

"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

withholding support from many organizations willing to provide family planning services consistent with the Mexico City guidelines. They complain about a lack of funds, yet are willing to forgo an increase if it is linked to Mexico City.

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 hope the resolution will be opposed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, we should understand what we are voting on. We are about to vote on a resolution to decide when, not whether we release funds, but when.

Somebody said yesterday that this vote is about an additional \$123 million for groups that fund abortion. That is absolutely false. We have appropriated this money. There is no additional money. In fact, we are voting to spend and release \$160 million less than we appropriated 2 years ago. So whether or not this resolution passes this afternoon, the funds are going to be spent anyway. It is just a question of when.

We should also understand that U.S. law, which all of us have supported, says that none of this money can be used to pay for abortions anywhere, and very careful audits have been made of this money, and nobody has shown that a cent of it has ever been used to promote abortion.

Some say we will have another population funding vote maybe later this week. That is not going to happen. This is the only vote on family planning. Do we vote to release the money now, that is March 1, or July 1? That is all it is. But if we delay, we are using the ultimate arrogance. We are saying we know better than you; you cannot have family planning money.

Let me tell you what happens when we spend it. In Russia, abortion was routinely used as a method for family planning. In the 4 years since we started family planning programs there, just by increasing the number of contraceptives by 5 percent, the number of abortions fell 800,000. So when we put family planning money into Russia, abortions came down by 800,000. When we withhold family planning money, abortions then go up. We ought to ask ourselves about that.

The Senator from Maine, Senator SNOWE, spoke so eloquently on this. Senator GORDON SMITH, who is very much a right-to-life Senator, spoke of his opposition to abortion but of his support of family planning.

We should listen to what is really here. We are just saying, let us stop abortions by voting for family planning.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, today the Senate will consider House Joint Resolution 36, the administration's request to begin releasing voluntary fiscal year 1997 international family planning funds on March 1 rather than July

1 this year. This resolution simply reduces the delay in the funds' release from 9 months to 5 since the fiscal year began October 1, 1996. Although some want to characterize this as an abortion vote, it simply is not. The funds to be released could be used only for voluntary family planning—not for abortion. In fact, today's vote is about whether the Senate will help prevent unintended pregnancies in the first place.

Furthermore, the resolution the Senate is considering does not call for any additional funding for international family planning. Whether these funds are released in March or July, the entire amount of funding appropriated for international family planning in fiscal year 1997 will ultimately be spent.

Passage of this resolution merits the support of all Members of Congress who wish to see improvements in the quality of life for women and families around the world. U.S. contributions to international family planning programs have improved the lives of women in developing countries immeasurably. The ability to plan the size of one's family is essential if women and children are to live longer and healthier lives, and if women are to make the educational and economic gains they and we wish to see.

A majority of our colleagues in the House of Representatives endorsed the President's plan to release funds for voluntary family planning when it passed House Joint Resolution 36 on February 13. Now the Senate must decide. The fiscal year 1997 Foreign Operations Appropriations bill, which Congress passed as part of the Omnibus Appropriations bill last year, includes a provision that prohibits the U.S. Agency for International Development [USAID] from obligating funds for international family planning until July 1, 1997. The provision also states that if the President determines the delay is having a negative impact on USAID's population program, funds may be made available beginning March 1, 1997, if Congress approves the finding.

On January 31, the President certified that the restrictions imposed by Congress are, in fact, having a negative impact on USAID's population planning program. The President argues that family planning service delivery and their supporting activities would be disrupted, costs at all levels for the program would increase, and, most importantly, the health and well-being of women, men, and children who are beneficiaries of U.S. assistance would be severely threatened. As a consequence, increases in unintended pregnancies, infants and maternal deaths and abortions would be inevitable.

The President also suggests that at least 17 bilateral and worldwide programs will have urgent funding needs in the March-June period. By delaying the release of U.S. funds until July these organizations would be forced to suspend, defer, or terminate family

planning activities. One program that would be adversely impacted by the delay is the Institute for Reproductive Health at Georgetown University. The institute does research on natural family planning and provides couples with access to family planning methods. In a letter to Congressman DAVID BONIOR earlier this month, the president of Georgetown University, Father Leo J. O'Donovan, stated that if funding for international family planning is delayed until July, the institute would be forced to terminate work that provides services to more than one million families throughout the world.

