy. In other words, they accepted the money. They said the money will be used for family planning but not for abortions. They would not use our money, U.S. taxpayers' money, they would not use their own money, and they also would not advocate changing laws in other countries.

Unfortunately, this was repealed by the Clinton administration shortly after he took office. The House of Representatives felt strongly it should be reinstated. After the House had a change of leadership in 1994, they reinstated the Mexico City policy. The Senate did not go along. So we had, if I remember, 10, 11, maybe even 12 votes in the last Congress over this issue, the Senate basically saying we want to reinstate our position of no prohibition on how the international family planning organizations use their money. If they want to use their money for abortion, they can use it for abortion. If they want to use their own money to advocate changing laws in other countries dealing with abortion—because a lot of countries have laws restricting abortions that this administration does not agree with and, frankly, the International Planned Parenthood Federation does not agree with, and they want to change it. So the Senate was concurring with the administration and the International Planned Parenthood Federation. The House was saying no, we should stay with the Mexico City policy.

So we had a dozen votes, both sides insisting on maintaining their own positions. The net result was we came up with this terrible arrangement which basically said we will continue this policy at 35-percent less money—which, incidentally, I might mention we had a 35-percent reduction overall in the bill.

Mr. Panetta said, let's have it the same way, and then we will dole the money out on a monthly basis and then we will have a vote in the next Congress over when that money will be released. That is what we are going to be voting on tomorrow.

So, if we maintain current law, the amount of money will be \$420 million. If we adopt the administration's resolution, it will be \$543 million. Under these provisions there is no restriction on abortion in this and no restriction on organizations' lobbying capability. The House passed H.R. 531, the Smith-Oberstar-Hyde resolution that had a couple of million dollars more, about \$170 million more. But the money had restrictions. The money has those restrictions that were, in effect, the law of the land from 1984 to 1993, that said these groups cannot use the money for abortion, they could not use the money for lobbying other governments to change their policies.

I happen to think the Mexico City policy was right. If we are going to be giving money to international family planning organizations, it should be for family planning. It should not be for abortions.

Somebody said, "You are not using U.S. taxpayer dollars for abortions. They are using their own money." Some of these groups, like the London-based International Planned Parenthood Federation, are advocates of abortion. If we give them so much money, U.S. money, they can say, we do not use a dime of that for abortion. Sure, we will use some of our other money for abortion. And sure we will use some of our other money to advocate changes in other countries' laws that we don't agree with. So, really, you have U.S. taxpayer dollars subsidizing international organizations that are, in effect, lobbying other countries to change their laws because they deem them too restrictive on abortion.

That is kind of offensive. It is not just these international groups that are doing it; it is the administration as well. I will just make a couple of comments.

Donald Warwick of the Harvard Institute of International Development has written that the International Planned Parenthood Federation "has in word and deed been one of the foremost lobbyists for abortion in developing countries." They are promoting abortion in developing countries, even to the extent of changing their laws.

The International Planned Parenthood Federation has made it clear that legalizing abortion and expansion of abortion networks is one of its primary goals. Their 1992 mission statement Strategic Plan—Vision 2000 repeatedly and unambiguously instructs its 140 national affiliate organizations to work to legalize abortion as part of a mandate to "advocate for changes in restrictive national laws, policies, practices and traditions."

So, we are supporting and giving money to the International Planned

Parenthood Federation so they can use that money, or other money, to lobby, to tell some countries that happen to have pro-life laws that they have to change their law. That bothers me. What makes us so self-righteous that we know that other countries should be changing their laws dealing with abortion? How can we be so self-righteous?

Then we find out it is not only some International Planned Parenthood organization, but we see it from our own State Department. On March 16, 1994, through Secretary of State Warren Christopher in a classified action cable to all overseas diplomatic posts, the State Department announced, "The United States believes access to safe, legal and voluntary abortion is a fundamental right of all women," and called for "senior level diplomatic intervention" to garner support for the U.S. position at the September U.N. conference on population in Cairo.

On May 12, 1993, Under Secretary of State Tim Wirth expounded the policy in a detailed speech at the United Nations, stating, "A government which is violating basic human rights should not hide behind the defense of sovereignty * * * Our position is to support reproductive choice, including access to safe abortion."

