

Population Conference in Cairo in 1994, and, indeed, we convinced other nations to increase their contributions to international family planning efforts, in the United States in the past year family planning funds were cut below 35 percent below the previous year, and then additional restrictions were added to that.

So the net effect was the budget, which previously was \$547 billion, has now shrunk to \$72 billion this year. These cuts are devastating families around the world.

According to a recent report released by the Rockefeller Foundation, in 1 year 7 million couples in developing countries will lose access to modern contraceptives, resulting in 4 million unplanned pregnancies. But here is the important part, Mr. President. As a result of lack of family planning and information in these countries around the world, 1.6 million of those unwanted pregnancies will end in abortion. That is the last thing we want.

Tragically, the international family planning program which we are going to vote on at 2:30 has become bogged down over the debate about abortion. I am perplexed about this, Mr. President. Why should those who oppose family planning also oppose abortion? Or, to put it the other way around, why should those who oppose abortion oppose family planning? Study after study has shown that lack of family planning leads to more unintended pregnancies, which leads to more abortions. If we want to end abortions, reduce the number of abortions, it is clear that we should have greater family planning than we currently have.

Let me illustrate this with an example in two countries. Russia. Russia has very little contraception available and abortion is the primary method of birth control. The average Russian woman has at least four abortions in her lifetime. I am absolutely shocked by that.

Now let us look at Hungary. Hungary has made family planning services widely available and the abortion rate in that country has dropped dramatically.

The impact these programs, that is, our family planning programs, have on the health and well-being of women and children around the world just cannot be denied. But there is another issue here that should not be overlooked, and that is the important role that population programs play in improving global environment or sustaining the environment of this globe which we are all traveling around on.

Listen to these statistics. The Earth now supports 5.7 billion human beings. In 30 years, it is estimated that the world population will grow from 5.7 billion to 8.3 billion, a 46-percent growth in 30 years—a 46-percent growth in the population of this world. We are growing by 86 million people a year; 90 percent of this increase will be in the so-called developing world.

India, let us take India as an example. India has to feed an additional 16

million people a year, and so many of these additional people that we have in the world are children. And 40 percent of the population of the average less developed nation is under the age of 15.

To say that this population explosion has put pressure on our natural resources is, of course, a terrific understatement. Over the past 50 years, the Earth is estimated to have lost one-fifth of its topsoil and one-fifth of its tropical rain forests, plus tens of thousands of plant and animal species so important to biodiversity. Overfishing in our oceans combined with pollution has resulted in the plundering of two-thirds of the fisheries of the world. Fifty years ago we had these fisheries. Two-thirds of them are now gone.

Let us just take a look at Bangladesh. There are 120 million people in Bangladesh, crammed into a country the size of Wisconsin, and that number is expected to rise in this little country the size of Wisconsin, rise from the current 120 million people to 200 million in the next 30 years—200 million people in a country the size of Wisconsin. Overpopulation in that country of Bangladesh and upstream in the Himalayas has led to severe deforestation. The poor people there have cut down every tree in sight. They have used them for firewood. They have used them for building materials. They have tried to clear for farmland. With no trees to hold the topsoil in place, it simply washes away. Overcrowding has forced thousands of people in Bangladesh to settle on land that is nothing more than washed away topsoil deposits from the Ganges and Bramaputra Rivers. That sorry land of Bangladesh is horribly vulnerable to flooding and storm surges. One flood, in 1988, inundated three-quarters of the country, killing tens of thousands of people.

Now, what can we do about all of this? First, we must focus on education in the developing nations, particularly female literacy. The statistics show absolutely that if we teach young women to read, everything else follows: Greater marriage, greater use of contraception, fewer and healthier children, better maternal health and a smaller likelihood of living in poverty. That is the first thing. Educate these folks, particularly the young women.

Second, the developed nations should do everything they can to influence population growth because that leads to better maternal and child health. Poor health keeps a nation poor and undeveloped. Ironically, poor health even contributes to overpopulation. If parents can be certain that their children will survive, they will invest more in them emotionally and materially and feel less pressure to have additional children.

So that is the second thing. Do everything we can to improve maternal and child health.

Third, and most relevant to the matter before us today, the Cairo Conference stressed the importance of redoubling our efforts to increase access

to family planning. In the 28 countries that have received the largest amount of family planning funds, the average family size has decreased 40 percent over the past 30 years—a 40 percent decrease in the average population size because of the family planning funds that have been distributed in those nations.

Mr. President, the United States plays a critical role in providing family planning services abroad. I feel strongly we should continue our leadership role in this area. It is both humane and environmentally sound. I urge my colleagues to support the early release of these family planning funds. In other words, vote for the release of these funds, which we will do shortly after the noon break.

Mr. President, I also hope that we can in future years increase the funding for these critical programs in our appropriations measures.

I thank the Chair.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

The Senate continued with the consideration of the joint resolution.

AMENDMENT NO. 9

(Purpose: To add a provision proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections)

Mr. HOLLINGS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts yielding just momentarily. According to the unanimous-consent agreement, I would just call up the amendment at the desk on behalf of myself and Senator BRYAN and ask that the clerk report and then have the amendment set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the resolution is set aside. The clerk will report.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], for himself, Mr. SPECTER, and Mr. BRYAN, proposes an amendment No. 9.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 1, beginning on line 3, strike "That the" and all that follows through page 2, line 5, and insert the following: "That the following articles are proposed as amendments to the Constitution, either or both of which articles shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years after the date of its submission for ratification:"

On page 3, after line 16, add the following:

"ARTICLE—

"SECTION 1. Congress shall have power to set reasonable limits on the amount of contributions that may be accepted by, and the amount of expenditures that may be made by, in support of, or in opposition to, a candidate for nomination for election to, or for election to, Federal office.