Delaying U.S. contributions to international family planning programs will also inhibit the progress that many countries have made toward reducing abortions. The Russian Department of Health reports that the use of contraceptives grew from 19 to 24 percent between 1990 and 1994 with the establishment of 50 International Planned Parenthood Federation affiliates across Russia. During that time period, the number of abortions performed dropped from 3.6 million to 2.8 million. According to the administration, if funding for international family planning is delayed until July, two of the largest organizations that receive USAID funds in Russia would be unable to provide 1.7 million couples with access to modern family planning methods as an alternative to abortion.

In Bolivia, USAID provides funding for both government and non-governmental organizations. Since the delivery of family planning services was expanded in the country between 1989 and 1994, the use of family planning in Bolivia increased by 50 percent. The administration argues that if funds for international family planning are delayed until July, USAID would be forced to defer ongoing population assistance in that country. This would jeopardize services for 20 percent of Bolivia's population and reduce support to local organizations providing family planning services to an additional 30 percent of Bolivia's rural population.

Many other developing countries experiencing rapid population growth would face similar setbacks if U.S. contributions were delayed. USAID currently assists more than 60 countries through 95 bilateral and worldwide programs. For more than 30 years, this organization has had a remarkable impact on the daily lives of people around the world. It has helped millions of families determine the number and spacing of their children through voluntary family planning programs. It has reduced high-risk pregnancies and helped save the lives of hundreds of thousands of women. And, again, it has reduced the number of unintended pregnancies and abortions.

USAID has also made a significant contribution to slowing down the world population growth. Due in large part to U.S. leadership and bipartisan support for USAID, global population is now growing at a slower rate. Nonetheless,

the world's population could double to over 11 billion by the year 2050 unless further progress is made. Delaying U.S. contributions to family planning an additional 4 months will only exacerbate the numerous social and environmental problems associated with rapid population growth. We simply cannot afford to delay U.S. contributions to family planning programs any longer.

The President has determined that a continued delay in funding for international family planning will cause serious, irreversible and avoidable harm. Just as our colleagues in the House of Representatives did, it is time for the Senate to lend its support to the President's request. I urge my colleagues to support House Joint Resolution 36 and permit the President to begin releasing funds for international family planning on March 1.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I recognize the important contribution that voluntary family planning programs can make to the effectiveness of U.S. foreign aid programs. Clearly, high rates of population growth are an immense barrier to economic and social change in developing countries.

I also recognize that increased access to population planning programs can help reduce the number of abortions, as I understand has been happening in Russia, for example.

However, we must also recognize why the Congress imposed the funding limitations contained in the fiscal year 1997 foreign operations appropriations bill. It was because of a serious difference of views, within the Congress and between the Congress and the administration, over whether U.S. population planning funds should go to organizations that also provide abortion services.

Like many of my colleagues, I have long supported the Mexico City policy of the Reagan and Bush administrations, which restricted funds for any non-governmental organizations that were involved in any way in abortion activities. Although there is a broad consensus that no U.S. aid funds should be used to fund abortions themselves, it is intellectually dishonest to ignore the fact that dollars are fungible.

Providing funds to an organization for purposes other than abortions can free up funds from other sources that can then be used for abortions. That organization can say, with a straight face, that the U.S. funds did not pay for the abortions, but the practical effect is the same, which is contrary to the intent of the law and the desires of the American people.

I have no desire to hold up the release of funds for population planning programs. And if the administration agrees to return to the Mexico City policy, there will be no future delays in the release of such funds. Funding for population programs may even increase. But if we vote to release the fiscal year 1997 funds early, it will be viewed by the administration as an endorsement of its current policy regarding funding for organizations that provide abortion services.

For this reason, I will vote against the early release of the funds.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I support the release of funds for international family planning. This program is essential to enabling the world's poorest women to improve their lives—and the lives of their families.

Over the past 2 years, Congress has drastically cut funds for international family planning—and has put barriers in the way of implementing the program. We have tied our international family planning program in knots—and are denying health care to the world's poorest women.

Today we will vote to right part of this wrong. We are not voting to increase international family planning. We are simply voting to release the funds—so that our family planning program will no longer be held hostage.

What do the cuts and delays in funding mean for poor women? The Alan Guttmacher Institute estimates that it means that 7 million couples in developing countries will no longer have access to contraceptives. There could be almost 2 million unplanned births. And there could be up to 1.6 million additional abortions.

When we deny a woman the right to choose whether or not to have children, we deny her the right to control and improve her life. We deny her the right to help herself and her family.

Those who oppose international family planning assistance claim to want to reduce the number of abortions. But the effect of our policies is just the opposite. Family planning prevents unwanted pregnancies and abortions. You would think this basic fact would not need to be restated on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

America's international family planning funds are not spent on abortion. So now, some insist on going after basic health care services that prevent pregnancy.