Why in the world would we have the Under Secretary of State make a speech to the United Nations telling other countries we think we know better, you should change your laws. We think you should have pro-choice laws in countries such as El Salvador or other countries that have maybe a predominantly Catholic population and have pro-life laws or laws restricting abortions? Why in the world would we be so self-righteous or sanctimonious that we should be telling those countries, We know best. Change your laws. We think you should have legal abortion. Maybe we think you should subsidize it.

That, to me, is offensive, to think that the Secretary of State or Under Secretary of State would have that position.

April 1, 1993, White House Deputy Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers noted the administration regards abortion as "part of the overall approach to population control."

And if we don't enact H.R. 581, the Smith-Oberstar-Hyde language, then what we are doing is giving this administration a blank check to give money to international organizations that have no restrictions whatsoever on how they use their money on abortion or changing laws in other countries. I think that is wrong.

So for my colleagues, just to summarize, we have a couple of options. We can accelerate the money with no restrictions whatsoever or, if you happen to be in favor of more family planning money, if you want more family planning money to go out internationally and you think that might reduce the incidents of abortion, you can do that, you can support the Smith-Oberstar-Hyde language.

We are going to try to get a vote on it. The House already passed it. Tomorrow it will be pending at the Senate desk. We hope to get a time agreement. I understand some people say, "We want to filibuster that." Why? What is the matter with having a vote? Let's find out where the votes are.

There is more money. This has \$713 million for family planning. House Joint Resolution 36, which will be voted on tomorrow, has \$543 million. There is \$170 million more money for international family planning, but it has restrictions. You will not be able to use that money or your money for abortion. So, if you want less abortions, you should support the Smith-Oberstar-Hyde language, and if you think it is wrong for our country to be advocating that other countries change their laws dealing with abortions, then you need to support that resolution as well.

So I urge my colleagues to vote no on the resolution we will have pending tomorrow, House Joint Resolution 36. Vote "no" on that and then vote in favor of H.R. 581, the Smith-Oberstar-Hyde language, which will have more money for international family planning and no money for abortion and no money for advocating changes in other countries' abortion laws.

I yield the floor, and I thank my colleague from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. How much time is remaining to the Senator from Vermont?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). The Senator from Vermont has 14 minutes.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I will take one moment for myself and then yield to the Senator from California.

I will note for my colleagues that we are here because of an agreement entered into in good faith by Republicans and Democrats, by those who supported the money for family planning and those who opposed it last year. Unfortunately, like in the House, we have a request for another vote because some of the people who made that agreement last year do not now want to live up to it.

I have spent 22 years in the Senate. If I give my word on something, if I make an agreement on something, I carry it out. I am surprised that there have been some in the other body, and elsewhere, who are not willing to honor the spirit of an agreement made.

I mention this only because there are aspects to this agreement that I was not happy with, and there are other votes I would have liked to have had. But the agreement was that both sides would have this vote and that would be it.

When I came here 22 years ago, the distinguished majority leader, Senator Mansfield, and the distinguished Republican leader, Senator Scott, said the same thing to every Member of the Senate: "Whatever you do here, keep your word."

Senators I have dealt with on this issue have. I am concerned some in the

other body have not, and it is unfortunate.

I note that contrary to what some on the other side have said this afternoon, this vote is not about the early release of family planning funds. If we approve this resolution, it still means the funds are going to be 5 months late.

It has been said that this vote will provide \$123 million more to organizations that fund abortions. That is totally false. This vote will not increase or decrease the amount we appropriated last year at all.

It is said this vote will increase from \$356 million to \$385 million the funds for family planning. Yes, but that is a \$130 million cut from 2 years ago.

We also agreed what this vote would be about, and what it would not be about.

And we heard that this is about funding abortion. Of course not. If anything, the facts show that where we have given money to provide family planning, the number of abortions have gone down, not up, and gone down very substantially, and when we withheld the money for family planning, abortions have gone up.