"SECTION 2. A State shall have power to set reasonable limits on the amount of contributions that may be accepted by, and the amount of expenditures that may be made by, in support of, or in opposition to, a candidate for nomination for election to, or for election to, State or local office.

"SECTION 3. Congress shall have power to implement and enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Mr. HOLLINGS. This is the amendment on the Constitution with respect to campaign finance that was just listed by the majority leader. I thank the distinguished Chair, and I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the Hollings amendment is now set aside.

APPROVING THE PRESIDENTIAL FINDING REGARDING THE POPULATION PLANNING PROGRAM

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Massachusetts is now recognized.

Mr. KERRY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, as my colleague from Rhode Island has mentioned, this afternoon, when we come out of the caucuses, we will vote on the vitally important issue of the release of funding for international population programs.

I strongly support the President's finding which states that the funding restriction placed on the previously appropriated population funds "is having a negative impact on the proper functioning of the population planning program." I strongly agree with that finding. The delayed funding, combined with the massive cuts are not only doing significant damage to international family planning programs, but quite literally is threatening the lives of thousands of women and children worldwide.

I hope no one here will underestimate the importance of this vote. It is about values—the values we place on the importance of women's health, child survival, and population assistance. The vote is not about increasing or decreasing funds. The damage of large funding cuts unfortunately already has occurred. We will vote now simply on whether we will release previously appropriated funds for population assistance 5 months late into the fiscal year, or 9 months late into the fiscal year. Let me remind my colleagues that these delays have been going on now for a year and a half, and the cumulative effect is extremely enormously negative.

These programs are on the brink of bankruptcy and are close to shutting down because they have already sustained a 35-percent cut since 1995. In dollar figures, this means a cut from \$547 million in 1995 to \$385 million in 1997, compounded by a year and a half of unprecedented delays in metering out that which has been appropriated at the trickling rate of 8 percent per month.

This should not be a partisan issue. The health and survival of women and

children and efforts to reduce infant mortality are not, or should not be, partisan issues. I joined then-Senator Alan Simpson in representing the United States at the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development in Cairo, where the United States was a major leader in galvanizing the international community to action. U.S. leadership was based on bipartisan values about international family planning. The conference brought together people from around the world—of all religious, nationality, and ethnic groups—working together toward responsible methods of family planning, and education, and to establish a platform from which to build toward the availability of these crucial social services in all corners of the globe. However, since the conference in Cairo, some Members of the United States Congress have made it their mission to erode the bipartisan base from which the U.S. pledged to lead by slashing funds and delaying the release of those funds. I think this is punitive, it is indefensible, and it is wrong.

Today we have the opportunity to right at least a small part of this wrong by releasing the previously appropriated funds for population assistance March 1 instead of July 1. In my judgement it is a matter of fundamental responsibility that we approve the Presidential finding that confirms the harm these delays are causing families worldwide, and prevent further delay is making the funds available.

Mr. President, if we do not do this, it means shutting the door to thousands of women and families worldwide who have asked for the opportunity to simply, take control of their lives and their health, and responsibly plan their families. We have succeeded in the difficult task of raising public awareness of the benefits of family planning. As one program coordinator in Nigeria said, "It is one thing to raise public awareness but if there is no access to birth control for poor women, what use is awareness?" We cannot turn our backs now. We must follow through. Let me stress: This vote is not about abortion, as some Senators have tried to argue. Opponents of family planning programs mistakenly believe that funds for these programs enable women to have abortions. That is erroneous emotionalism, Mr. President. We should look at the facts. The fact is that, by law, no U.S. assistance can be used to pay for abortions anywhere in the world. The irony is that the anti-abortion advocates who oppose these programs are actually increasing the incidence of abortions they decry by denying women the means to responsibly space their children. As our former colleague, Senator Mark Hatfield, a well respected prolife leader in support for population funding, articulated in a letter to Representative CHRIS SMITH, * * * "you are contributing to an increase of abortions worldwide because of the funding restrictions on which you insisted * * *. It is

a proven fact that when contraceptive services are not available to women throughout the world, abortion rates increase."

I ask my colleagues, whether you are in favor of abortion or not, to approve the Presidential finding and the earlier release of family planning funds. This is assuredly a vote for women's health, because it will determine whether we give or deny women in impoverished countries a critical ingredient they need to lead healthy lives and raise healthy children.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate now stands in recess until the hour of 10 minutes past 2.

Thereupon, at 12:54 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:10 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. COATS).

APPROVING THE PRESIDENTIAL FINDING REGARDING THE POPULATION PLANNING PROGRAM

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 2:10 having arrived, the Senate will now resume consideration of House Joint Resolution 36, which the clerk will report.

The bill 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 resumed consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 5 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form with the vote on the joint resolution to occur at 2:15.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, very briefly, I urge my colleagues to vote against the President's request for early release of population funds. Significant concessions have already been made by those of us who support the pro-life position. We agreed to raise the overall level of funding from \$356 million in 1996 to \$385 million, and the disbursement rate from 6 percent to 8 percent a month. Now the President wants to move up the date when disbursement begins. This would make \$123 million more available for organizations that either support or lobby for the legalization of abortion.

The administration claims that 17 projects will be forced to close down if we delay funding until July. Yet, virtually every one of these programs could be funded because they are willing to abide by Mexico City conditions not to support abortion or lobby to legalize it. To protect a few groups who support abortion, the administration is