Over 100 million women throughout the world cannot obtain family planning because they are poor, uneducated, or lack access to health care. Twenty million of these women will seek unsafe abortions. Some women will die, some will be disabled. We could prevent some of this needless suffering.

This issue won't go away. I will join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in fighting against the irrational and cruel effort to end U.S. assistance for international family planning. We will continue the fight to enable the world's poorest women to control and improve their lives.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I would like to join with so many of my colleagues in opposing this resolution requested by President Clinton. There are several reasons why I believe it would be wrong for the Congress to accelerate funding for international population control programs. It is the wrong thing to do fiscally, and it is the wrong thing to do on its own merits.

For the past 3 weeks, the U.S. Senate has been debating the need for a balanced budget amendment. And now, as one of the Congress' first acts, we are considering spending an additional \$123 million in fiscal year 1997 for international population control?

Second, does it make sense for us to be accelerating spending on this extraordinarily controversial program without the kind of sensible protections that existed during the Reagan and Bush administrations?

Mr. President, despite the claims to the contrary by the other side, this is a vote that involves the issue of abortion. That is because this vote involves U.S. taxpayers funding of organizations that perform and promote abortions overseas. During the Reagan and Bush administrations, our international family planning programs were administered under the Mexico City policy, so-named after the 1984 U.N. population conference in Mexico City where this U.S. policy was formulated. Under the Mexico City policy, this program was kept entirely separate from the issue of abortion. This was accomplished by requiring that U.S. family planning programs overseas could only be administered by private groups that do not conduct abortions, or promote abortion as a method of family planning.

Because we all know that money is fungible, funding abortion-promoting groups to conduct family planning programs overseas permitted these groups to extend their international presence, increase their abortion activities, and lobby more aggressively to weaken laws restricting abortion overseas. The Reagan/Bush policies helped protect our international family planning programs from the controversy that inevitably arose through their association with private pro-abortion groups. With the protection of the Mexico City policy, funding for our international family planning programs increased from \$251 million in 1987 to \$434 million in 1993.

One of President Clinton's first actions after his inauguration in 1993, however, was to rescind the Executive order that put the Mexico City policy in place. Because of the President's action, suddenly this once again became one of our most controversial foreign aid programs.

This Congress has an opportunity to reinstate the sensible family planning policies of Mexico City. I commend my colleague from Arkansas, Senator HUTCHINSON, for his leadership in introducing legislation that would return family-planning funding to the principles set forth by Presidents Reagan and Bush. I am proud to be an original co-sponsor of this important legislation.

There is a reason why last fall's Omnibus Appropriations Act delayed expenditures for this program so that some of the expenditures of the money would not actually be spent until next year. This was the result of a delicate compromise between the Congress and

the administration. The administration was offered the choice. The Congress was willing to lift all restrictions on the rate of spending for overseas family planning funds, but only if the administration would refrain from funneling those funds through abortion advocacy groups like the International Planned Parenthood Federation. I would note that the Clinton administration preferred to keep funding restrictions in place so that it could continue administering the program through pro-abortion groups.

Now the administration wants to undo this compromise. The administration wants all funding restrictions lifted. At the same time, they refuse to accept the sensible Reagan/Bush policies that protected this program from the contentious abortion debate.

Groups supporting this resolution have argued that a more rapid expenditure of these funds by groups that perform abortions and lobby aggressively for abortion-on-demand laws would, in the long term, reduce the rate of abortions around the world. This Senator, however, fails to understand the logic of funding pro-abortion groups to advance this pro-life objective. It is a simple fact that the rate of abortions increases dramatically whenever a country legalizes abortion. I do not believe sending more U.S. taxpayer dollars to an international network of clinics run by groups that conduct abortions is likely to reduce the number of abortions worldwide.

Mr. President, the answer to ensuring the long-term health and welfare of women across the world and stabilizing the world's population is not to promote abortion overseas as a population control alternative with U.S. taxpayers' hard-earned dollars. The answer is to promote free markets and individual liberties in underdeveloped countries. Over two-thirds of the world's recent fertility decline can be accounted for by the expansion of economic opportunity and personal freedoms, as women across the world are given access to greater educational and lifetime opportunities. Freer markets, more education and information and more opportunities for the world's women—that's the answer.