I yield to the Senator from California 8 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Thank you, Madam President, and I thank the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

I rise to support his arguments, to indicate my support for House Joint Resolution 36. Madam President, I recently returned from a few days in Nepal. If you go to Nepal, you will see that about 35 percent of the children die before the age of 5, and they die before the age of 5 because they are impoverished. They don't have enough food, and they die. This is true in many areas, particularly undeveloped countries, all around the world.

I think that one of the most important and effective components of U.S. foreign assistance has been our family planning programs. I believe these programs reduce poverty, I believe they improve health, I believe they raise living standards around the world, and they enhance, certainly, the ability of couples and individuals to determine the number and spacing of their children.

I think many of us in this country take that opportunity for granted. Most of us have had the freedom to make choices about how we live our lives by planning the size of our families. But in poorer countries where contraceptive options are not available, women have much higher birth rates, and the more children they have, the higher the poverty rates. Children are malnourished, many get sick, many die.

UNICEF estimates that 34,000 children under the age of 5 die every day—every day—in developing countries. And it is not just children. UNICEF further estimates that 600,000 women die of pregnancy-related causes each

year and that unsafe abortions are responsible for 75,000 of these deaths. By giving women the opportunity to plan their pregnancies, lives are saved—the lives of women and their children.

So the need for these family planning programs could hardly be clearer. Unfortunately, because of this dispute between the House and the Senate last year, the compromise the Senator from Vermont referred to was reached, but that delayed the release of family planning funds until July 1, or March 1, if the President found the delay was harming these programs and Congress agreed.

The President has made the finding, arguing, I think, persuasively that the delay thus far has forced many programs to suspend or defer their operations and that further delay, until July, could cause them to shut down.

Already, programs serving over 700,000 people annually in Bolivia, the Philippines, Ecuador, and elsewhere, have been suspended.

Two weeks ago, the House voted 220 to 209 to agree with the President's finding. So the vote in the Senate is crucial.

If we concur with the President and the House, we can release these life-saving funds only 5 months late instead of 9 months late. The difference is critical.

Some have tried to draw a connection between our family planning programs and abortion. But no connection exists. Since 1973, U.S. law has prohibited any USAID funds from being used to pay for abortions as a method of family planning or to coerce any person to have an abortion. All our programs are voluntary and they involve contraception, not abortion. Programs are rigorously monitored to ensure strict compliance.

So the argument that these programs cause an increase in abortion is simply a red herring. It is actually worse than a red herring in a sense because it is patently and demonstrably false. In fact, it stands the truth on its head. It is the delay in our family planning programs that is actually causing an increase in abortions.

The evidence is clear. When family planning options are available, fewer unintended pregnancies occur, and abortions decline.

In Russia where the average Russian woman used to have a stunning seven or eight abortions in her lifetime, family planning has made a huge difference. With United States assistance, organizations like the Russian Family Planning Association have raised the rate of contraceptive use from 19 percent to 24 percent from 1990 to 1994. Even that modest increase produced results. In the same period, the Russian Department of Health reported that the total number of abortions performed dropped from 3.6 million to 2.8 million. That is 800,000 fewer abortions. This is specific, irrefutable, documented, statistical proof that family planning moneys drop and lower the rate of abortion.

The story repeats itself over and over. In Mexico, in Colombia, wherever USAID has funded family planning, this is the case.

So facts are facts. And the link is clear. As our esteemed former colleague, Mark Hatfield, who was and is a proudly pro-life Senator, reminded us each time we voted on this issue, family planning assistance prevents abortion.

So this vote is about one thing and one thing only—it is about giving women in the developing world a chance to make their lives and the lives of their children better, safer, healthier, and more fulfilling.

I believe we have every reason and every interest to give them that chance. I hope every Member of this body does as well. So I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. I thank the Chair. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. How much time is remaining for the Senator from Vermont?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has 3 minutes, 34 seconds remaining.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, with the exception of a few self-appointed experts who have apparently never been to Beijing, Mexico City or Calcutta, it is widely understood that stabilizing the Earth's population is the foremost challenge of our time.

This vote is as important as any vote we are going to cast this year. But I do not think we should confuse with something it is not. There are other votes for or against abortion, but as the distinguished Senator from California has said, that is not what this vote is. There seems to be no end to the number of times we will fight the fight on abortion. But that is not what this vote is about, despite what some would try to suggest.