Mr. President, I would gladly vote to remove spending restrictions on this program if the administration would agree to protect it from abuse by pro-abortion advocates. But under the legislative procedures we have before us today, that sensible option is not available. Therefore, I cannot support this resolution, and urge its defeat.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, this week, the Senate will have the opportunity to vote on two measures related to international family planning. One, House Joint Resolution 36, which is supported by the Clinton administration, would release population control funds on March 1, instead of July 1. The funding could not be meted out any faster than 8 percent of the total appropriated for fiscal year 1997 per

month—a limitation recommended by the President's Chief of Staff last year. But the funds could be made available to groups that provide abortions or lobby in support of more liberal abortion policies abroad.

The alternative measure—the so-called Smith-Oberstar bill, H.R. 581—would provide for the immediate release of all fiscal year 1997 population control funds, subject to conditions that would preclude their use for abortion-related activities. In other words, Smith-Oberstar would ensure that the funds are used for what we all say is intended here—family planning, not abortion.

I would point out that both measures passed the House of Representatives on February 13. But the Smith-Oberstar bill, which passed that Chamber with more votes than the President's proposal, would make about \$170 million more available for the population control program than would President Clinton's plan. And, as I just noted, it would guarantee that the funds are used for their intended purpose—family planning—not for abortion or lobbying in support of more liberal abortion policies abroad. It would reinstate the Mexico City policy, a policy initiated by the Reagan administration at the 1984 U.N. conference in Mexico City, attaching certain conditions to the way foreign organizations can use the American people's hard-earned tax money.

Mr. President, there were two main conditions associated with the Mexico City policy. First, an Agency for International Development [AID] grantee, getting U.S. tax money for family planning overseas, could not be involved in abortion, even with its own resources.

Second, that grantee could not lobby or pressure foreign governments on the abortion issue.

At the crux of this debate is a simple question: Why did President Reagan establish those conditions for receipt of American tax dollars? Once we understand the answer to that question, we can get this debate into its proper focus.

Let us start with this fundamental principle: Any nongovernmental grantee of the United States abroad—which includes, of course, all the organizations that receive U.S. population assistance funds—is, in effect, an agent of the United States.

It does not matter how the group puts its own money to use. What matters is that, when we give them American dollars, we give them our seal of approval, too. An AID grant confers more than just funds. It bestows respectability, standing, and clout. It is, in effect, an official endorsement.

And that is why, for decades, we have always imposed all sorts of restrictions and requirements upon AID grantees. We do so in recognition of the fact that money is fungible. Give a million dollars to an organization, and you free up a million dollars of its own money for other activities.

Far more important though, we all understand that an AID grant marks an organization as acceptable, ideologically and ethically, to the United States.

Back in 1984, President Reagan saw that AID grants to groups involved in abortion overseas presented an ethical dilemma. Yes, it was their own money they were using to perform or promote abortion. But every dollar they got from American taxpayers freed up another dollar for their abortion-related work.

President Reagan understood that the international community viewed those abortion groups as quasi-official agents of the U.S. Government. And for good reason. Private organizations, having the imprimatur of taxpayer funding, could well be viewed by foreign leaders as speaking on behalf of the U.S. Government about abortion-related policies.

In fact, some AID grantees openly ran pro-abortion lobbying campaigns, with their own resources of course, in countries where abortion was not legal.

Their money, freed up by AID grants, gave them access to local media and local officials. In country after country, they ran sophisticated—and effective—campaigns in favor of abortion.

And they are still doing it. The tiny island nation of Mauritius is an example of the worldwide effort being waged by the International Planned Parenthood Federation. This is what IPPF said in its own report on activities in Mauritius:

As a direct result of the advocacy campaign, the policy climate in Mauritius has changed favourably . . . The MFPA (Mauritius Family Planning Association, a member of the IPPF) is determined to maintain the momentum, and sees its role more stimulating as it contributes to the wave of change.

There is a fundamental issue here: Should funds be earmarked for family planning as intended, or should taxpayers be required to fund lobbying activities with which they might disagree? While there is general consensus in favor of family planning, most people do not believe tax dollars should be used for lobbying activities.

Back in 1984, President Reagan did not like the idea of our grantees pressuring foreign governments—particularly with the appearance of an official endorsement by the government of the United States.

That is why he made a distinction, in his Mexico City white paper, between what foreign governments do with their money, and what our grantees do with their money.

Foreign governments that might be involved in abortion would not be seen as agents of the United States, but AID grantees would be seen in that light.

So in his Mexico City policy, President Reagan gave AID's population grantees a choice. If they wanted to remain eligible for future grants, they would have to promise not to get involved with abortion or abortion lobbying overseas, even with their own money.

And the program worked very effectively with that kind of policy in place. While the Mexico City policy was in effect, the program provided funds to about 400 organizations worldwide, accounting for nearly half of the combined pool of family planning funds made available by donor nations. And as I recall, the amount of money appropriated for international family planning rose considerably during the Reagan-Bush years.

Only two grantees—albeit two very powerful grantees—chose to put abortion advocacy ahead of their commitment to family planning. Their involvement in abortion was apparently so deep that they were willing to cripple the family planning work of even some of their own affiliates that were willing to accept the Mexico City conditions during those years.

So when we are told today that the Mexico City policy—like the provisions of the House-passed Smith-Oberstar bill—would wreck international family planning, we need only look back on past experience to see what effect it really had.

Mr. President, past experience tells us that almost every AID population grantee would put its commitment to family planning head of its involvement in, and lobbying for, abortion. Only one or two would not.

This country's approach to international family planning is seen around the world as part of our foreign policy. And those few grantees that are zealous in their support for abortion should not be allowed to call the shots for what is really an arm of American foreign policy.

So the question the Senate faces this week is not how much money the AID population account will get in March or in July. The question is whether, as a matter of American foreign policy, the prestige of the American Government and the resources of the American people should support family planning on the one hand, or a worldwide campaign for abortion on demand on the other.

If that issue had been better understood when the House of Representatives voted on this matter earlier this month, the President's resolution might not have been approved.

Mr. President, I want to conclude by quoting President Reagan, when he first enunciated the Mexico City policy in the early 1980's. He said:

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 resources—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.

That goal should not be held hostage to the Clinton administration's demand that we fund groups involved in abortion and in abortion lobbying. Fortunately, we do have an alternative, as

embodied in the Smith-Oberstar bill. That is the legislation the Senate should vote to send to the President this week.

Mr. President, it is a shame that some people seem to care more about promoting abortions and related policy than providing family planning services abroad. I ask unanimous consent that a column by Robert Novak about that be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KYL. If we are going to get back to the old policy—a successful policy that ensured funds were made available promptly and used for population assistance as intended—we need to reinstate limitations similar to the Mexico City policy. When we can be sure that the funds are to be used for their intended purpose—that is, for family planning—I believe we will find a large consensus that will support the program. I, for one, will do so under those circumstances.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 13, 1997]

FAMILY PLANNING SHOWDOWN

(By Robert Novak)

President Clinton's strategy for keeping U.S. funding of global population control free of restrictions on abortion was exposed in a remarkable speech delivered by the first lady two months ago in La Paz, Bolivia.

Hillary Rodham Clinton, addressing the Sixth Conference of Wives of Heads of State and Governments of the Americans on Dec. 3, declared: "Some members of the U.S. Congress have voted to limit American support for family planning initiatives. My husband's administration remains committed to encouraging a continuation of these investments."

That left pro-life members of Congress open-mouthed in outrage. The "limit" on contraceptive help to poor countries that Mrs. Clinton deplored was proposed last year not by them but by her husband's chief of staff at the time, Leon Panetta. The Clinton administration's position: better take less birth control money than accept anti-abortion restrictions. The House itself will choose which course in a showdown vote today.

President Clinton, who as governor of Arkansas espoused a moderate pro-life position, is now joined at the hip with extreme abortion rights advocates. From his veto of the partial-birth abortion bill to his current stance on world population control, he will not risk alienating the feminist support that is critical to Democratic success.

The current dispute began in August 1984, when the International Conference on Population held in Mexico City adopted language urged by Reagan-appointed U.S. officials. The nations of the world signed a report urging all governments to "take appropriate steps to help women avoid abortion, which in no case should be promoted as a method of family planning." President Ronald Reagan then issued an executive order applying the Mexico City language to U.S. foreign aid. No longer would Uncle Sam be violating local religious and cultural norms that oppose abortion.

Some 350 foreign organizations complied, but the London-based International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF) refused to certify that it would not promote abortion

for family planning. Indeed, IPPF's current "Vision 2000" is a battle plan for fighting abortion prohibitions worldwide. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, who along with other administration officials denies that the United States funds abortions abroad, in House testimony Tuesday said she had never heard of "Vision 2000."

On Jan. 22, 1993, two days after taking office, Clinton signed an executive order repealing the Mexico City language. With Undersecretary of State Timothy Wirth pushing hard, population control money increased dramatically amid overall fiscal restraint. In two years, funding increased by 79 percent to \$582.7 million.