This vote is about a program that is absolutely crucial if we are going to stabilize the Earth's population in the 21st century. The number of people born in the next decade are going to decide that question.

A quarter of the Earth's people live in poverty. They have no jobs. They have nothing resembling adequate shelter and medical care. They drink from the streams they and their animals bathe in. They live from hand to mouth in filth and in despair. We can do something to help.

Our family planning program gives those people a chance to get out from under the crushing weight of more and more hungry mouths to feed. Some argue that by giving them that chance, we impose our values on them. The people who make that argument should ask those people, as I have. They should ask them if they feel we are imposing our values on them. What they will hear, as I have, is that there are hundreds of millions of couples who

want access to family planning and cannot get it or cannot afford it. They desperately want to be able to decide when to have children and how many to have. They do not see that as us imposing our will on them, but giving them the chance to make their own decisions. Then they will decide.

The only question is whether they will decide with family planning, or with abortion or by having more children who die in infancy of hunger and disease. If we ask those people if they want to have the technology, and the knowledge, so they can make the choice of when to have children and how many to have, or if they would rather rely on abortion or have more children who will die of disease or hunger, the answer is very simple. They want control over their own lives. And by passing this resolution, as the House did 2 weeks ago, we give those people safe alternatives to abortion now, not 4 months from now when for many of them it will already be too late.

Madam President, it is the height of arrogance for us to stand on this floor and say, because of a few single-issue groups in the United States, we will not give families in other countries the chance to make the decisions that any one of us could do in our own family or in our children's families because we live in a nation where family planning is readily available and all of us make the kind of income where it is not a problem for us.

But we stand here and say, so somebody can put a notch on the wall, that they voted politically correctly for which single-issue group or some fundraising letter has gone out, and we turn our backs on millions of people who want our help.

Again, I would remind my colleagues of the facts in the record here. In 4 years time in Russia, where we made available family planning services, where we increased just one simple thing, the use of contraceptives by just 4 or 5 percent, the number of abortions went down by 800,000.

But some of the same people stand on the floor of the Senate today and the floor of the House, and say that they are against providing these services because somehow they are following a right-to-life or antiabortion agenda, and they voted against the money that was used in Russia. And that same money helped reduce the number of abortions by 800,000.

We have Members in this body and the other body who say they have to be so dependent on single-issue groups that they cannot vote for this money. They cannot vote for this money because somebody somewhere in that country, some private organization, might use money of their own, not ours, for abortion, so we should not give them any money for family planning. Fortunately, a majority of the House was wise enough to stand up to the single-issue groups, and vote for this resolution.

Let us stop the hypocrisy and stop the pandering to single-issue groups. I do not care whether they are to the right or to the left. Let us do what is right. How can we stand here and say, "Oh, we can do this because we're rich and we know better, but, boy, we're going to show you. We can't help you because somewhere somebody will send out newsletters to somebody will say they didn't stick to the agenda that our group asked them to do." Let us stop the hypocrisy and do what is right; and let's vote for this resolution.

I ask unanimous consent a letter by the distinguished Secretary of State Madeleine Albright be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, February 21, 1997.

Hon. THOMAS A. DASCHLE,
Minority Leader,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR DASCHLE: I am writing to urge your support on the upcoming vote to release already-delayed international family planning funds in March instead of July of this year. Given the negative consequences to women and men in developing countries, as well as the administrative costs associated with further constraints on these funds, I am confident that you will agree that a March release date is justified and that no identifiable purpose is served by further delay.

In his January 31 report to the Congress, the President made it unmistakably clear that "a delay will cause serious, irreversible and avoidable harm." At least 17 separate programs, administered by the U.S. Agency for International Development and amounting to at least \$35 million, would be seriously impacted by the funding delay. As a result, unintended pregnancies will rise, maternal and infant deaths will be more numerous, and abortions will increase. Clearly, family planning saves lives, enhances the health and well-being of women and their children, and prevents the tragic recourse to abortion.

International family planning also serves important U.S. foreign policy interests: elevating the status of women, and reducing the flow of refugees, protecting the global environment, and promoting sustainable development which leads to greater economic growth and trade opportunities for our businesses. Efforts to slow population growth, reduce poverty, promote economic progress, and empower women are mutually reinforcing. The proof is not found in arcane studies, but in vigorous economic development in countries like South Korea and Thailand.

The President and I are committed to building bipartisan support for a foreign policy that will serve our national interests into the 21st century. International family planning programs have a successful track record and have garnered bipartisan support for the past 30 years; we must rebuild this support for the next 30 and beyond. Unhappily, international family planning programs have often been misunderstood, creating unnecessary rancor. Let me be clear—the United States does not, has not, and will not promote or provide abortion services as a method of family planning in developing countries. These programs are carefully executed and monitored to ensure that U.S. funds are not used for illegal purposes. The upcoming vote is not about abortion. It is, in fact, just the opposite: the release of family planning funds now will reduce the incidence of unintended pregnancy and abortion.

On the other hand, it is an indisputable fact that family planning does reduce abortion, as best evidenced by significant declines in abortion as family planning services are becoming available in Russia and Central and Eastern Europe. The argument is also made that by providing support for family planning services, the United States may unwittingly enable organizations to use some of their private funds to provide legal abortion services. Carried to its logical conclusion, of course, the United States would not provide support for child survival or any other health programs in countries where legal abortion services are supported by national health systems.

The Congress has a real opportunity to correct a problem with funding set in place last fall. In so doing, you can help advance our interest in improving the status of women, protecting the environment, and encouraging robust economic progress around the world. This progress will make the difference for hundreds of thousands of citizens abroad. Most important, voluntary international family planning programs are in the interest of our own citizens. I urge your support for S.J. Res. 14.

Sincerely,

MADELINE K. ALBRIGHT.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky and I discussed earlier. I ask unanimous consent, understanding, of course, that I will yield immediately to the Senator from Kentucky if he or his representative comes to the floor, that I be allowed to continue without the time going beyond the time we would begin the Byrd amendment at 3:30.

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

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, it is so frustrating. Every year we have this debate, time after time. We have written into our law that not one cent of our money for family planning can be used for abortion, and none of it has been. Yet we hear the argument, "But we can't send money to some private groups because they may use some of their money for abortion." We do not hear anybody stand on the floor and say we cannot send foreign aid to this or that government because they may use some of their money for abortion. That is never done, nor will it ever be done, nor should it be done. But it points out the illogic of their argument.

This has become a litmus test vote for some pressure groups in this country. The same pressure groups are wise enough to not to advocate withholding foreign aid from governments that allow legal abortion or that uses their funds for abortion. I am not suggesting that nor have I heard anybody suggest that. However, the hypocrisy is obvious.

Let us not legislate for single-issue groups, on the right or the left, Democrat or Republican, Conservative or Liberal. Let us instead legislate what is in the best interests of the country. Now, maybe we will offend the right one day and the next day the left, maybe we will offend this single-issue group one day and that single-issue group the next day, maybe we will upset somebody's special-interest

newsletter this day and somebody else's the next day. But do you know what, Madam President? In the long run the American people will be far more respectful of the U.S. Senate if we do that.

On this issue it is very simple. We have already appropriated the money. What we are doing now is withholding the money so that it cannot be spent. As long as it is not spent, instead of people having access to family planning, instead of people being able to make the decision themselves of how many children they will have and when, the number of abortions will start going up again. As we have shown over and over again, when family planning is available, the number of abortions go down, and when family planning withheld, the number of abortions go up. It was that way long before any one of us served in this body. It will be that way long after we leave.

So we should stop the rhetoric for the fundraising letters, but instead do what is right. We want to help countries determine what they may or may not do on the question of overpopulation, on the use of their own resources, being given not the tools of abortion but the tools of family planning, and tell the special interest groups that say no, that maybe they have gone a bit too far.

I have nothing but respect for my colleagues who are opposed to abortion. I wish there would never be another abortion in this world. But I am also a realist enough to know that simply withholding family planning money or passing laws does not stop abortion. Giving people alternatives to abortions, modern contraceptives, that does cut down on abortions.