Republicans took control of Congress in January 1995 and sought to restore anti-abortion restrictions. To break a deadlock last September, the Republican leadership offered this compromise: Organizations that followed the Mexico City language would receive full funding; those that refused—such as IPPF—would get 50 percent.

No soap, said Panetta. Instead, he made a counter-offer at 6:30 in the morning on Saturday, Sept. 28, after an all-night negotiating session in the Capitol seeking an omnibus spending agreement. Panetta proposed a 35 percent reduction of family planning spending (the same as the rest of the foreign aid budget). In other words, accept less money for population control rather than accept anti-abortion restrictions. Abortion has precedence over contraception. Facing another politically ruinous government shutdown, the Republicans had no alternative other than to say yes.

The agreement also mandated a vote in the House (to be held today) on full funding without the Mexico City language. But pro-lifers will also offer an alternative co-sponsored by Republican Rep. Christopher Smith of New Jersey and Democratic Rep. James Oberstar of Minnesota for even fuller funding—\$713 million compared with \$543.6 million—but including the Mexico City language.

Vice President Al Gore has met privately in a strategy session with abortion-rights advocates, and White House aides have been whipping up public support. They have spread propaganda that the Smith-Oberstar amendment represents a double cross that undercuts support of family planning. All of this is incorrect.

Even if Smith-Oberstar passes both houses of Congress, a presidential veto is likely. That would cause spending to revert to the present \$420.4 million level, with no restrictions on IPPF or other abortion advocates. Here is not a fight about contraception but about abortion.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, today, the issue before the Senate is whether or not to approve the release of desperately needed international family planning funds 5 months after the start of the fiscal year or 9 months after the start of the fiscal year. This is not a tough decision, we should have released the money months ago; our failure to release the family planning funds has caused unnecessary harm to women, children, and families around the globe. However, since we do not have the ability to go back in time and release the funds at the beginning of the fiscal year, I urge my colleagues to prevent future harm and to support the President's request and release the family planning funds on March 1.

In this increasingly global economy, it is in the United States' best interest

to provide international family planning assistance to developing countries around the world. As the Rockefeller Foundation reports, " * * * resource scarcities, often exacerbated by population growth, undermine the quality of life, confidence in government, and threaten to destabilize many parts of the globe * * *. Thus in a world made smaller by global commerce and communication, such scarcities affect us in the United States. Civil unrest can alter the balance of power in key regions, destabilize nations with large populations and extensive resources, or contribute to humanitarian disasters that call for assistance and peace-keeping services." The rate of population growth is often inversely related to the rate of economic growth.

In addition, developing countries provide a significant expanding market for U.S. goods. Unrest and instability can lead to a decrease in exports and thus a decrease in the number jobs here at home. The lack of jobs in a developing country, resulting from the ever expanding work force, can also drive down wages and lead to job loss in this country by forcing U.S. workers to compete with low-wage workers overseas.

Developing nations with increasingly desperate needs for resources have also been known to over use their natural resources to the detriment of the long-term environmental stability of the nation and of the world.

International family planning funds allow women to choose to have fewer and thus healthier children. In turn, studies show that when families can count on healthier children, they are likely to have fewer children. This limits population growth around the globe.

Clearly, there are many other reasons to support international family planning, including the documented decrease in abortions that results from access to family planning assistance and the decrease in infant and maternal mortality. The people of the United States have been outspoken in their support for programs that improve the health and safety of women and their babies and that provide alternatives to abortion as a method of family planning.

Despite the great importance of family planning, not only for individuals and families, but also for the economic well being of many nations including the United States, the last Congress sustained a 35-percent cut in international family planning funds, a cut that was first enacted in fiscal year 1996. This cut was enacted despite the fact that there are still 230 million women worldwide, one out of every six women of childbearing age, that do not have sufficient access to modern contraceptive methods and despite the fact that we will soon have the largest population of women of child bearing age ever.

A study conducted by family planning and population organizations in

early 1996 predicted that the 35-percent cut in funding would result in an estimated additional 1.9 million births, 1.6 million abortions, 8,000 maternal deaths in pregnancy and 134,000 infant deaths.

This study did not even consider the effect of the delay in the release of funding that was part of both the fiscal year 1996 and fiscal year 1997 budgets. The fiscal year 1997 budget prevents funds from being released until 9 months into the fiscal year, and even then only a percentage of the funds can be released every month.

An additional 4 month delay in the release of funds would result in a further reduction in international family planning funds in fiscal year 1997 of \$123 million, or one-third of the money appropriated. In addition, because the agencies and organizations can only receive the funds in small increments, there is no economy of scale in the purchase of contraceptives, and there is no consistency in the ability to provide needed services.

As part of the agreement that allows these funds to be released at all, there is a provision that allows the President to determine that the funding limitations are having "a negative impact on the proper functioning" of the international family planning program and request early release of the funds. The Congress is required to vote by the end of February on whether or not to release the funds in March. Supporting the early release of funds cannot undo the damage caused by the current delay or by the significant cuts already incurred. It can, however, ensure that 17 bilateral and international organizations are not left in urgent need of funds, that women have access to safe, effective contraceptives in the next few months, and that unintended, unsafe pregnancies are prevented.

The United States has a 30-year commitment to working with organizations and governments around the world to provide women and their families with the ability to decide freely and responsibly the number and spacing of their children, improving maternal and infant health, and improving the security and independence of women's lives.

Some in Congress question the success of these efforts. The U.S. commitment, however, has been a success by every measure. In countries in which the United States has joined in family planning efforts, the average number of children a woman bears has decreased from six to three. The number of women utilizing modern contraceptives has grown from 10 to 50 percent. The U.S. provides people around the world with the opportunity to plan for the safest births and the healthiest children possible.

Unfortunately, international family planning has become tangled up in the debate over the ability of a woman to choose to terminate a pregnancy. There are those who believe that fully funding the international family plan-

ning program would lead to increased abortions. In fact, no U.S. international family planning funds are used for abortion or abortion related services. It is already against the law and that law is rigorously enforced. In addition, if women are not able to access safe, modern contraceptives, there will certainly be an increase in abortion, along with maternal and infant deaths.

Part of the appeal of linking international family planning and abortion is that many in the United States are concerned with the amount that we spend overseas and do not want funds to pay for activities that are not funded in the United States, like abortions, or to fund programs that coerce women into not having children. No international family planning money is spent on abortions or related services, or on programs that coerce women into making certain family planning decisions. In addition, just about 1 percent of our entire budget is spent on foreign aid of any sort, and only a fraction of that funding is spent on humanitarian aid, such as family planning.

Last year, Congress agreed to provide family planning funds to communities around the world because the need is there and support for the program exists. Congress should not prevent the funds from being spent by delaying the release for months beyond the start of the fiscal year.

By voting for the immediate release of funds, we will be voting against maternal and infant ill health and death, and against increased abortions worldwide. We will be voting to strengthen the global economy and preserve our environment. We will keep faith with our duty to provide constructive leadership in the world. I urge my colleagues to vote to release the funds now so that women and children around the globe can be safe and healthy.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr President, the Senate will soon vote to affirm or reject President Clinton's decision to seek the prompt release of international family planning moneys already appropriated for fiscal year 1997. Let me be crystal clear on this point, the question before the Senate is the release of moneys already agreed to by this body. Virtually every Senator who served in the last Congress has already voted to support international family planning. And it is worth noting that the fiscal year 1997 appropriation for international family planning is significantly reduced from previous years' funding levels; a 35 percent cut from the fiscal year 1996 figure.

Mr. President, I strongly support and I do urge all of my colleagues to support President Clinton's decision to seek the early release of the \$385 million appropriated by the 104th Congress for fiscal year 1997. Traditionally, the Senate in bipartisan fashion has supported the President's position on this issue. And I want to commend the House of Representatives for earlier

agreeing to the President's request to release the monies for international family planning.

The politics of extremism and misinformation have turned this into a much larger vote than it should be. The American people should watch closely the results of the vote on this issue. They will get an early glimpse of whether the popular rhetoric about working together is real or simply a political ploy to mask the politics of division and confrontation that most agree was denounced in last fall's election by the American people.

Today the world's population has swelled to more than 5 billion people, with nearly 100 million more added each year. Without strong leadership in support of voluntary family planning programs, experts predict that in just over 30 years the world's population is likely to double to more than 10 and possibly as many as 13 billion people. Since the mid-1960's, our country has led the global effort to combat population growth. Currently, the Agency for International Development provides assistance in more than 60 countries through nearly 100 programs.

Importantly, USAID is prohibited by U.S. law from using taxpayer dollars to pay for abortions as a method of family planning or to motivate an individual to seek an abortion. USAID contracts contain legally binding provisions forbidding abortion as family planning and strict procedures including staff monitoring and regular audits are in place to ensure that no U.S. taxpayer moneys go to pay for abortions abroad. Those who argue this issue is about abortion are engaging in a campaign of misinformation and deceit.