As I say, I have nothing but the greatest respect for those who have moral opposition to abortion. But we should be realistic. It is like the old days when we passed laws against abortion and the back-room abortionists thrived, as they did in my State. When abortion was legal, people made the choice.

This is not necessarily directly on point in this debate, but I remember and I remind people who think simply passing a law determines what is a very difficult question for any woman to ask, what happened in my State in days when I was a young prosecutor. I got a call at 3 o'clock one morning to go to our medical center where a young woman lay nearly dying, hemorrhaging from an illegal abortion. As part of the investigation I instituted that 3 a.m. in the morning, we found out that a number of women, some college students, had gone to one person in our community to seek abortions. He would arrange illegal abortions for them. Abortions were performed by a man who had learned how to perform abortions while working for the SS at Auschwitz. The women would be sent to Canada, the abortions would be performed. They were basically the darned needle type of abortion, and subsequently he

would blackmail these women for money or sex. They had no other place to go. This is where they went. This one young woman nearly died, did not die but ended up sterile as a result. If she had not nearly died, I never would have found out about it. This man would never have been prosecuted. I prosecuted him. As a result of that, we ended up with another case, which I was very proud of, called Leahy versus Beecham, a predecessor to Roe versus Wade, which made clear that abortions within a medical context would be legal. Then the difficult question that any woman would have to make would be her decision, whatever consequences would be hers, not the manipulations of a back-room abortionist.

In a way, we do almost the same thing here. We say we will withhold safe and legal alternatives to abortion, family planning, because we are against abortion. The abortions will go up. Abortions will go up and people will die. Instead, we should give families, from the largess of the United States, money to plan their families.

Madam President, I yield back all time on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

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

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

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 3:30 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will now resume consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 1, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require a balanced budget.

The Senate resumed consideration of the joint resolution.

Pending:
Byrd amendment No. 6, to strike the reliance on estimates and receipts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is amendment No. 6, offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

The debate on the amendment is limited to 2 hours, equally divided and controlled in the usual form.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 6, AS MODIFIED

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment and send the modification to the desk.

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

The amendment is so modified.

The amendment (No. 6), as modified, is as follows:

On page 3, strike lines 12 through 14 and insert the following:

"SECTION 6. The Congress shall implement this article by law.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair and I thank the manager of the resolution, Mr. HATCH, and I thank all Senators.

Madam President, the proponents of the proposed constitutional amendment now before the Senate would have the American people believe that if their proposal is adopted by Congress and ratified by three-fourths of the States, the Federal budget will then be constitutionally required to be balanced every year, unless supermajorities of both Houses pass waivers. But let us all remember that "the devil himself can quote Scriptures for his purpose." My purpose here is to strip away the hype and the rhetoric and examine the manner in which this constitutional amendment will actually work.

Section 1 of the article states, "Total outlays for any fiscal year shall not exceed total receipts for that fiscal year * * *." That is pretty plain. That seems quite straightforward and very clear. There appears to be no room for any misplay or misunderstanding. The entire Federal budget must be balanced each and every year, right down to the bottom dollar. Unlike State and local governments or businesses, where borrowing is frequently used for the purchase of capital investments—or, in the case of family budgets, where debt is incurred for the purchase of homes and automobiles and to pay for college tuition costs—the Federal unified budget will not be allowed to incur debt for any reason under this amendment. Instead, the Federal Government's investments in military weaponry, highways, bridges, waterways, and all other capital items will have to be paid for, in full—cash on the barrel head—as they are purchased. Total spending for any year for any purpose will have to be no greater than the income to the Treasury for that same year if this amendment is adopted.

But, the question arises, just how are we mere mortals to ensure that total outlays do not indeed exceed receipts, and how will that constitutional requirement be enforced?

How, indeed, given that the Federal budget deficit, its total receipts and its total outlays, unlike the family budget, is based entirely on estimates? Granted, these estimates of total outlays and total receipts are prepared by some of the finest statistical wizards in this country—the men and women who work for the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office.

Once the amount of the deficit is set in the annual Congressional Budget Resolution, then the Congressional Budget Office, CBO, monitors the performance of the economy throughout