Current U.S. international family planning moneys are actually reducing the frequency of abortions abroad. Thus it makes no sense to me that the opponents of abortion have decided to grade legislators on this vote. Rather, they should be supporting these programs with the same vigor they now display in opposition. Consider the recent program example of Russia. Between 1990 and 1994, the use of contraception increased from 19 percent to 24 percent of the population. As a result, the number of abortions in Russia over that period decreased by 800,000. Russian women used to have, on average, two to three abortions each over a lifetime. Family planning programs are already at work offering alternatives to abortion for women and families. All across the former Soviet Union and in countries like Mexico and Columbia, there is a body of evidence that suggests increased contraceptive use actually reduces the number of abortions. If the Senate rejects President Clinton's request to release the 1997 international family planning moneys, the result will be more abortions performed worldwide.

I want to get away from abortion because that is truly not what today's debate is about. I want to focus for a few minutes on what international family

planning moneys do accomplish and the importance of continued U.S. leadership in this area. United States international family planning programs are perhaps the most successful foreign aid programs ever supported by U.S. taxpayers.

International family planning is about women's health. Death from pregnancy related conditions is the No. 1 cause of death for women in developing countries. According to Amnesty International, almost 600,000 women per year die because of pregnancy related causes. The death of a mother in the developing world is particularly tragic for a family seeking to escape poverty as these women are usually both the principal care givers for children and a wage earner. U.S. foreign assistance moneys have increased the availability of quality reproductive health care, including women-centered, women-managed services.

International family planning is about child survival. It is estimated that nearly 35,000 children under the age of 5 die every day in the world's developing countries. Allowing families to space the birthing of children will ensure healthier mothers better able to breast feed and care for children. Increased access to family planning, combined with other factors, could reduce child survival in the developing world by 20 percent. Rejecting the President's request for the release of the 1997 moneys will surely set back efforts to reduce the number of children who die each and every day in countries like India, Bangladesh, and Uganda.

International family planning is about helping young girls worldwide. Cultural preferences for sons in the developing world has dire and sometimes deadly results for young girls. Throughout the developing world girls are fed less; girls do not get adequate health care; and girls do not get the opportunity to attend school. And we all know of the documented cases where infanticide is practiced against young girls because of a preference for sons. It is somewhat ironic that many who rail against this treatment of young girls in China and other countries would now seek to further restrict or end United States international family planning programs that do so much to better the lives of young girls.

International family planning programs are fundamental to preserving the endangered natural environment of our planet. We all know of the punishing toll that the world's population takes upon the earth: the air we breathe; the clean water we require for healthy and sanitary living; and the arable land available to feed the population. More than one-half of the world's developing population is below the age of 25. And the number of women of reproductive age in the developing world will soon total nearly 1 billion. Our population problems and the ramifications for the United States are growing. The U.S. commitment to

combat overpopulation of our planet is shrinking. It is a responsibility I believe we must not shirk.

The Senate has the opportunity to send a message of hope and opportunity to the women of the world today, and particularly those women in the developing world seeking to make a better life for themselves and their families. It is really that simple. I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for the resolution to release this crucial funding.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Vermont has expired. The Senator from Kentucky has 1 minute and 6 seconds remaining.

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield back the time, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 13 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Akaka	Feinstein	Moseley-Braun
Baucus	Glenn	Moynihan
Biden	Graham	Murray
Bingaman	Gregg	Reed
Boxer	Harkin	Reid
Bryan	Hollings	Robb
Bumpers	Jeffords	Rockefeller
Byrd	Johnson	Roth
Campbell	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Chafee	Kerrey	Smith, Gordon
Cleland	Kerry	H.
Collins	Kohl	Snowe
Conrad	Landrieu	Specter
Daschle	Lautenberg	Stevens
Dodd	Leahy	Torricelli
Dorgan	Levin	Warner
Durbin	Lieberman	Wellstone
Feingold	Mikulski	Wyden

NAYS—46

Abraham	Faircloth	Lugar
Allard	Ford	Mack
Ashcroft	Frist	McCain
Bennett	Gorton	McConnell
Bond	Gramm	Murkowski
Breaux	Grams	Nickles
Brownback	Grassley	Roberts
Burns	Hagel	Santorum
Coats	Hatch	Sessions
Cochran	Helms	Shelby
Coverdell	Hutchinson	Smith, Bob
Craig	Hutchison	Thomas
D'Amato	Inhofe	Thompson
DeWine	Kempthorne	Thurmond
Domenici	Kyl	
Enzi	Lott	

NOT VOTING—1

Inouye

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 36) was passed.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed.

Mr. BYRD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.